AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

ADVANCING UNITED STATES' INTERESTS AT THE UNITED NATIONS

HEARING

BEFORE THE

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FOURTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

JUNE 16, 2015

Serial No. 114–59

Printed for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs



Available via the World Wide Web: http://www.foreignaffairs.house.gov/ or
http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

95–125PDF WASHINGTON : 2015

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Publishing 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 FOREIGN AFFAIRS

EDWARD R. ROYCE, California, *Chairman*

CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH, New Jersey
ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, Florida
DANA ROHRABACHER, California
STEVE CHABOT, Ohio
JOE WILSON, South Carolina
MICHAEL T. MCCAUL, Texas
TED POE, Texas
MATT SALMON, Arizona
DARRELL E. ISSA, California
TOM MARINO, Pennsylvania
JEFF DUNCAN, South Carolina
MO BROOKS, Alabama
PAUL COOK, California
RANDY K. WEBER SR., Texas
SCOTT PERRY, Pennsylvania
RON DESANTIS, Florida
MARK MEADOWS, North Carolina
TED S. YOHO, Florida
CURT CLAWSON, Florida
SCOTT DESJARLAIS, Tennessee
REID J. RIBBLE, Wisconsin
DAVID A. TROTT, Michigan
LEE M. ZELDIN, New York
DANIEL DONOVAN, New York

ELIOT L. ENGEL, New York
BRAD SHERMAN, California
GREGORY W. MEEKS, New York
ALBIO SIRES, New Jersey
GERALD E. CONNOLLY, Virginia
THEODORE E. DEUTCH, Florida
BRIAN HIGGINS, New York
KAREN BASS, California
WILLIAM KEATING, Massachusetts
DAVID CICILLINE, Rhode Island
ALAN GRAYSON, Florida
AMI BERA, California
ALAN S. LOWENTHAL, California
GRACE MENG, New York
LOIS FRANKEL, Florida
TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
JOAQUIN CASTRO, Texas
ROBIN L. KELLY, Illinois
BRENDAN F. BOYLE, Pennsylvania

AMY PORTER, *Chief of Staff* THOMAS SHEEHY, *Staff Director*
JASON STEINBAUM, *Democratic Staff Director*

CONTENTS

Page

WITNESS

The Honorable Samantha Power, U.S. Permanent Representative, United States Mission to the United Nations, U.S. Department of State 4

LETTERS, STATEMENTS, ETC., SUBMITTED FOR THE HEARING

The Honorable Samantha Power: Prepared statement 8

APPENDIX

Hearing notice 60
Hearing minutes 61
The Honorable Gerald E. Connolly, a Representative in Congress from the Commonwealth of Virginia: Prepared statement 63
Written responses from the Honorable Samantha Power to questions submitted for the record by the Honorable Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, a Representative in Congress from the State of Florida 64

ADVANCING UNITED STATES' INTERESTS AT THE UNITED NATIONS

TUESDAY, JUNE 16, 2015

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS,
Washington, DC.

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:13 a.m. in room 2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Ed Royce (chairman of the committee) presiding.

Chairman ROYCE. This hearing will come to order.

This morning we look at the role of the United Nations and we look at the role of the U.S. there with Ambassador Samantha Power.

She has spent 2 years as the U.S. Permanent Representative to the U.N. The Ambassador has approached her job with great energy, great determination, perhaps best shown during last year's Ebola crisis in West Africa. And, in that case, the administration and Congress worked together to contain Ebola and to save lives. Ambassador, thank you for those efforts. Thank you for joining us today.

The Ambassador's testimony comes at an important time. If a final Iran nuclear agreement is reached, and the deadline is in 2 weeks, then the Security Council will be expected to remove international sanctions while preserving the ability to react to Iranian cheating. And given all we know about the history of Iran's nuclear program, cheating should be expected.

The committee wants to know how, in a case of cheating, a proposed sanctions "snap-back" process would work. We know for sure that Russia and China wouldn't make this easy. And I have never known any U.N. process described as taking place in a "snap." Last week's revelation by a panel of U.N. experts that there has been not a single report of Iran violating the U.N. arms embargo not only lacks any credibility, but calls into serious question the chances of the U.N. snapping back any sanctions.

The committee is disturbed to watch the U.N.'S continuing anti-Israeli bias, especially in the Human Rights Council. More disturbing is that the Obama administration seems to be on the brink of discarding decades of bipartisan support of Israeli against the U.N. onslaught. President Obama has raised the dramatic step of allowing the Security Council to impose conditions related to a two-state solution rather than supporting negotiations between the parties themselves. Ambassador, as Ranking Member Engel and I

wrote to you the other month, an imposed plan will not get us closer to peace.

Nearby, Syrians are being slaughtered before the world's eyes. Two years ago the United Nations called the crisis in Syria the worst humanitarian disaster since the Rwandan genocide. Yet, despite several U.N. resolutions, the Assad regime continues its indiscriminate barrel bombing and chemical weapons attacks.

Those responsible for these war crimes must be held accountable. Ambassador, you have said this, to your credit. But when? When will that accountability come? The committee hears testimony tomorrow from some of the brave Syrians who have appeared in front of the Security Council to share their stories of responding to Assad's abhorrent attacks, including chemical attacks.

Elsewhere, religious minorities are under attack. Unable to claim citizenship in Burma or elsewhere, many have called the Rohingyas "the most persecuted minority in the world." Burma's persecution has led thousands to desperately flee to overloaded boats. Many are rightly bothered by the United Nation's poor track record protecting Rohingyas. Young Rohingya Muslim girls can think that they are finding safe haven, but end up being trafficked, being sexually exploited, being led into a lifetime of misery.

United Nation's peacekeeping, by the way, despite many shortcomings, has managed to protect innocent civilians and minorities. In recent years, the missions in the Democratic Republican of Congo, in Mali and South Sudan have saved lives. The committee wants to continue working with the Ambassador to see that these missions are appropriately supported, and we hope that something can be done for the Rohingya people. That is easier if failing missions some decades old are closed and the horrendous sexual abuses are tackled head on.

U.N. reforms shouldn't be limited to peacekeeping. This summer, when the U.N.'S scale of assessments is reviewed, I trust the U.S. delegation will be working to spread the burden and give major donors greater say in management decisions.

Ambassador Power, you will be wrestling with many critical issues in the coming months. To say you have a difficult and even hostile environment at the U.N. is an understatement, but you do not appear to be one to shy away from a challenge. I look forward to continuing to work with you on these pressing matters. We thank you again for being with us today.

And I will now turn to Mr. Eliot Engel, the ranking member, of New York for his opening statement.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this hearing.

And, Ambassador Power, welcome. Thank you for your testimony today and, more importantly, for your distinguished service. As far as I am concerned, you are certainly the right person at the right time to be our U.N. Ambassador and we are lucky to have you.

Across seven decades, the United Nations has done a great deal of good: Millions saved from starvation, diseases like smallpox wiped off the map, sanctions that have ended conflict and curbed terrorism, peacekeeping missions that have brought stability to war-torn regions.

At the same time, however, we must acknowledge that the U.N. is far from perfect. We need to improve the organization's manage-

ment, enhance transparency and strengthen internal oversight, and we must continue to speak out forcefully when member states use the U.N. as a platform to unfairly single out Israel.

In my mind, the best way to address these problems and to advance American foreign policy priorities is to maintain our engagement with the organization. U.S. leadership at the U.N. has headed off deeply biased and one-sided resolutions targeting Israel. We cast a lone no vote against the Commission of Inquiry into the situation in Gaza.

We have helped scale back the number of anti-Israel efforts in the Human Rights Council overall. And the Human Rights Council has really been a joke, as far as I am concerned.

We pushed back against the resolution recognizing Palestinian statehood, and we have rejected efforts by the Palestinians to use the U.N. to gain concessions from Israel outside of the context of negotiations.

I want to thank you, Madam Ambassador, because you have been such a champion to Israel. The Israeli Ambassador to the U.N. said last week that, if it weren't for the help of the United States and you personally, Israel—and I quote him—"would be in real trouble." When the United Nations continues to attack Israel, it really undermines the credibility of the United Nations.

I am confident that you will continue to make clear, Madam Ambassador, that the United States will continue to oppose any biased or one-sided resolutions at the U.N. and that we will not shy away from using our veto at the Security Council, if necessary, despite some of the rhetoric we have heard from President Obama.

But even with strong American involvement, the U.N. has been virtually paralyzed when it comes to a range of challenges around the world because other members of the Security Council continue to block meaningful action. I would like to mention just a few. I am eager to hear your views on these topics.

I will start with the civil war in Syria. Half the population of that country has been displaced. An entire generation is growing up in refugee camps. To be sure, the U.N. has done a lot for refugee families in Jordan, Lebanon, and Turkey, and most of the assistance for Syrian people inside Syria has flowed through the U.N.

But Russia's intransigence has prevented the U.N. from playing a more active role in helping the Syrian people chart a better future for their country. And that is only the tip of the iceberg with Russia.

Under Vladimir Putin's leadership or lack of leadership, Russia has walked away from democracy, the rule of law, and human rights. Their ongoing intervention in Ukraine threatens stability and democracy across Europe. This war has left thousands dead, tens of thousands wounded, and more than 1 million displaced. We need to expose the Kremlin's lies wherever and whenever we can. So I commend you for shining a light on the hard facts in the U.N.

With regard to Iran, we are all eager to see what a comprehensive nuclear deal will look like. I am particularly concerned about who will determine if Iran is in violation of the agreement. What happens if we think Iran has stepped over the line, but Russia and China disagree? I am also concerned about how and when U.N. sanctions against Iran will be lifted. The U.N. is going to have a

big role to play, and I am eager to hear your views about how this process will move forward.

Finally, in our own neighborhood, I am very pleased that the mandate for the U.N. International Commission Against Impunity in Guatemala was recently renewed. Creating similar conditions in Honduras and El Salvador would make a big difference in fighting corruption and impunity, and I hope we can work together urging our partners to take this step.

Ambassador Power, thank you again for appearing today. I look forward to your testimony.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you.

So this morning we are pleased to be joined by Ambassador Samantha Power. She is the United States Permanent Representative to the United Nations and a member of the President's cabinet.

Prior to her appointment to the U.N., Ambassador Power served as special assistant to the President and Senior Director for Multilateral Affairs and Human Rights on the National Security staff at the White House. Ambassador Power is the Pulitzer Prize winning author of "A Problem from Hell: America and the Age of Genocide."

We thank you for being with us today.

And, without objection, the witness' full prepared statement will be made part of the record and members will have 5 calendar days to submit any statements or questions or extraneous material for the record.

Ambassador Power, I would ask you if you could please summarize your remarks and then we will go to questions. Thank you.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE SAMANTHA POWER, U.S. PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE, UNITED STATES MISSION TO THE UNITED NATIONS, U.S. DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Ambassador POWER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Congressman Engel.

Distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today and thank you for being here. Thank you, also, for your leadership in advancing America's national security interests and our values in the world.

Last week I traveled to Ukraine, where I had the chance to see up close what happens when the rules undergirding our international peace and security are ignored.

At a shelter for displaced families in Kiev, I met a mother who told me how her husband and 2-year-old child had been killed in February when a shell struck their home in a village in eastern Ukraine.

The shelling, as you all know, was part of a sustained assault by combined Russian separatist forces and the victims, just two of the more than 6,300 people who had been killed in the Moscow-manufactured conflict.

Shortly after the attack the mother fled town with her five surviving children in a van whose roof and doors had been blasted out. Her plea, one I heard echoed by many of the displaced families I met from eastern Ukraine and occupied Crimea, was for the fighting to stop and for their basic rights to be respected.

As the members of this committee know, we are living in a time of daunting global crises. In the last year alone, Russia continued

to train, arm, and fight alongside separatists in eastern Ukraine. A deadly epidemic spread across West Africa, and monstrous terrorist groups seized territory across the Middle East and North Africa committing unspeakable atrocities.

These are the kinds of threats that the United Nations exists to prevent and address. Yet, it is precisely at the moment when we need the U.N. most that we see the flaws in the international system, some of which have been alluded to already.

This is true for the conflict in Ukraine in which a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council is violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity that it was entrusted with upholding.

It is true of the global health system that, despite multiple warnings of a spreading Ebola outbreak, including those from our own CDC, was slow to respond to the epidemic.

And it is true of U.N. peacekeepers who too often stand down or stand by when civilians they are responsible for protecting come under attack, thus leaving populations vulnerable and sometimes open to radicalization.

Representing our Nation before the United Nations, I have to confront these and other shortcomings every day. Yet, though I am clear-eyed about the U.N.'S vulnerabilities, the central point I want to make to this committee is that America needs the United Nations to address today's global challenges.

The United States has the most powerful set of tools in history to advance its interests, and we will always lead on the world stage. But we are more effective when we ensure that others shoulder their fair share and when we marshal multilateral support to meet our objectives.

Let me quickly outline five ways we are doing that at the U.N.

First, we are rallying multilateral coalitions to address transnational threats. Consider Iran. In addition to working with Congress to put in place unprecedented U.S. sanctions on the Iranian Government, in 2010 the Obama administration galvanized the U.N. Security Council to authorize one of the toughest multilateral sanctions regimes in history.

The combination of unilateral and multilateral pressure was crucial to bringing Iran to the negotiating table and ultimately to laying the foundation whereby we were able to reach a framework agreement that would, if we can get a final deal, effectively cut off every pathway for the Iranian regime to develop a nuclear weapon.

Consider our response to the Ebola epidemic. Last September, as people were dying outside hospitals in West Africa, hospitals that had no beds left to treat the exploding number of Ebola patients, the United States chaired the first-ever emergency meeting of the U.N. Security Council dedicated to a global health issue.

We pressed countries to deploy doctors and nurses, to build clinics and testing labs, and to fill other gaps that ultimately helped bend the outbreak's exponentially rising curve.

America did not just rally others to step up, we led by example, thanks, also, very much to the support of this Congress deploying more than 3,500 U.S. Government civilian and military personnel to Liberia, which has been Ebola-free since early May.

Second, we are reforming U.N. peacekeeping to help address the threats to international peace and security that exist in the 21st

century. There are more than 100,000 uniformed police and soldiers deployed in the U.N.'S 16 peacekeeping missions around the world. That is a higher number than in any time in history, with more complex responsibilities also than ever before.

The United States has an abiding strategic interest in resolving the conflicts where peacekeepers serve, which can quickly cause regional instability and attract extremist groups as we have seen in Mali. Yet, while we have seen peacekeepers serve with bravery and professionalism in many of the world's most dangerous operating environments, we have also seen chronic problems too often, as mentioned, including the failure to protect civilians.

We are working aggressively to address these shortfalls. To give just one example, we are persuading more advanced militaries to step up and contribute soldiers and police to U.N. peacekeeping. That was the aim of a summit that Vice President Biden convened at the U.N. last September where Colombia, Sweden, Indonesia, and more than a dozen other countries announced new troop commitments.

And it is the message I took directly to European leaders in March when I made the case in Brussels that peacekeeping is a critical way for militaries to do their fair share in protecting our common security interests, particularly as they draw down in Afghanistan.

This coming September, President Obama will convene another summit of world leaders to build on this momentum and help catalyze a new wave of commitments and generate a new set of capabilities for U.N. peacekeeping.

Third, we are fighting to end bias and discrimination at the U.N. day in and day out we push back against efforts to de-legitimize Israel at the U.N. and we fight for its right to be treated like any other nation, from mounting a full-court diplomatic press, to heap secure Israel's permanent membership into two U.N. groups from which it had long and unjustly been excluded, to consistently and firmly opposing one-sided actions in international bodies.

In December, when a deeply unbalanced draft resolution on the Israel-Palestinian conflict was hastily put before the Security Council, the United States successfully rallied a coalition to join us in voting against it, ensuring that the resolution failed to achieve the nine votes of Security Council members required for adoption. We will continue to confront anti-Israel bias wherever we encounter it.

Fourth, we are working to use U.N. tools to promote human rights and affirm human dignity as we did by working with partners to hold the first-ever Security Council meeting focused on the human rights situation in North Korea in December. We used that session to shine a light on the regime's horrors, a light we kept shining through a panel discussion I hosted in April with escaped victims of the regime.

One woman told of being forced to watch the executions of fellow prisoners who committed the "crime" of daring to ask why they had been imprisoned, while another woman told how members from three generations of her family—her grandmother, her father, and her younger brother—had starved to death. This is important for U.N. member states to hear.

Fifth, we are doing everything within our power to make the U.N. more fiscally responsible, more accountable, and more nimble, both because we have a responsibility to ensure American taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and because maximizing the efficiency of our contributions means saving more lives and better protecting the world's most vulnerable people.

Since the 2008 to 2009 fiscal year, we have reduced the cost per peacekeeper by 18 percent and we are constantly looking for ways to rightsize missions in response to conditions on the ground as we will do this year through substantial drawdowns in Cote d'Ivoire, Haiti, and Liberia, among other missions.

Let me conclude. At the outset, I spoke of my recent visit to Ukraine. Across the range of Ukrainians I met, from the mother who lost her husband and 2-year-old child in the assaults by combined Russian separatist forces, to the brave students who risked their lives to take part in the Maidan protesters against the kleptocratic Yanukovych government, to the young members of Parliament working to fight corruption and increase transparency, what united them was the yearning for certain basic rights and the belief that the United States could lead other countries and the United Nations in helping make their aspirations a reality.

I heard the same sentiment when visiting the U.N.-run camps of people displaced by violence in the Central African Republic, in South Sudan, and in the Ebola-affected communities of Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone at the peak of the outbreak.

Some may view the expectation that America can help people overcome their greatest challenges and secure their basic rights as a burden. In fact, that expectation is one of our Nation's greatest strengths and one we have a vested interest in striving to live up to, daunting as it may feel in the face of so many crises.

But we cannot do it alone, nor should we want to. That is why it is more important than ever that we use the U.N. to rally the multilateral support needed to confront today's myriad challenges.

Thank you. And I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Ambassador Power follows:]

Ambassador Samantha Power

House Foreign Affairs Committee

Advancing U.S. Interests at the United Nations
June 16, 2015

Chairman Royce, Ranking Member Engel, distinguished members of the Committee, thank you for the invitation to testify today. I am grateful for this panel's enduring commitment to American leadership at the United Nations and in the world. And I appreciate the rigor that your members bring to ensuring the oversight and effective use of our contributions to the United Nations – a goal we share.

Today, I will lay out five main objectives to advancing America's interests at the United Nations, and detail the progress we are making towards meeting them: 1) marshalling the unique multilateral capabilities of the UN to address transnational threats; 2) reforming UN peacekeeping for 21st century conflicts; 3) fighting bias and discrimination within the UN; 4) promoting human rights and human dignity; and 5) improving the UN's efficiency and effectiveness by pressing for reforms that make the organization more fiscally responsible, accountable and nimble.

I. Rallying Multilateral Coalitions to Address Transnational Threats

The first objective is building multilateral coalitions to address global threats. In the past year, a deadly epidemic exploded in West Africa, threatening to roll back decades of progress and kill tens or even hundreds of thousands of people. A monstrous terrorist group emerged from Syria's grinding civil war, seizing large swaths of Iraq – and executing journalists, aid workers and entire communities simply because of their ethnicity or what they believe. Unsatisfied with occupying and attempting to annex Crimea, Russia trained and armed separatists in eastern Ukraine, and sent Russian soldiers to fight by their side.

What many of these contemporary crises share in common is that the threats they pose extend far beyond any national border or even region. And no individual country – not even one as powerful as the United States – can tackle them alone. Nor would we want to, even if we could. But far too often, we have seen other countries – including those most directly affected – do little or nothing at all, as though expecting the United States or others to do the job for them. That puts us in a daunting position – aware that we ignore these problems at our own risk, but also that, to address them, we must rally other countries that are often reluctant to do their part.

These are the kinds of global challenges for which the United Nations was created. And yet these crises also expose profound weaknesses and vulnerabilities in the international system. We saw a global health system led by the WHO that – despite multiple warnings from NGOs like Médecins Sans Frontières and from our own Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) – was slow to respond to the epidemic's growing momentum, missing the chance to contain the outbreak early. We saw a UN Security Council where two out of the fifteen members – China and Russia – used their veto to stop a resolution on the situation in Syria that included a referral to the International Criminal Court. That resolution would have sent a clear message to perpetrators that the international community agreed they must be held accountable for their crimes – particularly the Assad regime, which has tortured, killed, starved, bombed and gassed its own people; but instead it was blocked. And we see Russia – one of the permanent members of the Council entrusted with "primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security" – trying to lop off territory of its neighbor Ukraine. I visited Ukraine just last week in order to send a message of solidarity with the Ukrainian people and reaffirm our support for their right to determine the course of Ukraine's future.

In my position as the United States Representative to the United Nations, I have to confront these vulnerabilities every day. The reality is that we need the UN to work, and to do so more efficiently and effectively, if we are to confront today's global threats and succeed in making the world more secure. We need to marshal the international community's unique multilateral capabilities to complement our unilateral capabilities, and the UN is the best forum for doing so.

Iran

As we consider the importance of multilateralism, let me address an issue on everyone's minds: Iran. Republicans and Democrats agree that we cannot and will not allow Iran to obtain a nuclear weapon. That is why President Obama worked with members of both parties in Congress to put in place unprecedented U.S. sanctions on Iran. President Obama also recognized that convincing other countries to impose similar sanctions would increase the pressure on Iran – which is why the Administration pushed hard to get the UN to impose multiple rounds of targeted sanctions against Iran. And we succeeded. Today, the UN has in place one of the toughest sanctions regimes in the history of the organization – sanctions that all UN Member States are required to

enforce. The European Union and other like-minded countries followed suit with their own additional sanctions. It was this combination of unilateral and multilateral pressure that helped bring Iran to the negotiating table. With our leadership, the UN Human Rights Council established a Special Rapporteur to monitor human rights in Iran, and it has renewed the rapporteur's mandate since then. The rapporteur has written hard-hitting reports that maintain international pressure on Iran to improve its human rights record.

Because I know it is of interest to this committee, let me speak briefly about the framework of a Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action that our negotiators reached in early April. This deal is not predicated on trusting Iran. To the contrary, the Administration entered these negotiations clear-eyed about the nature of the Iranian regime – a regime that has been a leading state sponsor of terrorism, a chronic human rights violator, and patron of abusive regimes. We have never lost sight of that reality. Indeed, that is precisely why we grounded the framework on rigorous verification measures to provide the information and access necessary to ensure that Iran meets its commitments and that its nuclear program is exclusively peaceful. It is based on facts, not faith. On proof, not goodwill.

This framework is predicated on our core objectives – strictly limiting Iran's program to ensure it is exclusively peaceful, and cutting off every pathway that Iran could take to developing enough fissile material for a nuclear weapon. That means no enrichment paths through Natanz or Fordow. No plutonium path through Arak. And effectively no potential covert path.

Iran will be subject to a rigorous transparency regime. Many important commitments such as those related to enrichment last at least a decade, yet some commitments are permanent – with no sunset clauses. Iran will decommission over 10,000 enrichment centrifuges, around two-thirds of the stock it possesses. Under this deal, Iran will get rid of about 98 percent of its stockpile of enriched uranium, retaining only 300 kilograms. As centrifuges are removed and facilities repurposed, Iran's breakout time – the time it could take to produce enough highly enriched uranium for a nuclear weapon – will go from a few months to at least one year.

In exchange, Iran will receive substantial sanctions relief only when it verifiably completes its major nuclear-related steps and the breakout time has been increased to at least a year. And if Iran violates the deal, we will snap sanctions back into place.

Just as the pressure from UN sanctions helped bring Iran to the negotiating table with the P5+1, we expect the UN Security Council to play an important role in an eventual deal. And just as our domestic sanctions can easily be put back into place if there is substantial noncompliance, there will be procedures to ensure that the UN sanctions snap back too.

Ebola

A nuclear armed Iran is not the only threat for which we have mobilized multilateral action through the UN. In September 2014, as we looked in horror at the sharply rising curve depicting the Ebola epidemic's projected spread, we used the UN to catalyze the international community – including the UN's own institutions – to confront a threat growing exponentially. On September 15, we convened representatives of UN Member States at the U.S. mission for a briefing by the CDC. At the briefing, CDC representatives told diplomats from around the world that – according to the worst case projections – more than a million people could be infected with the disease within months if urgent action was not taken. Together with the CDC and representatives from Guinea, Liberia, and Sierra Leone, the United States argued that an all-hands-on-deck effort was essential to avoiding a catastrophe on this scale. And we urged the diplomats in that room to send this urgent message back to their capitals.

Three days later, we used our convening power as president of the UN Security Council to hold the Council's first ever emergency meeting on a health crisis. We invited a Liberian healthcare worker named Jackson Naimah to speak to the Council by video. He described people dying outside the gates of the Médecins Sans Frontières clinic in Monrovia where he worked, because there were no more beds to take them in. He said, "I feel that the future of my country is hanging in the balance…If the international community does not stand up, we will be wiped out."

The following week, President Obama convened world leaders, pressing them to do their part, whether by deploying health professionals and logisticians, building Ebola treatment units and labs, providing personal protective equipment, contributing cash, or filling any of the other gaps enabling the epidemic's exponential spread.

The United States led this effort by example, deploying more than 3,500 U.S. civilian and military personnel from the Department of Defense, USAID, the CDC, the U.S. Public Health Service, and other agencies to Liberia. Liberia went from having the highest number of infections many times over when the U.S. began its intervention, to the first of the three most affected countries to reach zero cases in April. We are extremely grateful to Congress for providing the resources for this robust response through an emergency appropriation, without which the United States' decisive role in addressing this crisis would not have been possible.

The UN system's response as coordinated by UNMEER has played – and continues to play – a critically important role in bending the curve, from the logistics support provided by the World Food Program, to the awareness-raising efforts in communities by UNICEF, to the trainings and epidemiological work of the World Health Organization (WHO). As we move from bending the curve to ending the curve, we are working closely with the UN Secretariat to ensure UNMEER is scaled down as swiftly as conditions allow, and ultimately concludes its mission. UNMEER is

scheduled to transfer its remaining responsibilities on the ground to relevant UN agencies and country teams by the end of July, and close out financially by the end of August.

We are not at zero yet but there is no question that, had it not been for the U.S.'s leadership – not only in our unilateral efforts in Liberia, but also in galvanizing other nations to do their part – tens or even hundreds of thousands more lives may have been lost. And our job does not stop at zero – we know that 70 percent of countries are not yet prepared to prevent outbreaks like Ebola from becoming epidemics. President Obama hosted 44 countries at the White House to advance the Global Health Security Agenda and over 100 concrete new commitments to build capacity around the world to prevent, detect and respond to infectious disease threats. G-7 Leaders have just agreed to match the U.S. commitment by agreeing to assist 60 countries over the next five years, including the countries of West Africa, to establish this vital capability. In New York, we continue to work with partners to attain additional, tangible commitments and to ultimately prevent the tragedy that unfolded in West Africa from happening again.

Foreign Terrorist Fighters

In addition to strengthening our efforts to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon and curb the deadly Ebola outbreak, we are also using the UN to mobilize coordinated global efforts to combat violent extremism – and in particular, to halt the flow of foreign terrorist fighters and their sources of funding. More than 22,000 foreign terrorist fighters from over 100 countries have traveled to Syria since the beginning of the conflict, at least 4,000 of whom carry Western passports.

This is a problem where the failure of any one country to stop the flow of fighters or funding can have immediate, dire consequences for other countries. Yet governments have been slow to develop the laws and capabilities to address this grave threat. To help close these gaps, President Obama convened a Summit of world leaders at the UN in September, where the Security Council adopted a resolution requiring countries to have laws to prosecute foreign terrorist fighters and those who fund them, and to prevent them from entering and transiting their territory. It also calls on governments to improve cooperation in this effort, including through increased information sharing and capacity building, as well as efforts to counter violent extremism. We are now focused on implementing this landmark resolution, mobilizing the UN system alongside our individual efforts to help countries develop their ability to address this threat.

We are also using the UN to find innovative ways to cut off the ways violent extremist groups fund their violence and recruitment. As with our sanctions on Iran – the more countries that join this effort, the harder it is for groups like ISIL and al-Nusra Front to fill their coffers. A resolution we led in February targeted three of the groups' funding streams: illicit oil smuggling, the trade in looted antiquities, and ransoms for kidnapping victims.

II. Preparing UN Peacekeeping for 21st Century Conflicts

The second objective is reforming UN peacekeeping for 21st century conflicts. There are currently sixteen UN peacekeeping missions worldwide, made up of nearly 130,000 personnel, at least 100,000 of them are uniformed military and police, compared to just 75,000 total personnel a decade ago. This is by far the most peacekeepers that have ever been active in history and does not even include the 22,000 personnel deployed as part of the African Union mission in Somalia.

Numbers only tell part of the story. We are asking UN peacekeepers to do more, in more places, and in more complex conflicts than at any time in history. We are asking them to contain – and at times, even disarm – violent groups. We are asking them to facilitate safe delivery of life-saving humanitarian assistance. We are asking them to protect civilians from atrocities. And we are asking them to help provide stability and post-conflict reconstruction in countries emerging from brutal civil wars. Two-thirds of peacekeepers are operating in active conflict areas, the highest percentage ever, often involving myriad rebel groups and militias who have made clear that they intend to keep fighting.

Some say that we're asking too much of UN peacekeeping. But we are asking more of peacekeeping because today's threats demand that peacekeepers play such a role.

These conflicts matter to the United States. Violence within a country can quickly cause national and regional instability, displacing millions of people, upending markets, and spilling over into neighboring countries. Conflicts undo the hard-earned progress countries have made toward building democracy; they weaken both governments and civil society; and they allow criminals and repressors to thrive. And conflicts increasingly attract violent extremist groups, who can use the vacuum of authority to terrorize civilian populations and plan and launch attacks – including on the United States or on American citizens living abroad. The suffering they cause can also be a powerful recruitment tool for terrorists, even when they are not fueled at the outset by violent extremist elements.

Not only does curbing violent conflict make us safer, it is also consistent with what our hearts tell us is right. We – and by "we" I count not only members of the Administration and Congress, but also the vast majority of Americans – do not want to live in a world where religious or ethnic communities who lived together for decades in harmony, such as the Muslims and Christians in the Central African Republic, learn to hate and fear one another.

There is one additional reason America has a strategic interest in making UN peacekeeping effective: it ensures that other countries help shoulder the burden in addressing violent conflicts, both by contributing troops and sharing the financial costs of operations, thereby helping address the free-rider problem we see in so many matters of international security, and helping avert potentially costlier U.S. military involvement.

But at the same time as we see the promise of contemporary peacekeeping, we also see its pitfalls. Troops frequently take a long time to deploy, and have limited mobility. Missions have trouble keeping units fed and hydrated in remote areas. And with alarming regularity, peacekeepers fail to stand up to human rights abusers and protect civilians from attacks.

Consider the peacekeeping mission in the Democratic Republic of Congo. After years of stagnancy, a special unit of the mission known as the Force Intervention Brigade has played a catalytic role in disarming and defeating powerful rebel groups. The UN force commander, Brazilian Lieutenant General Carlos Alberto dos Santos Cruz, has led the brigade in neutralizing a number of powerful rebel groups, including the M23, which had committed unspeakable atrocities against Congolese civilians. And yet at the same time, we still see UN peacekeepers in Congo all too often failing to protect civilians. Last June, when the Congolese town of Mutarule came under attack just a few kilometers from a UN peacekeeper base and residents called for help, no one responded. More than thirty people were massacred, eight of them kids.

We are also deeply troubled by the observations of sexual exploitation and abuse detailed in a recent evaluation by the Office of Internal Oversight Services (OIOS). This is unfortunately yet another in a string of reports which highlighted allegations made against foreign troops, including UN Peacekeepers, operating in situations in which soldiers, entrusted with the responsibility of protecting the dignity, welfare, and lives of vulnerable people, fundamentally violate that trust. Any instance of sexual exploitation or abuse is one too many. We have urged the United Nations to shed light on these and other allegations of abuse in support of efforts to prevent or halt such abuses. In the same vein, we are urging the United Nations to take swift action to hold those responsible to account and to protect those who expose such abuses.

Let me share five lines of effort the United States is pursuing to strengthen UN peacekeeping so it can better meet the demands of 21st century conflicts.

First, we are deepening the pool of countries that deploy troops and police. That is why Vice President Biden convened world leaders at the UN General Assembly in September 2014 for a Peacekeeping Summit, where he pressed for – and secured – more commitments from capable force contributors, particularly from developed countries. Indonesia announced that it will more than double its deployment of troops to peacekeeping from 1,800 to 4,000. Colombia announced its intent to contribute troops for the first time in its history. President Obama will convene another UN summit in September to build on this momentum, and secure the additional troop and police commitments to match the demand of today's conflicts.

A critical part of that effort is encouraging the return of European militaries to UN peacekeeping. Two decades ago, 25,000 troops from European militaries served in UN peacekeeping operations

– more than 40 percent of blue helmets at the time. Today, fewer than 6,000 European troops are serving in UN peacekeeping missions, less than 7 percent of UN troops. In March, I traveled to Brussels to make this case directly to European leaders.

As I argued in Brussels, peacekeeping allows European troops with key niche capabilities to have an outsized impact, and raises the quality of the entire enterprise, while giving European militaries the chance to preserve their level or preparedness, and take up their fair share of maintaining international peace and security. We have seen the momentum-shifting impact that even a modest contribution of 400 Dutch troops can make in the capabilities of the UN peacekeeping mission in Mali. And the need comes at a time when Europe has troops to spare, having drawn down in Afghanistan from approximately 35,000 troops four years ago to less than 2,000 today.

Second, we are ensuring that countries with the will to perform 21st century peacekeeping have the capacity to do so. To this end, President Obama announced the African Peacekeeping Rapid Response Partnership, APRRP ("A-Prep"), which is investing $110 million each year for the next three to five years to build the capacity of an initial core group of six countries – Ethiopia, Ghana, Rwanda, Senegal, Tanzania, and Uganda. The initiative aims to deepen our investment in countries that have a track record of deploying troops and police to peacekeeping operations and that make a commitment to protecting civilians from violence and complements the ongoing Africa Contingency Operations Training and Assistance (ACOTA) program and its pre-deployment training of over 75 battalions for African Union/United Nations Peace support operations demands. APRRP is an extremely important initiative that deserves Congress's support.

Third, we are working to build a global consensus in support of the mandates peacekeepers are being asked to undertake. Today, approximately 98 percent of UN peacekeepers have mandates that charge them with protecting civilians. However, a number of large troop-contributors openly express skepticism at the scope of responsibilities assigned to their forces, which has resulted in their standing by or standing down rather than standing up when civilians are attacked. A report by the UN's internal oversight office last March found that in 507 attacks against civilians from 2010 to 2013, peacekeepers virtually never used force to protect civilians under attack. Thousands of civilians may have lost their lives as a result. This is unacceptable and we are committed to changing it.

Fourth, we are pressing UN peacekeeping to make bold and innovative institutional reforms. Recent reforms include longer troop rotations to preserve institutional memory, financial penalties for troops who show up without the necessary equipment to perform their duties, and financial premiums for troops who are willing to accept higher risks. The Secretary-General launched the first strategic review of peace operations in nearly 15 years and we anticipate the

final report on this review any day now. While we don't expect a review alone to remedy deficiencies in capabilities and shortages in political will, we are pushing the high-level panel to address the shortcomings within the UN itself, such as inadequate planning, uneven mission leadership, and inadequate measures to prevent sexual exploitation and abuse.

Fifth, we are making UN peacekeeping missions more adaptive to changing conditions on the ground. While the UN is not known for being a nimble organization, crises are fluid, and peacekeeping must get better at adapting to them. Consider the UN peacekeeping mission in Liberia, UNMIL. Last year, we were in the process of drawing down UNMIL's forces when the Ebola outbreak metastasized. Our strategy had to shift swiftly from downsizing to maximizing UNMIL's abilities and infrastructure to aid in the Ebola response. Now that the outbreak has been brought under control in Liberia, our discussion of UNMIL's role must adapt once again.

We are constantly looking for ways to right-size missions. In some circumstances, right-sizing means scaling down. This year, thanks in large part to our pressure, the MINUSTAH mission in Haiti will complete its reduction to the troop and police levels it had before the 2010 earthquake, while continuing to train the Haitian National Police to take up their responsibilities. As Côte d'Ivoire prepares to hold its first presidential elections since the 2011 crisis, the UN peacekeeping mission there is continuing its phased reduction in military personnel. And as Liberia and its neighbors bring the Ebola outbreak to zero, we will once again be looking to draw down forces in UNMIL.

Right-sizing does not always mean downsizing. In South Sudan – where more than 120,000 civilians are taking shelter from violence on UN bases, at least 2 million people have been displaced, and a peace agreement remains elusive – current troop levels must be maintained. In the Central African Republic – where last year blue helmets took the place of African Union peacekeepers, and where French troops are drawing down – the UN is still at only 80 percent of its full strength. The mission must scale up to 100 percent to create the political space for a transition to a new, democratically elected government, and to ensure peacekeepers can prevent atrocities like the ones we have witnessed by armed militias.

As we work to make the UN better at adapting to changing conditions, it is important that we make ourselves more nimble as well. No matter how carefully we plan, unforeseen emergencies can and often do arise – including crises for which it is in our national interest to support new or expanded peacekeeping operations. The Central African Republic and South Sudan are just the most recent examples.

That is why I hope Congress will support the request to authorize the Peace Operations Response Mechanism requested in this year's budget. This mechanism would ensure funding is available to respond swiftly to unforeseen requirements that emerge outside of our regular budget cycle,

without endangering critical, ongoing, budgeted peacekeeping efforts or other national security priorities. This added flexibility will strengthen our ability to help prevent conflicts from destabilizing countries or entire regions, and to save lives. Any allocation of such funds would be subject to the Secretary of State's determination that additional funds are needed, and would be allocated only after consulting with Congress.

And finally, there is very little that undermines the efforts of a UN peacekeeping mission more than to have those who are sent to protect the vulnerable become the abusers. The United States is therefore a leading and long-standing proponent of measures to prevent and investigate misconduct in peacekeeping operations, in particular sexual misconduct. Any case of abuse is a case too many, and we remain concerned at the number of cases involving the most egregious forms of sexual exploitation and sexual abuse. We are working with partners to improve the measures for protection from this abuse in the areas of prevention, including training, enforcement and remedial action. We have called upon all member states to continue their efforts in strengthening accountability, including holding perpetrators accountable. We support measures that will enhance community outreach for reporting, and those that adequately provide for victim assistance.

III. Fighting Bias and Discrimination within the United Nations

The third objective is confronting anti-Israel bias, which has become a long and bipartisan American tradition at the UN. It is the living legacy of every single U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations – from my predecessor, Ambassador Rice, through master diplomats from both parties, from Moynihan to Kirkpatrick, Albright to Holbrooke.

Day in and day out, we push back against efforts to delegitimize Israel at the UN, and fight for its right to be treated like any other nation. We do this not because Israel is one of our closest allies – though Israel is. We do it because unfairly singling out any nation undermines the entire UN system, by violating its core principles. Or, as UN Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan so eloquently put it in 1975, when the UN was on the verge of passing its infamous resolution declaring Zionism a form of racism, "What we have at stake here is not merely the honor and the legitimacy of the State of Israel – although a challenge to the legitimacy of any member nation ought always to arouse the vigilance of all members of the United Nations. For a yet more important matter is at issue, which is the integrity of the whole body of moral and legal precepts which we know as human rights."

Here are just a few of the ways we are doing that.

When 18 biased resolutions against Israel were proposed during the UN General Assembly last September – as they are every fall – we opposed every one of them.

When the UN Human Rights Council held a special session last July to create a Commission of Inquiry to investigate alleged human rights violations committed in the context of military operations in the Palestinian Territories, we cast the sole "no" vote on a profoundly flawed resolution that focused overwhelming criticism on Israel without once mentioning Hamas.

Before the United States joined the UN Human Rights Council in 2009, more than half of all country-specific resolutions were focused on Israel; today, we've helped lower that proportion to one-quarter. Nonetheless, the Human Rights Council has still adopted many more resolutions criticizing Israel than it has on North Korea, Iran, Syria or Sudan, which is unacceptable.

For years Israel was the only UN Member-State that was excluded from a regional body at the UN in Geneva and the only Member State that had no group to caucus with in New York in the General Assembly committee that addresses human rights. We were determined to change this, and we did. In January 2014, after a sustained, full court diplomatic press, we helped secure for Israel permanent membership in the Western European and Others Group – the regional group that includes the United States. And in February 2014, we secured Israel's membership in the like-minded human rights caucus, JUSCANZ, from which it had long been excluded in New York.

The United States has worked hard to stand up to every effort that seeks to delegitimize Israel or undermine its security. We have consistently and firmly opposed one-sided actions in international bodies, and will continue to do so. In most cases of unfair and unbalanced texts introduced in the Security Council, we have been able to advocate successfully for the U.S. position during negotiations and, if necessary, form a coalition of like-minded countries to stop such resolutions from moving forward. In December, when a deeply unbalanced draft resolution on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict was hastily put before the Security Council, the United States successfully rallied a coalition to join us in voting against it. Secretary Kerry reached out to leaders of multiple countries represented on the Security Council, as we did simultaneously from our mission in New York. As a result of our efforts, the resolution failed to achieve the nine votes of Security Council members required for adoption.

The United States believes that a two-state solution is vital to ensuring the preservation of a Jewish and democratic Israel, and we will continue to work to achieve that goal.

IV. Promoting Human Rights and Human Dignity

The fourth objective is promoting human rights and human dignity. The United Nations was created not only to maintain international peace and security, but also to, "reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person." We strive every day to press the UN to live up to this goal – standing up to repressive regimes, shining a light on their

abuses, pressing for perpetrators to be brought to justice, and empowering victims and human rights defenders.

In scale and sheer depravity, few human rights crises in the world compare to the horrors of present day North Korea. Between eighty and one hundred and twenty thousand people are confined in gulags, where the torture and rape of prisoners is routine, and children are forced to watch the executions of their own parents. Yet the regime's denial of access to independent observers, such as human rights groups and journalists, and its draconian measures to prevent people from escaping the country, has limited the documentation of its widespread abuses. That is why we worked with countries on the UN Human Rights Council to create a Commission of Inquiry on Human Rights in North Korea in 2013, to conduct an in-depth investigation of the country's human rights conditions.

The Commission conducted more than 200 confidential interviews with victims, eyewitnesses, and former officials, and held public hearings in which more than 80 witnesses gave testimony. Witness accounts were corroborated by other forms of evidence, such as satellite imagery confirming the locations of prison camps. The Commission's findings, laid out in the its February 2014 report, included that "systematic, widespread, and gross" human rights violations have been and are being committed by the North Korean government, in many instances constituting crimes against humanity, committed "pursuant to policies established at the highest level of the State."

Building upon these findings, we have worked with our international partners to press for the UN to continue to denounce North Korea's abuses, and take steps to hold the perpetrators accountable. These efforts led to the Security Council holding its first ever meeting focused on the human rights situation in North Korea. Representing the United States in that December 22 meeting, I had the opportunity to help give voice to victims of the North Korean regime, like Kim Young-soon, who had escaped from Prison Camp 15. She and other prisoners were so famished they picked kernels of corn from the dung of cattle to eat. She said, "If there was a day that we were able to have mouse, that was a special diet for us. We had to eat everything alive, every type of meat we could find." I also spoke to the Council about North Koreans who had been tortured for trying to flee the country, such as the man who – after being returned by China – was chained to the back of a truck by North Korean authorities, and then dragged for three loops around the city where he lived – nearly 30 miles in distance – so everyone there could see. "When he fell down, they kept on driving," the man's sister told the Commission of Inquiry.

As I told the Council in that meeting, we not only denounce repressive regimes because it is in keeping with American values. We also denounce them because – as we have seen throughout history, the way governments treat their own citizens – particularly those governments that systematically violate the rights of their own people – tends to align closely with the way they

treat other countries and the norms of our shared international system. It is no coincidence that the Asad regime, which tortures thousands of people to death in its prisons, assigning victims a case file and serial number, has also repeatedly violated the international ban on chemical weapons, as we saw in the heart-wrenching video of the three tiny children who were the victims of one of its recent attacks in Sarmin, in Idlib provice. It is no coincidence that the Russian government, which has methodically cracked down on independent human rights organizations within its borders, is also violating the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine and seeking to prevent the Ukrainian people from determining their own future. And these are parallels we highlight in our diplomatic efforts and our public efforts.

Some of our most important battles to fight discrimination and promote human rights are being waged within the United Nations system. When Russia sought to overturn a decision by the Secretary-General granting benefits to the spouses of UN employees in same-sex marriages, we rallied other countries against Russia's effort, and roundly defeated it. When multiple countries on the UN's NGO committee sought to exclude organizations simply because they focus on promoting LGBT rights, we pushed to ensure they are treated equally. These efforts send a clear signal of our commitment to advocate for all human rights for all people.

Another enduring form of discrimination – within the UN and in the world – is anti-Semitism. The last year has seen an alarming rise in attacks on Jews, including in the heart of Europe – from the assault on the Jewish supermarket in Paris in January, to the attack on the Jewish museum in Brussels in May. So, when President Obama asked me to lead a Presidential Delegation to the 10th Anniversary of the OSCE's Berlin Conference on anti-Semitism, I raised our concerns about the rising tide of anti-Semitism in Europe directly with their leaders. I made clear that such attacks are not only a threat to the Jewish community – they are a threat to European liberalism and pluralism. And we made clear that all countries must make this struggle a national priority, whether it is unequivocally condemning it, providing the necessary resources and political backing to efforts to combat the rising tide of hatred and attacks , holding perpetrators accountable, and providing outreach to the community at risk.

It was in this context that it was an especially important milestone that, working with Israel, the European Union, Canada, and other nations, we convened the first-ever meeting on anti-Semitism in the UN General Assembly in January, at which Congressman Deutch spoke on a panel. More than fifty countries – representing nations of all faiths – took the podium not only to denounce anti-Semitism and attacks like the barbarous killings in Paris that had occurred weeks earlier, but also to commit their countries to take concrete steps to stop its alarming rise. Going forward, we intend to hold those countries to their pledges, and to persuade the other countries that did not speak that this struggle is theirs too.

V. Making the UN More Efficient, Accountable and Nimble
Finally, our fifth objective is making the UN more efficient, effective, nimble, and accountable.

Before we dig into the details of the individual accounts, it is worth putting into perspective the relative scale of U.S. contributions to the UN. As Secretary Kerry pointed out when testifying before this Committee in February, the United States' foreign policy budget totals approximately $50.3 billion. That is roughly one percent of the entire federal budget. One percent. And U.S. contributions to the UN are just a small fraction of that small foreign policy budget. How small? The total request for the three accounts that fund the UN and affiliated organizations – CIPA, CIO and IO&P – totals approximately $4.8 billion. That comes out to less than one-tenth of one percent of the United States federal budget. One-tenth of one percent. That is an important scale to keep in mind as we discuss the relative increase and decrease of the requested accounts.

That sense of scale does not mean we should not work relentlessly to maximize the impact of every dollar we contribute – we should and we must. Nor does it mean that $4.8 billion is an insignificant contribution – it is substantial, and far more than any other country contributes to the UN system and international organizations, which is why we are working hard to negotiate a lower assessment rate for peacekeeping. But it is worth remembering – even with a clear-eyed view of the limitations of the United Nations – that we are getting a lot of multilateral leverage out of a relatively modest proportion of our overall budget.

In the FY 2016 budget, some of our account requests have increased compared to last year. For example, we have asked for increased Contributions for International Peacekeeping Activities. Yet it would be a mistake to conflate such requests with a lack of fiscal discipline or the declining efficiency of our contributions. In reality, we are not only getting the UN to do more to fulfill its mandate, but also ensuring that it does its job more efficiently.

First, we are making the UN more fiscally responsible. Take the example of peacekeeping. Since the 2008-2009 fiscal year, the cost per peacekeeper has actually been reduced by 18 percent, when adjusted for inflation. And through tough negotiations with G77 countries, we have prevented reimbursement rates from rising dramatically. In addition, we have strongly supported the UN's Global Field Support Strategy, which aims to optimize the delivery of support to peacekeeping operations, through streamlining and utilizing centralized shared services to support missions. The strategy's implementation saved some $250 million in peacekeeping costs during the 2012 to 2013 financial period, while improving the access of forces in the field to critical start-up resources.

We have also worked with the UN to change the way it awards air service contracts for peacekeeping operations. In 2014, these contracts accounted for some $770 million. Yet under the previous system, Russian companies enjoyed a near monopoly, thanks in part to subsidies by

their government. The new Request for Proposal (RFP) process, which we played a leading role working with the UN to adopt, has helped level the playing field, enabling companies from other countries to compete. In the first RFP process held last year, a Western company won a helicopter contract for the first time in twenty years. That company happened to be American.

We are applying this same sense of fiscal discipline across the UN system. We have limited increases to the 2014/2015 budget to 2.2 percent, compared to 4 percent or higher in previous two-year periods. We have led efforts to slow rising staff costs – the main driver of UN budget growth over the last decade – through pay freezes dating back to 2012, and which will extend at least through the end of 2016, affecting some 30,000 UN staff across twenty-four UN organizations. And we are actively pursuing additional efforts to reduce staff costs by rationalizing headcounts and compensation costs in these organizations.

Second, we are making the UN more accountable. We succeeded in requiring the public disclosure of audit and evaluation reports for the organization, which began on January 1, 2015. We are working to ensure that the UN and its agencies follow best practices in protecting whistleblowers – and where they do not, to strengthen those protections – using the leverage that Congress provided to withhold 15 percent of U.S. contributions to organizations that do not effectively protect whistleblowers from retaliation. We helped secure the establishment of an independent Inspector General-like office responsible for evaluating the performance and readiness of peacekeepers in the field. And we helped obtain an unprecedented prohibition on some payments to individual soldiers or police from UN peacekeeping missions found to have engaged in misconduct, including sexual exploitation and abuse. We know the real measure of this reform will be in its implementation, and we intend to focus on ensuring the UN follows through on this commitment.

In order to continue to push for these and other much-needed reforms, it is essential that we pay our UN contributions on time and in full. When the United States is unable to pay our bills, we undermine our ability to advance our national interests. Some argue paying up front essentially gives the UN a free pass. But the opposite is true. When we don't pay our bills, we lose leverage in pressing for the reforms the UN needs; plus, we undermine our credibility in urging other countries to pay their dues on time and in full, which ensures the burden does not fall disproportionately on us.

In closing, we are tireless in our efforts to make the UN more efficient and maximize the impact of our contributions to advance our national interests and fulfill our duty to the American taxpayer. But we are also rigorous because we recognize that, when we right-size a peacekeeping mission and free-up surplus troops, we can redeploy those blue helmets to another crisis, where they can protect children from being recruited as fighters, and prevent communities from being massacred. We recognize that when we streamline the delivery of humanitarian assistance, we

free up resources like medical supplies, tents, and rations that can be directed to other people who need them to survive. The bottom line is simple: when we save resources, we help save lives.

We take seriously our obligation to the American people to protect their security and ensure that their tax dollars are spent wisely, and we are confident that our contributions to the UN – both in terms of U.S. funding and our leadership – effectively and responsibly advance U.S. national security interests and American values in an era of diffuse and diverse challenges.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you, Ambassador.

Myself and Eliot Engel have had frequent conversations on this issue of Iran's nuclear weapons capability, and I indicated several years ago that this was going to be the primary focus of this committee, was trying to prevent what I worry will be the undetectable nuclear breakout capability of Iran.

Now, I want to ask you about this Iran agreement and U.N. snap-back sanctions. If we have cheating on the part of Iran, as they have cheated on every other agreement so far—and this, I would presume, is going to be a real problem if we go forward and we don't get the verification in this agreement that has to be in the agreement—so now we take up this dispute resolution panel, as it is called, this issue, which would likely include the six powers and Iran, the International Atomic Energy Agency would also continue reporting on Iran's program under this suggestion here.

But here is my question. You have got Russia and China playing a role. So it is not clear to me how U.N. sanctions realistically would snap back once the cheating is found. And I would just add the caveat that we would also probably see a situation where Russian, Chinese, French, German companies are back in Iran. Commerce is flowing. It is going to be very difficult stop, certainly not at a snap. So walk me through that, if you would.

Ambassador POWER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First let me very much agree with the comment you made earlier that nothing that happens at the U.N. tends to happen in a snap. I have lived that firsthand.

But let me also underscore that President Obama and the entire negotiating team and certainly I, as a member of the administration, also embrace your premise that we cannot trust on the basis of past Iranian actions, on the basis of current Iranian actions, outside the nuclear sphere.

So I think there are two very important aspects, both of which you have touched upon, but just to elaborate on, that show that any agreement that we reach would be predicated, in fact, on a lack of trust.

So the first is, in fact, one of the most intrusive inspection regimes imaginable, the ability to monitor what is happening along the nuclear supply chain to an unprecedented extent, forever commitments related to the additional protocol, and the modified code. I mean, these are things that are going to last well beyond the life of this agreement.

And I think what is important about it is recognizing that there, of course, are dangers of covert capabilities being brought online. And that, again, is what this inspection regime is oriented around.

But the second manifestation, I think, of the lack of trust is the snap-back mechanism. And one snap-back mechanism, of course, is within our own hands. There are many sanctions that the President of the United States just would be able to snap back with the stroke of a pen.

But, in my world, President Obama has been very clear from the very beginning that we cannot allow a procedure for snap-back to be left in the hands of Russia or China for the very reason that you indicate.

While it is true that we were able to get the multilateral sanctions regime through the Security Council, again, the toughest, I think, in the 70-year history of the United Nations, it does not therefore follow that, in the event of breach, that we would be able to get that same resolution through a second time.

And so, while I can't get into the specifics of the mechanism right now because we are at a very delicate stage in the negotiation and all of this is being worked through to the finest detail, I can say, number one, Congress will be briefed as soon as the deal is done, if it gets done, and, number two, we will not support a snap-back mechanism or an agreement that includes a snap-back mechanism that leaves us vulnerable in the manner that you are fearful of. In other words, we will retain the ability to snap that multilateral sanctions architecture back in place without Russian or Chinese support.

Chairman ROYCE. I think that has to be the focus because it took so many years for the international sanctions to be put in place so that those companies terminated their business with Iran. And now we have a situation as a result of the way this is being negotiated where they are all waiting to position themselves to get back into the country.

Now, the other aspect of this, as you say, we are going to have an effective sanctions regime. That would imply, then, that what the Iranians are telling the world, which is that there is not going to be any investigation on their military bases, that the international inspectors are not going to be able to have access to those types of sites—and, as you know, that is where they have done a lot of their testing, is on those military sites—that would put us in the precarious position of an agreement that would be like the 1994 Framework Agreement with North Korea, where without the ability of the international inspectors to actually go into those types of sites, the cheating would be, in a case like that, not even detectable.

So, again, this is why 367 Members of this body, the majority of our colleagues on one side of the aisle and a vast majority on the other side of the aisle, in other words, an overwhelming majority of this institution, have written a letter to the President saying, "We do have to have the international inspectors have this ability to go onto those military bases and other sites anywhere, anytime. That has to be in this negotiation."

Let me raise another issue, too, and that is an issue that I know you have spent a lot of time on at the United Nations. Despite the deal with Russia to remove Assad's chemical weapons, it is clear he still has some of them. It is clear he is still using them, especially having them dropped on Aleppo.

And, Madam Ambassador, given Russia's clear desire to protect the Assad regime, what can the U.N. do, and particularly the Security Council here, to effectively confront the crisis in Syria?

And I will just ask you for your thoughts, but also mention that last month Ranking Member Engel and I offered a successful amendment to the defense policy bill directing the Pentagon to closely examine a no-fly zone over Syria's skies. This would especially relate to Aleppo and the other civilian areas which are routinely, routinely, bombarded.

And, you know, of course, the United States can't do this on its own. It would need strong support and participation from our allies and partners in the region. And many of them have been asking and offering, by the way, their support, asking for this kind of a step, a no-fly zone that would protect the civilian population there.

And tell me about your engagement on that issue and where that might stand at the United Nations.

Ambassador POWER. Okay, Mr. Chairman. Let me, if I could, just a quick comment on your additional comment on Iran to simply say that there has been a lot of rhetoric from the Supreme Leader, from the Iranian President, from many within Iran, and there is a lot of politics going on, and I think it is not helpful for us to get into the psychology of what any particular Iran leader is thinking or saying at a given time.

Chairman ROYCE. Well, Ambassador, it is not difficult to interpret what he is trying to message when he routinely starts the mornings with rallies of "Death to America."

Ambassador POWER. I understand.

Chairman ROYCE. I interpret that he means what he is saying in these cases.

Ambassador POWER. Well, all I wanted to underscore before, turning to your important Syria question instead of comments, is President Obama will not accept a deal in which we do not get the access that we need in order to verify compliance.

Chairman ROYCE. Thank you. We want to hold the President to that. Thank you.

Ambassador POWER. I am sure you will.

So, on Syria, let me first address the chemical weapons issue. Because of the credible threat of military force back in 2013, we were able to forge an agreement with the Russians, one of the rare instances.

As you know, they have used their veto four times on Syria-related issues, including a referral of some of the worst atrocities we have seen since the second World War, a referral of those crimes to the International Criminal Court. They vetoed that. They vetoed very mild condemnatory language.

We live their alliance with the Syrian regime and the costs and consequences of that every day. I mentioned in my opening remarks Ukraine and the perverse consequences of a permanent member trying to lop off part of someone else's country. To see a veto holder use its veto in this reckless, disgraceful way is extremely disturbing.

However, in this one instance, we were able to team up in order to get this dismantling regime put in place. The OPCW and the U.N. stepped up together, really, in an unprecedented way, building the airplane as they flew it. And, as a result, we have the removal and/or destruction of 100 percent of the declared Syrian chemical weapons program.

But you are absolutely right. We also have alarming and grave reports that the Syrians, seemingly incapable of fighting without drawing on chemical weapons, have now found a new way, even with the dismantlement of their declared chemical weapons regime, which is to turn chlorine into a chemical weapon.

We are pushing at the Security Council. We have just in the last few months secured another resolution again, somehow getting Russia's support to make it very clear to the world that just because chlorine is a household product doesn't make it not a chemical weapon when it is put in a barrel bomb and dropped on civilians. So we made that clear in the hopes that that would be a deterrent, threatened further measures.

We are now at the point in which we need accountability for these crimes. And we are pushing—I don't want to get ahead of diplomatic discussions—but pushing Russia to take ownership of this, to use their influence with the regime behind the scenes and to move forward and get something through the Security Council that would actually establish accountability.

Separate from that, in terms of the U.N., of course, Staffan de Mistura is the U.N. envoy. We need a big political push in terms of negotiations. Those negotiations have not really progressed since the last Geneva Conference. It has really been a period of protracted stalemate.

But the regime, of course, has suffered a series of military setbacks. Russia and Iran themselves, of course, share at least one additional concern with us, which is the growth of ISIL in Syria.

And so we are pushing Russia on the Security Council and outside of it to join with us here and make a serious political push so that we can get a kind of peaceful transition, one that brings about an end to the Assad regime, which would gas its people and has committed such unspeakable atrocities, but one also that would not leave Syria vulnerable to ISIL actually coming in and filling the breach.

On the no-fly zone, finally, I don't have a lot to add.You know that every day we are looking into the toolbox and trying to ascertain which tool is appropriate in which circumstances. On the humanitarian, on the sanctions, on the support for the train and equip program, we have done an awful lot, again, to try to influence the situation inside Syria.

A no-fly zone, if implemented and executed, would entail using military force against the Syrian regime. And our judgment is that, at this point, the risks of doing so would exceed the potential benefits, not least because of the number of extremists, again, who could conceivably benefit from such a——

Chairman ROYCE. Well, remember, the main beneficiary right now, Ambassador, as the regime drops those chemical bombs on Aleppo, it is the ISIS fighters that, you know, the middle class, the Free Syrian Army, are battling on the outskirts. So here is the case in this instance of the regime working in tandem with ISIS in order to collapse, basically, the resistance to ISIS up in the north.

But, anyway, tomorrow this committee will hear from the brave responders who are recently back from their efforts to save—these are physicians who were out there to save civilians from these chemical attacks—on the nature of the chemical attacks.

But thank you for your good work. I need to go to Mr. Engel. Ambassador, thank you very much.

Ambassador POWER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. ENGEL. Ambassador, as I said in my opening remarks, let me acknowledge the very strong work you have done in defending Israel at the U.N.

You listed several instances in your written testimony, and I want to acknowledge your personal commitment to pushing back against efforts to de-legitimize Israel at the U.N.

The ridiculous nonsense from the U.N. Human Rights Council, which consists of some of the worst offenders of human rights, really makes that Council, in my opinion, a joke and undermines the credibility of the U.N. itself.

The President recently gave an interview with Israeli Channel 2 news in which he said that the U.S. was reevaluating—and I quote him—"how we approach defending Israel on the international stage around the Palestinian issue."

I understand that this reevaluation will not affect our security relationship with Israel. The President made that clear. But, frankly, his remarks were troubling, as were other remarks he has made on the same subject.

Reevaluating the ways that we defend Israel on the international stage could have ominous consequences and it is obviously very concerning for those of us who seek to strengthen the U.S.-Israel relationship.

If the U.S. priority is achieving a permanent two-state solution, giving Israel another reason for unease will not help that goal. So I want to ask you: What is the status of this reevaluation? And what is it based on?

Ambassador POWER. Thank you, Congressman Engel.

First, as you yourself have noted, the President was very clear, I think, in that interview and has consistently been clear that we are not reevaluating our bond with Israel, our security and military relationship, the tremendous friendships that exist between the American people and the Israeli people.

I think what we are engaging right now is a moment in which it is not exactly clear how progress toward a two-state solution is likely to be made. And so we are in daily touch, as you know, with the Israeli Government. The Israeli national security advisor is here in Washington, I believe, still as we speak, meeting with our national security advisor.

With a government now formed, we are deepening those discussions again about how we find a path forward toward a two-state solution, recognizing, as I know we all do, that that is the way in which Israelis and Palestinians can live durably side by side in security and in dignity.

With regard to the area of concern that you have flagged, the United States—the Obama administration—has consistently opposed the de-legitimization of Israel. We have also pushed consistently for the the legitimation of Israel across the U.N. system. And I can give lots of examples of that.

We uniformly oppose one-sided actions designed to punish Israel, and we will continue to do so. I want to be very clear. In most cases, in many cases, at least, we are actually able to build coalitions and prevent things from coming up to a vote, as we did in December, again, when I cast a no vote. But we were able to deny the Palestinians—when a resolution was brought forward and it

was biased, it was one-sided, it was hastily sort of jammed upon the Council, we were able to forge a blocking coalition.

I also want to note that there are occasions in which we work with our Israeli counterparts up in New York on affirmative U.N. resolutions, on things that Israel thinks can advance its interests. And so I think it is hard to speak about hypotheticals, and I would caution against doing so.

During the Gaza crisis last summer, where I know you were very engaged, we came very, very close, working with Israel on a U.N. Security Council resolution, that we thought potentially could be additive as that crisis was winding down. In the end, it didn't come to pass. But, again, the text and the content of what we are talking about I think would really matter.

And suffice it to say, again, I want to underscore that the United States would oppose any resolution that we believe is biased or would undermine Israel's security.

Mr. ENGEL. Well, thank you for that answer. And it goes in line with your written testimony—and I quote—"We have consistently and firmly opposed one-sided actions in international bodies and will continue to do so." So it is a welcome message.

But how do you anticipate this pledge manifesting at the U.N. as the French and others pursue a Security Council resolution that could set artificial timetables for negotiations?

Ambassador POWER. Again, we have not seen—or I have not seen—a French resolution. We read in the press the same things you read, and we have certainly heard about various texts that are flying about.

But I will say, since I have gotten to New York, there have always been texts circulating relating to this set of issues. So I think, again, I am not going to speculate on hypotheticals beyond saying we are not negotiating any U.N. Security Council resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Let me just say, in conclusion, what is disturbing about some of the remarks that the President has made is that there is the hint—or maybe not even a hint—that perhaps next time around on some of these resolutions, rather than vetoing them, the anti-Israel biased resolutions we might just abstain. And that, of course, would allow it to pass.

When some of us hear that, we cringe because, if we can't count on the United States to stand firmly behind Israel against these ridiculous one-sided, biased resolutions, then I think it makes the U.N. almost worthless in terms of trying to be a group moving the process along rather than beating up on Israel with the built-in bias at the U.N.

So when we hear those remarks from the President, it disturbs many of us that have supported a two-state solution, that support Israel's right to exist, and that fight against the legitimization of Israel all the time.

Ambassador POWER. Thank you.

Mr. ENGEL. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. We now move to Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, chairman of the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank so much, Mr. Chairman.

And, Madam Ambassador, thank you for being so kind to my interns before this session.

Following up on the excellent remarks made by Ranking Member Engel, as we know, President Obama issued a not-so-veiled threat to Israel that the U.S. might not be able to support a veto of the French resolution at the U.N. Security Council on Palestinian statehood.

Now, you use the word "oppose," "We will oppose." But will the United States—yes or no—veto any resolution at the U.N. that forces, imposes, this two-state solution on Israel? What will our position be? Will we veto? You say we oppose. But will we veto? That would send a strong message.

Ambassador POWER. Again, given that we worked last summer on a U.N. Security Council resolution with Israel that we were potentially prepared to support and we weren't able to get everybody on the Council to rally around, I think it is perilous to make blanket statements.

But I want to underscore we have consistently opposed. We will oppose anything that is biased, anything that would undermine Israel's security. And I think our track record is very solid here.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you. I think it is that track record that worries Israel. I applaud you for saying that you are going to root out the anti-Israel bias that exists. And sometimes we don't have to look too far to find that bias.

Moving on to U.N. reform, can you provide to this committee later in written form a breakdown of exactly how much money across the entire U.S. Government have we contributed annually to the U.N. since 2011? I would appreciate that, Madam Ambassador.

And regarding the Iranian nuclear deal and Iran and the sanctions we have on Iran, recent reports indicate that the administration will not only seek to lift sanctions at the U.N. on Iran's nuclear program, but also lift sanctions on Iran for its ballistic missile program, its conventional military support for terror, and its abysmal human rights record.

Will the administration lump all of these actions against Iran as nuclear-related? When we tried to bring it up, we said they are not nuclear-related, but it seems like, to lift sanctions, everything is nuclear-related.

Ambassador POWER. First, on your first question, thank you for not asking me to do that math here on the spot. It would have been deeply humiliating.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. It is tough for me to chew on that, too.

Ambassador POWER. And then, second, on Iran, absolutely not, I think is the answer to your questions. The sanctions that we, the United States, have put in place that are so important on human rights, given the deplorable human rights record which has not improved, their support for egregious atrocities in Syria, support for terrorism, all of those things——

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. It is a long list.

Ambassador POWER [continuing]. From the administration's standpoint, should remain in place.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. They won't lump them together. Thank you.

If I could continue, last week a U.N. panel stated that the U.S. has neglected to report Iranian sanctions violations, which the administration has denied.

Has the administration deliberately failed to report or refer violations of Security Council resolutions to the sanctions committee? And has there been a formal or informal directive from the White House to not fully implement or report on violations of Security Council sanctions?

Ambassador POWER. Absolutely not. And I myself am involved often in raising sanctions violations that Iran has carried out.

We have also, even over the life of this last delicate phase of negotiations, instituted more sanctions designations under the existing bilateral sanctions framework that Congress has been such a critical part of. So there is no pulling of our punches, even during these negotiations or ever.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you.

And, lastly, I remain concerned about the security situation in Haiti. Just last week this committee sent staff to Haiti to report back to us on the status of its elections.

According to our staff, several people in the security and diplomatic sector expressed concerns that pulling U.N. troops out during an election year was a huge mistake and that the Haitian National Police may not be ready to ensure stability and security.

What is the justification for the troop withdrawal at this critical juncture? And why were those concerns ignored? And will you commit to keep the few troops that will remain in Haiti after the elections are finished, we hope, in 2016?

Ambassador POWER. Thank you.

I myself was in Haiti in January asking many of the same questions that you have just posed. I think what is very important is that the environment now in Haiti is different from the environment post-earthquake. We had huge engineering battalions who were part of MINUSTAH, the U.N. mission in Haiti, who were removing rubble. Now almost all of the rubble in the country has been removed.

So what we have really seen is, yes, a drawdown in terms of the authorized number of troops. And that is something the United States has helped spearhead, in part, back to the chairman's comment at the beginning, recognizing that the system is massively stretched around the world, recognizing we have to answer up here, also, in terms of the budgetary demands that U.N. peacekeeping makes on the American people as well as on other member states, but mainly, in this instance, recognizing that police, foreign police units, mobility, more mobility, fewer engineering battalions, that, basically, you needed a recalibration of the mission according to new circumstances.

So it is true that there has been a significant drawdown, but there is still a substantial infantry presence. There is still the ability to do rapid response. We have introduced more helicopters to allow troops and police to move more quickly across the country.

And a lot of the functions that the U.N. peacekeeping mission had been performing are now migrating to the so-called U.N. Country Team, the development professionals, the election experts, and so forth. That is not really a job for the military in many cases.

I also would note that you are right that the Haitian National Police have a long way to go, but the strides that they have made, I think, over the last 2 or 3 years are really extraordinary and very much the product of U.S. and other member state bilateral support as well as the U.N. training that has gone on there.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much.

Haitian Americans have greatly enriched our south Florida community, and we pay such close attention to Haiti. Thank you so much.

Ambassador POWER. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. Brad Sherman of California, ranking member of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

Mr. SHERMAN. Ambassador, thank you for your service not only in government, but before you joined the government. Thank you for your work in opposing and exposing genocide, particularly the Armenian genocide.

I want to echo the ranking member on the protection of Israel at the United Nations. We were all concerned by some indication that the administration would cut back that support. It is good to support Israel. It is even better when it is difficult.

And I want to praise the administration for standing with Israel at the NPT consensus review process where, in order to prevent actions inimical to Israel, we not only opposed the inimical actions, but we opposed—because we had to—the entire agreement.

So, hopefully, that answers the question as you have here when you committed to the ranking member that it is our position to veto one-sided, anti-Israel resolutions at the U.N.

The President has recognized that involving the U.N. in the details of the peace process is not a way to advance peace. Obviously, the U.N. might adopt a resolution that had a few noncontroversial provisions: Two-state solution, peace and security for all.

But would we veto any U.N. resolution that tried to codify the parameters of a peace deal and included controversial elements in that codification?

Ambassador POWER. Thank you, Congressman Sherman.

I think that is a reprise of the Congresswoman's question with a slight shift. I really am going to resist making blanket declarations on hypothetical resolutions.

Our position, again, I think has been very clear for some time. I have said, again, we would oppose anything that was designed to punish Israel, that would undermine Israel's security. But I think, again, it is perilous. There is no resolution in front of us.

Mr. SHERMAN. I will move on to less hypothetical questions.

Ambassador POWER. Thank you.

Mr. SHERMAN. First, under current U.S. law, the administration is required to cut off Palestinian aid if the Palestinians pursue or support charges against Israel at the ICC, and I am confident that you will follow the law on that one spirit and letter. I won't even ask that as a question because I know of your dedication to law.

The United States Constitution vests specifically power over all international commerce, particularly sanctions, in the United States Congress. The administration has in the area of trade recognized that the Congress is the primary arbiter and has asked us to pass a statute providing limitations and structure, but I want

to make sure that the administration will follow Article I of the Constitution when it comes to sanctions on Iran.

We have got this review process. I would hope that you negotiate a deal in Switzerland so good that Congress universally supports it, but that may not be the case. Imagine a situation in which there is a deal that is cut, the administration supports it, but less than one-third of either House has indicated support for the deal.

There are news reports that you will prevent a lifting of U.N. sanctions at least for a month to give Congress a chance to go through the process of review. Will you be allowing a lifting of U.N. sanctions during the statutory review process?

Ambassador POWER. Thank you. I thought you were going to another hypothetical, but you went directly to an issue I know that is in the news.

It is useful and appropriate, needless to say, for Congress' voice to be heard. And I think the bills that have come now through both Houses provide——

Mr. SHERMAN. And signed by the President.

Ambassador POWER. Pardon me?

Mr. SHERMAN. And signed by the President.

Ambassador POWER. [continuing]. And signed by the President—provide a structure for that voice, and there is some predictability to it, I think, at least in terms of process.

As you indicated, our view is that we will be able to defend any deal that is good enough for us, and we will come up here and seek to do so.

On the precise sequence, it is clear that there are now two bodies whose voices will need to be heard. And how that will all work I think is, again, one of those details——

Mr. SHERMAN. So you are saying it is possible that, if the United States Congress declares by over a two-thirds majority in both Houses, that we reject the deal, if we establish U.S. policy on this deal pursuant to Article I of the Constitution, you might still be at the United Nations undermining that policy declared by Congress pursuant to the Constitution?

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN [presiding]. If the gentleman will suspend, we will have the Ambassador answer the question, but we are going to try to get everybody in with their 5 minutes.

Ambassador POWER. Okay. Just simply to say, again, that is a hypothetical about what the vote in Congress would be.

Again, we feel this will be a deal that we can defend where we can convince Congress also to support the deal. All I am getting at is the precise choreography of how the sequencing works through, that is just a matter still for the negotiation.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much.

And now we turn to Mr. Christopher Smith of New Jersey, chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Organizations.

And we will try to do those in 5 minutes so everyone will have a chance.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Madam Chair.

And welcome, Madam Ambassador, and thank you for your testimony and for your work.

More than a decade ago, Madam Ambassador, sex trafficking and sexual exploitation and abuse in peacekeeping was exposed in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. I chaired a series of hearings beginning in 2005. I went to Goma. I spent a better part of a week meeting with peacekeepers and trying to get, you know, a real plan to try to mitigate and, hopefully, eradicate that horrific abuse.

I chaired, like I said, a number of hearings. Jane Holl Lute sat where you sit. She is my third cousin. She did a magnificent job at the U.N. trying to get zero tolerance for the Secretary General's policy. Unfortunately, some of our witnesses then—and some would say still—there is a lack of compliance with that blue helmet bulletin.

Last year the Advisory Committee on Administration and Budget said nearly half of the allegations reported in peacekeeping issues involved the most egregious form of sexual exploitation, abuse of minors. They cited Haiti, DR Congo, Liberia, Sudan, and South Sudan as the chief offending deployments.

On May 15, as you know, the U.N. Office of Internal Oversight Services evaluated efforts to combat sexual exploitation and abuse by U.N. peacekeepers. They found that, pursuant to the 2007 MOU, truth-contributing countries who retain the primary responsibility to investigate misconduct apparently are not doing a very good job.

Questions about the quality of the investigative standards, wide variations in sanctions that weaken the commitment to zero tolerance—and get this—the penalty is often simple repatriation and disbarment from any future U.N. peacekeeping deployment, not prosecution and jail.

OIOS made some recommendations—six of them—that I think bear consideration on an expedited basis. Perhaps you could speak to that. They also noted that there was a real lack of helping victims, particularly little girls, who have been abused.

Secondly, let me ask you about a Syria war crimes tribunal. In 2013, I wrote an op-ed for the Washington Post and then held, again, a series of hearings. We had David Crane, the former prosecutor from the Sierra Leone Special Court, and he and so many others made it clear, the ICC is not up to the task.

We need a regional court like Yugoslavia, Sierra Leone, and Rwanda, take all of the lessons learned from that and prosecute both in Iraq and Syria those on either side that are committing—or any side—these terrible atrocities. Your thoughts on that.

And, finally, the committee on NGOs for ECOSOC recently voted down the application for consultative status from an American NGO known as Freedom Now. The no votes came from China, Russia, Cuba, Venezuela, Sudan, Iran, Nicaragua, Azerbaijan, among others.

I have worked with Freedom Now for 15 years. They have worked on Gao Zhisheng, Liu Xiaobo, Father Ly in Vietnam, Aung San Suu Kyi in Burma. A great organization. On the same day the Palestinian Refugee Center, which works with Hamas and Hezbollah, was approved.

What are we doing to try to help Freedom Now get their accreditation?

Ambassador POWER. Thank you, Congressman. I will try to move quickly through each of these three very important issues. I will work backwards.

First, on Freedom Now, I couldn't agree more. They are doing some of the most important work to highlight the plights of political prisoners around the world. I know I personally use their work, try to reinforce whatever they are campaigning on. I know Members of Congress also have teamed up with them.

And the just very sad fact is that the NGO Committee, in which members are elected by the U.N. membership often by their regions, is stacked with a group of countries who don't themselves tolerate NGOs in their own countries.

And so, you know, every frustration that one feels about who gets elected to this or that in the U.N. body stems from the same issue, which is that regions are not taking sufficient responsibility for the integrity of who they are putting forward on behalf of their continent.

And this is a classic example, but we are not giving up. We are working behind the scenes with Freedom Now, and now that it goes to the full Economic and Social Council from this subset or this smaller NGO committee, we have a chance to overturn the vote.

It is going to be challenging because, again, recall that, in the United Nations as a whole, a body of 193 countries, more than half are not democratic. So we always have our work cut out for us.

But, again, we have been able to score a number of very important victories for political prisoners and human rights in civil societies and other bodies, and we are going to dedicate ourselves to that and welcome the support of Congress also leveraging relationships in capitals and so forth.

Second, again, working backwards, on Syria, I remember very well your op ed, and I think it is a very, very important idea that you have put out there.

The issue with the ICC—it may well not prove up to the task, but the bigger issue with the ICC is there is no way to get ICC jurisdiction that doesn't go through either the Syrian Government, which hardly wants to hold itself accountable for monstrous atrocities, or through Russia, which, by supplying and supporting the Syrian regime, is implicated in some of those atrocities.

The same challenge, as you know well, would apply if we were to try to replicate the Yugoslav or the Rwanda Tribunal. Both of those came about through votes in the Security Council. And that goes back to the first point I made in my remarks at the outset, which is just this deformity, in a way, where a permanent member of the Security Council can block the creation—whether an ICC referral or the creation of an international criminal tribunal of the kind you are describing.

You know, again, somebody—I think it was Chairman Royce—raised this issue before on accountability, saying, "Yeah. You always say they are going to be held accountable. The question is when." You know, we just in the last 6 months have seen perpetrators of the crimes carried out 20 years ago in Srebrenica held accountable not only at the ICTY, where they had been held accountable, but, also, in Serbia proper, in Bosnia, et cetera.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you so much. Thank you. I apologize. But we are 1½ minutes——

Ambassador POWER. I will find a way to get the sex trafficking in somewhere else.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. I am now pleased to turn to Congressman Albio Sires of New Jersey, the ranking member on the Subcommittee on the Western Hemisphere.

Mr. SIRES. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ambassador, welcome.

During last year's Gaza crisis, five Latin America countries pulled their Ambassadors from Israel. I am talking about Chile, Peru, El Salvador, Ecuador, and Brazil.

I am wondering. What efforts are we making to urge those countries to send the Ambassadors back? I know that we have sent letters to those countries urging them to be engaged again. Are we making any efforts to urge them to send the Ambassadors back?

Ambassador POWER. You know, I think I am going to take that question—all I can really speak to is what I do every day in New York, which is lobby those very countries not to take the positions they usually take in the General Assembly or with the Human Rights Council and so forth.

On the very specific issue of their level of representation, I actually don't have an answer for that, but will get back to you quickly.

Mr. SIRES. Okay. Well, that is going to bring me into the U.N. Human Rights Commission. I personally feel that they are not effective when you have a Cuban sometimes leading the Human Rights Commission.

Since the President made his announcement, the abuses have increased. People are put in jail. Women are beaten just to go to church. And this Human Rights Commission—I never hear anything regarding the abuses on the island. And I know, at one time, Cuba was in charge of this Commission. I mean, that is the biggest joke I ever heard.

So what can we do to get them to speak up about the abuses on the island? I mean, this is a crackdown on the very people that we are trying to help, supposedly.

Ambassador POWER. Thank you.

Again, let me just say that, on the question of the conditions inside Cuba, I couldn't agree more. There have been—I just looked up these numbers on the way over here—600 arbitrary detentions just in the month of May alone and 2,300 over the course of this year, in 2015.

So there remains a significant human rights crisis inside Cuba. And I want to underscore, again, that the effort at normalization is aimed at getting at some of these issues. Now, clearly, it is not having an overnight effect. I don't think anybody could have expected it would.

But the bet that we are making is that, over time, more access to information, more Internet, more exposure to Americans and American values, is going to actually, you know, help ensure that Cuba, again, over time, liberalizes. But, in the meantime, we have to spoke out about these abuses.

Mr. SIRES. I was just going to add, if nobody speaks up about it——

Ambassador POWER. Well, I certainly do.

Mr. SIRES [continuing]. It is not going to help the Cuban people, no matter what efforts we make.

Ambassador POWER. Well, if I could, again, in addition to the earlier followup that I owe you, I will send you the public statements made by senior U.S. officials, you know, even since the changes in our relationship with Cuba were announced because I don't think we have, again, held our tongues at all.

I myself also make a point of meeting with dissidents like Yoani Sanchez, like the daughter of Oswaldo Paya, and the people who, you know, may well have been murdered by the regime. I mean, we need to walk and chew gum at the same time. It is extremely important.

But if I could distinguish that from the Human Rights Council issue you raise. They are related. The Human Rights Council is vulnerable to the flaws that you and Congressman Engel and others have pointed to already in this hearing and that others have made clear their views on. It is, again, a body in which a country that does not have a good human rights record can end up in a leadership position. That is officially true.

It is also a body that the United States, by virtue of being a member, has used to create Commissions of Inquiry for Syria that otherwise would not exist because of Russia's veto on the Security Council. That has moved the ball very substantially on LGBT rights. It is the first time the U.N. has said LGBT rights are human rights.

It created a Commission of Inquiry for North Korea that documented the systematic horror that the gulags are inflicting on the people of North Korea every day in a way that in the entire history of that regime had not been done before. We have a special rapporteur for Iran that would not exist if not, again, for the Human Rights Council.

So like a lot that exists at the U.N., it is not us. It is not the body——

Mr. SIRES. So do we expect that maybe this would also happen with Cuba?

Ambassador POWER. I think one of——

Mr. SIRES. If the abuse——

Ambassador POWER. I think one of the effects over time in the U.N. system of the steps that the President has taken vis-à-vis Cuba—my prediction will be that people will be focusing less on the embargo and on U.S. policy, which has been a diversion from the human rights situation inside Cuba, and now we will have a better chance of drawing people's attention to human rights crisis inside Cuba.

Mr. SIRES. Thank you very much.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Sires.

We turn to Mr. Dana Rohrabacher of California, chairman of the Subcommittee on Europe, Eurasia, and Emerging Threats.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much, Madam Chairman.

And, Madam Ambassador, thank you very much for your service. You are much respected, your energy and your commitment.

And although there are some things that we obviously disagree on, I want to associate myself with my colleagues' concern about the blackout of reporting of human rights abuses in Cuba.

And let me just note this idea that—well, it is offset in some way by the fact that there is going to be more Internet connection between people and more communication with people in the United States.

The people of Cuba know when their neighbor has been arrested or beaten up in front of them. They don't need to see it over the Internet. And the people who are beating them up and throwing them in jail, they know, too. And, in fact, what they know is we have given up a huge amount of leverage over them and gotten nothing in return as they continue to oppress their own people.

And I believe perhaps this travesty that we are discussing and describing there really reflects why some of us don't have faith that the United Nations—considering that there is a Cuban head of the Human Rights Commission. That we don't have faith that the U.N. is going to be doing the right thing to create a better world, that the United States has to play perhaps a more active, direct role rather than trying to spend our time maneuvering through the United Nations all kinds of different resolutions and policies that could have the opposite impact of what we are looking for.

With that said, I would like to ask you a little bit about Ukraine. You were mentioning the people that were shelled, a family that you know that—or you described being shelled by the Soviet—or—excuse me—Russian allies there in Ukraine.

How many civilians have died since this whole incident began? Do you know?

Ambassador POWER. Sixty-three hundred is the official number, but we think there is underreporting because the separatists don't allow access.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, of that 6,300, how many were separatists in separatist towns and villages?

Ambassador POWER. That I don't know offhand.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. You know, I want to tell you, when I ask that question, almost nobody knows. But it was my understanding—I went over to Europe and met with some people involved in intelligence agencies in various countries.

They were telling me that, actually, in the Ukrainian military, which was one-third made up of people who were not in their military, but were instead on the payroll of some oligarch, they had heavy artillery and were indiscriminately shelling these separatist villages.

Do you know anything about that?

Ambassador POWER. First, let me actually correct what I said earlier. You asked how many civilians had been killed.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Right.

Ambassador POWER. To my knowledge, the 6,300 figure that we have is both civilian and soldiers. So let me also get you the breakdown on the actual civilians, if it exists.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. All right. Fine.

Ambassador POWER. One of the issues that I raised in Ukraine in my visit was how critical it is for the Ukrainians to abide by international humanitarian law. It is absolutely critical.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Yeah. Okay.

Ambassador POWER. And it is critical for hearts and minds as well as for the law.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Is it possible that the majority of the civilian casualties that you are talking about were actually civilian casualties that were the victims of the Ukrainian Army and the oligarch that financed one-third of their Army at one point? Is that possible?

Ambassador POWER. If I could say two things.

First, I think it is highly unlikely on the basis of the reports that we received from the United Nations and from the OSCE.

Second, I want to underscore again why this conflict started. It started because Russia moved troops and weapons and so forth into the——

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Just so you know, Madam Secretary, the Russians would suggest it started when there was a violent overthrow of an elected government.

Ambassador POWER. Right. I don't make it a point of listening to President Putin's claims, as a general rule. I don't find them credible.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Well, I think that you are our representative and you should pay attention to everybody's claims and you should refute them if they can be refuted rather than dismissing them.

Because I happen to believe that, if that coup, meaning violent overthrow of an elected——

Ambassador POWER. Violent.

Mr. ROHRABACHER [continuing]. Violent overthrow of an elected government, had not happened, we would not be in this situation and the Ukrainians would have been spared this.

But our—and you can go beyond that to where our European allies didn't offer Yanukovych the deal that he wanted and the response that most people in the Ukraine have. They don't like Russia and they didn't want to be in agreement with Russia.

There are a lot of things that led up to this. It didn't start with Russia going into the separatist areas. That is not where it started. At least that is what they explain.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you, Mr. Rohrabacher.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Thank you very much.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Thank you.

And now we turn to Mr. Ted Deutch of Florida, the ranking member on the Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Madam Ambassador, thanks for appearing today. Thanks for standing up for the human rights of the people of the Ukraine.

I also want to thank you and commend you for the outstanding work that you have done representing this country and our values at the United Nations. Your efforts at the Security Council on the Syrian conflict, your continued willingness to speak out in support of human rights, your efforts to get the U.N. to act on Iran's abysmal human rights record, and your unrelenting pushback against unfair and biased attempts to de-legitimize Israel deserve to be commended.

In Syria, we cannot succumb to a condition that you taught me, psychic numbing, despite the ongoing slaughter. And I thank you for pointing out today that the use of chlorine against one's people is the use of chemical weapons against one's people.

I also want to especially thank you for your recent efforts at the NPT Review Conference to block language that would have jeopardized Israel security and for preventing anti-Israel efforts to place Israel on the list of children's rights abusers.

I know that, going forward, you will continue to use your platform to prevent all efforts to use the United Nations to de-legitimize Israel or, importantly, to impose any outside solution on the Israeli-Palestinian conflict when only a negotiated settlement can ultimately bring peace.

I appreciate your efforts as well you described at the Human Rights Council. But I would suggest that the Human Rights Council cannot be taken seriously. And I am someone who believes in engagement at the U.N., but I am repeatedly shocked by the decisions of the Council, including how some of the world's absolute worst human rights abusers are allowed to sit on the Council.

My colleague from New Jersey talked about Cuba. Cuba is ally to Venezuela, plays a prominent role as well. And I expect the same bias will apply when the investigation into last summer's conflict in Gaza comes out, which we expect will be equally one-sided.

I find it absurd that the Council has only one standing agenda item, the Agenda Item 7 that relates to a specific country. And that country is Israel.

And my question is: While it says at the Human Rights Council's Web site that—it describes the election process, but it says, "The General Assembly takes into account the candidate state's contribution to the promotion and protection of human rights as well as their voluntary pledges and commitments in this regard."

Under your leadership, Madam Ambassador, has the United States suggested that any reforms can be made to the Council so that the members of the Council perhaps have to recognize the importance of human rights as well?

Ambassador POWER. Thank you, Congressman.

I mean, let me say the language that you have just read out was hard-thought language negotiated by our predecessors, by the Bush administration, by the United States. Unfortunately, simply putting that language in the kind of founding ethos of the Human Rights Council doesn't make it such.

Fundamentally, as I was saying earlier, regional groups put forward the candidates they seek to put forward and sometimes there are a whole set of back-room arrangements and, you know, all kinds of bilateral issues that are at stake in which people agree to give votes to certain countries on the basis of things that have nothing to do with human rights, so just stipulate.

There are two reasons that I would like to at least appeal to you to still consider the United States' membership in the Human Rights Council very worthwhile.

The first is the very reason that you point to, which is the absurdity of having a single standing agenda item on Israel and not on North Korea and not on Syria, which is gassing its people, not on ISIL. You know, it is ridiculous.

However, by the United States being on the Council, we are in the room and we are calling it out. In fact, since we joined the Council, the number of Human Rights Council resolutions on Israel has gone from a half of the Human Rights Council products to a quarter. Now, a quarter is still absurd, given the state of the world.

Chairman ROYCE [presiding]. Ambassador.

Ambassador POWER. Yes.

Chairman ROYCE. If I could interrupt, we are going to have to recess the committee for 15 minutes. And then we will commence again.

Ambassador POWER. Okay.

Chairman ROYCE. But I am going to have to ask the members, also, to—we will be clearing the room. We will be leaving the dais. And afterwards we will reconvene at that time.

Thank you very much, Ambassador.

Ambassador POWER. Okay. Thank you, Congressman.

[Recess due to police activity.]

Chairman ROYCE. This hearing will reconvene.

And let me say we appreciate the work of the Capitol Police to make us aware of a security situation and to ensure that the hearing here is safe to reconvene.

And I appreciate the cooperation of our witness. Thank you very much, Ambassador. We will now go to Mr. Chabot, Ambassador Power, for the questions he was going to ask.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And welcome back, Ambassador Power.

I first of all would like to associate myself with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle with respect to Cuba. There is a great amount of skepticism there. I won't go into that great of detail because others already did, but I share that skepticism.

The topic I would first like to go into in a little detail is the fact that Russia, as we all know, by force has taken Crimea and much of eastern Ukraine. Yet, this administration still hasn't supplied Ukraine with weaponry that is going to be necessary for it to defend itself. And, our U.N. allies have done very little to help, but that is not really surprising.

Secretary Kerry met with Putin last month and, in effect, told Putin that we would lift sanctions on them if they would promise not to take even more territory, not that they would abandon Crimea, but that they not take any more territory.

Earlier this year, my Democratic colleague, Mr. Connolly, and I introduced the Crimea Annexation Non-Recognition Action, H.R. 93, which states that it is U.S. policy not to recognize the sovereignty of Russia over Crimea or its waters or its airspace.

What is the U.S. and what is the U.N. doing to get Russia out of Crimea? It is no secret that some believe that this administration wants Russia's support in the Iran deal so badly that it is willing to cut Russia some slack on Ukraine and especially with respect to Crimea. What would you respond to that, please?

Ambassador POWER. Thank you, sir.

Well, having, again, just returned from Ukraine, these issues are particularly fresh in my mind as is the suffering of the people of Crimea, many of whom have been displaced to Kiev, the Tartar

community there, unable to exercise its rights, independent media completely shut down, disappearances, detentions.

So there are two issues, in a way. One is the fact that Russia, a permanent member of the Security Council, has attempted to lop off part of someone else's country. The second is the conditions in which people in that territory are now living or the displacement that has arisen from the abuses being carried out.

At the United Nations, as we discussed earlier, because Russia is a permanent member and a veto holder, a privilege that all of us really should exercise great responsibility in having, but Russia is not, our ability to get the Security Council to sanction a permanent member or a veto holder, of course, is blunted.

However, in the U.N. General Assembly—and this is unheralded, not widely known—we were able to galvanize 100 countries to vote against what Russia was attempting to do in Crimea, to stand for Ukrainian sovereignty and territorial integrity, to reject the phony referendum which gave the people of Crimea a choice between independence from Ukraine and joining Russia. Didn't even give them, as you recall, the choice of remaining part of the country that they were a part of.

The consequence of that resolution, which may sound symbolic, is that the maps at the United Nations, the maps under international law, will not change. And so it is still the case that all the maps at the United Nations, again, show Crimea where it belongs, which is part of Ukraine. As you know, U.S. sanctions that were put in place by virtue of Crimea will not be lifted until Crimea is restored to Ukraine.

And with regard to Secretary Kerry's meeting, I don't know if there has been misreporting, but the U.S. position has been very, very clear, which is Minsk implementation is required in order for there to be any off-ramp on the eastern Ukraine-related sanctions. Minsk implementation, as you know, would result in the restoration of the international border to Ukrainian sovereign control.

So that is our position. That is the position also that the Europeans agreed to at the G7 meeting.

Mr. CHABOT. All right. Thank you.

I am getting close to the end of my time. I have two questions, but I am just going to get in one.

I think, as we all know, pretty horrific things have been happening to Christians especially, but to Muslims as well under ISIS control.

We have seen dozens of people taken out to beaches and beheaded in Libya. We have seen people kidnapped, and God only knows what has happened. There have been crucifixions. There have been a whole range of things that have happened.

What is the U.N. doing to help protect Christians in places like Syria and parts of Iraq and Libya? And what can we do to push them, get them off the dime, to get involved there?

Ambassador POWER. Several things. I mean, first, part of ensuring protection for civilians who are vulnerable is being able to shelter them when they flee their homes and making sure that they are not vulnerable then to secondary attacks.

Because of the horrors carried out by ISIL, you are seeing a lot of advanced flight. If people even hear that ISIL is en route, they

are picking up their families and their kids and getting in the car and moving forward.

It is the U.N. working with the Iraqi Government and, indeed, even in parts of Syria with the Syrian Government and with Syrian opposition groups that are providing humanitarian assistance through the World Food Programme. UNHCR is sheltering refugees, the International Organization for Migration. That is on the humanitarian side.

But the U.N. is also the venue where President Obama chaired a Security Council meeting on foreign terrorist fighters where we have tried now to create an international framework where people share information, stop the flow of these, you know, many thousands of individuals from neighboring countries who have staffed ISIL, who are helping them replenish their numbers even as the coalition degrades the organization.

So the U.N. has become a venue in which we measure compliance and hold countries accountable when they are not doing what they should be, again, to prevent people from either leaving their territory or from crossing borders into Syria and Iraq to actually staff ISIL.

The coalition effort also has gotten a lot of legitimacy at the United Nations. We have 60 countries that are a part of it. Iraq came to the U.N. Security Council with a letter and asked, in fact, for the United States and the rest of the international community to step up militarily and through using diplomatic, political, and other means against ISIL.

So it is also a venue in which coalition countries come together to kind of compare notes and figure out what more we can be doing because, obviously, this is a long campaign that has a lot of ups and downs and it is going to be critical that we keep the military line of effort moving at the same time some of the governance issues get addressed so that people are not attracted at all to ISIL.

At the same time, we counter violent extremism in our own countries as people are getting alienated and radicalized. At the same time, we work the social media piece, the foreign terrorist financing, which can be done through oil revenue or other resource streams that we have sought to degrade, again, building on international cooperation.

But so much of the ISIL equation is the product of things crossing borders. And this is where, again, the United Nations, for all of its flaws, show its indispensability because it is the one organization that can impose standards that can hold people accountable globally, that can be a venue for naming and shaming, but, also, for mobilizing resources.

Mr. CHABOT. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. We will go to Representative Karen Bass of California, ranking member of the Subcommittee on Africa, Global Health, Global Human Rights, and International Operations.

Ms. BASS. Thank you, Mr. Chair, for calling today's meeting.

Ambassador Power, in your opening statement, you really demonstrated in a few minutes the complexity of what is happening in the world today, the unprecedented number of conflicts.

And, in this context, I really wanted to commend your leadership for focusing on conflicts and crises, especially in Africa, that often

don't rise to the attention of the world. And I wanted to discuss a couple of examples and then end with asking you a couple of questions.

You mentioned Ebola, but I really want to highlight the fact that you led the effort in the U.N. to push the international community to take action. You chaired the first emergency meeting to gather momentum for international support, and I really think it is a source of pride for all of us, the role that our Nation played in stamping out Ebola in Liberia. And I do want to ask you about this in a minute because we have some new cases.

In terms of Boko Haram, in October of last year, the Security Council took an important step to help the Nigerian Government defeat Boko Haram and assisted in an effort to return the girls. And you may know of a weekly campaign that goes on here that is led by Representative Wilson where members come together and make sure that Members of Congress do not forget the girls that have been missing over the last year. So I appreciate your support for U.S. funding to directly support the AU's effort to eliminate Boko Haram.

And in terms of the Central African Republic in Burundi, I had the privilege of traveling to both those countries with you. You were first in pushing our response, in part, because of your leadership in forming the Atrocities Prevention Board. And my understanding is the Board was informed and responded to the crisis at its onset and delivered $11 million in humanitarian support, $60 million in military assistance to the international effort.

In Burundi, when we traveled there, U.N. Ambassador Thomas-Greenfield met with the President and encouraged him not to try to run for a third term, and he did just that. And there was the attempted coup and now there is chaos.

And so a couple of the questions I had—I wanted to know if you could provide an update about the U.N. response to the crisis in Burundi, CAR, and then also the new cases of Ebola that have emerged.

Ambassador POWER. Thank you, Congresswoman.

Just to your opening point about the extent of the crises, the gravity of the crises, one of the lines I have been drawing on lately is Shakespeare's line from "The Tempest," which is, "Hell is empty. All the devils are here."

Ms. BASS. I will remember that. Sometimes it feels that way.

Ambassador POWER. And just to underscore also the pride I think all of us—and it really was a massive bipartisan—you know, a shining example of what a significant bipartisan effort can—the impact it can make in the real world on Ebola.

I mean, you know, people really stepped up in this country and, of course, the Congress providing the resources that we needed and drawing attention to the crisis, President Obama sending nearly 3,000 troops as well as a couple thousand civilians and then the American people.

I mean, ultimately, this effort was staffed by sanitization workers, health workers, doctors who left their families and took tremendous risks, recognizing, again, a kind of core axiom of the international system, which is, "It won't come here if we can neutralize it there."

And just on that score, where we are right now, you know, when that meeting at the Security Council that you mentioned occurred and when President Obama made his announcement, which we then used to leverage to get commitments from other countries, you had the CDC and others projecting as many as 1 million infections by January 2015.

We are now down to around 25 cases a week——

Ms. BASS. Incredible.

Ambassador POWER [continuing]. In Sierra Leone and Guinea, and in Liberia, of course, we have been down to zero since May. It is tricky, the last stage, and as long as there is one case, it is a case that can quickly exponentially multiply.

The systems are now in place. So again, the risk of a massive spike has been mitigated substantially by the investments that we have already made. But, you know, sort of kicking it and not just bending the curve, but ending the curve, it is a very, very challenging last phase.

The World Food Programme is there, you know, providing food to people who go to clinics. Because part of the challenge has been ensuring that individuals will step up and allow themselves to be isolated. They were often worried initially that, if they left their families, there would be nobody to take care of their kids or their families. So it really has had to be a comprehensive effort.

And I would say the biggest challenge outstanding is in Guinea still. The level of community resistance to outsiders and to messages from the center has been an impediment, but that is what we have to overcome here in the next phase and get this down to zero and then concentrate on building back better so that these societies are not only less vulnerable to an Ebola outbreak, but, also, to other forms of infectious disease and other health crises.

Very briefly, if I may, just on Burundi, you are right. I think, when we look back at the last year, we can, on the one hand, take some satisfaction that we really did go all in on preventive diplomacy.

We recognized that a decision to choose to seek a third term by the President of Burundi would be a violation of the letter and the spirit of the Arusha Agreement because the Arusha Agreement had been the social compact on which so many of the ethnic and political tensions had been, if not laid to rest, at least neutralized.

Violating that agreement was bound to have severe destabilizing effects, and we got ahead of it. The message was sent. The Security Council also traveled in the wake of our visit, a huge and sustained high-level engagement by the United States.

But at a certain point, you can deliver that message. You can say, "Put your country first. Please, Mr. President, be your country's George Washington. Be prepared to walk away." And certain leaders will put their own self-interests above the risk of severe destabilization.

Right now there is a U.N. envoy who is attempting to broker a way forward between the opposition and the leadership. But the third-term issue remains the central sticking point, and it has now been compounded by the fact that, in the wake of an attempted coup, which we condemned, the government has now attempted to

shut down almost all of the independent media, deny freedom of association.

So once people's rights are violated, then, again, you know, it is a further destabilizing phenomenon.

Ms. BASS. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. We will go now to Mr. Michael McCaul, chairman of the Homeland Security Committee.

Mr. MCCAUL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Ambassador, for being here.

Let me first—I led a delegation to the Middle East and Europe. Let me commend you—and, also, working in concert with Lisa Monaco, we met the Turkish officials. And the information-sharing on travel and watch lists is a huge breakthrough, and I commend you for that. I also encourage you to keep the pressure up on the foreign fighter issue.

As you know, the EU—if you are a citizen of the European Union and coming out of the region through Turkey, you are not going to be screened past a watch list, which I thought was a sort of glaring security gap. I know the EU Parliament is getting ready to address this issue. Many of the countries we met with, they understand the threat that that poses. And I hope that you can continue to apply that pressure.

Let me turn to foreign aid. We give a lot of money to countries that vote against us in the United Nations. And President Reagan's Ambassador, your predecessor, Jeane Kirkpatrick, testified before Congress and said we need to communicate to nations that their attitudes and actions inside the U.N. must have consequences for their relations with the United States outside of the U.N. system.

And in response to her testimony, Congress passed legislation that would tie their voting patterns at the U.N. to the amount of foreign assistance provided. However, unfortunately, in 1990, this provision was repealed.

But the State Department continued this practice of reporting to Congress on voting included in its report voting at the U.N. and listed foreign assistance alongside countries voting both with, for and against, the United States.

The Obama administration ended this practice in 2010, and I wanted to see if you could explain to me why the administration ended that practice.

Ambassador POWER. Well, I am actually not aware that we ended that practice because we still retain very, very careful records of voting coincidence with the United States. It is extremely important.

I study these, pore over these, look at ebbs and flows, you know, try to explain why a country goes from a yes vote to a no vote or an abstain to a yes.

So it is extremely important. And we believe very much in transparency, and I am sure that this is something we can look at and maybe we can take offline.

If I could get, though, at the—I think the harder issue that you raise is not can we share our assessment of how countries are aligning with us on a range of issues. It is this question of then what do you do about it.

So my view is that we should call countries out. We should press them publicly and privately. It needs to be raised in capital.

One of the advantages of being a member of the President's Cabinet is the close working relationship I get to have with Secretary Kerry and Ambassador Rice, and it puts us in a position, again, to elevate what often their Ambassadors are doing sometimes without even capitals knowing and making sure that there is an accountability chain back to the capital.

Depending on the vote, I mean, it is conceivable that you could look at more robust steps along the lines you describe. But let's recall, I think, that often countries that may vote against us, let's say, on a resolution in the General Assembly—or I shouldn't say against us, but against a resolution that we vote for—those same countries may be providing peacekeepers to northern Mali, preventing a resurgence of extremism—or seeking to.

They may be countries that we are providing very generous contributions, thanks to the American people and Congress, on PEPFAR and on combating HIV/AIDS. We are all part of now trying to ensure that girls get educated around the world. A lot of that foreign aid can be dedicated to that. Ebola we have described, you know, the investments in the global health security architecture we have to make that is in our interest over time.

So, usually, the decisions around who we provide assistance to are overdetermined by a set of factors and a set of interests that are also very, very important to us. And so I just think——

Mr. MCCAUL. And I know my time is——

Ambassador POWER. Yes.

Mr. MCCAUL. And it is very complex, ordinarily complex, but I do think Congress has to look at this issue. And I know you are required to submit an annual report on the voting practices in the U.N.

It was due on March 31, and it is June. Are you planning to submit this report?

Ambassador POWER. We meet our obligations to Congress.

Mr. MCCAUL. Okay.

Ambassador POWER. So, yes, I will again look into where it is.

Mr. MCCAUL. Okay.

Ambassador POWER. It may be on my desk.

Mr. MCCAUL. All right. Well, I would like to see that. And I recognize the complexity, but it is important to us. So thank you very much.

Chairman ROYCE. Mr. David Cicilline of Rhode Island.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Ambassador Power, for being here today and for offering your expert testimony on many of the issues before this committee.

I want to begin by commending you for your tremendous work and your leadership at the U.N. as Congresswoman Bass said, in a very complicated world, you have provided some extraordinary leadership and have been able to lead an effort to accomplish quite a lot at the U.N. So I want to thank you for your service.

I am going to first turn to the efforts being made to stem the flow of foreign fighters. You mentioned in your written testimony in a little more detail the President convened a summit of leaders at

the U.N. in September, where a Security Council resolution was adopted requiring countries to have laws to prosecute foreign terrorist fighters and those who fund them and to prevent them from entering the country and crossing territories.

What seems to be the greatest challenge in seeing those measures implemented? And are there things that we could be doing to support that effort?

Because we have heard so much testimony over the last several months about this issue of foreign fighters and stemming the flow of foreign fighters. And this seemed like a positive step, but I would just like to hear your thoughts on that.

Ambassador POWER. Thank you.

It is not often how the question is posed, which is why, which I think is really important. And I think we have made substantial headway by putting the issue on the agenda, by identifying the kind of categories of action in which countries needed to step up, and we are not where we should be. And by "we" I mean the international community.

And Secretary Johnson, our Secretary of Homeland Security, just got to make this point. We held about a month ago the first-ever U.N. Security Council meeting in which interior ministers sat in the chairs. And this was our logic of saying, you know, in the old days, if threats were one country crossing another country's borders, it made sense for foreign ministry people to be talking to one another.

But here, when the threats are deriving often from lapses in internal security or from a community's failure to catch that somebody was drifting off and potentially even about to become a foreign terrorist fighter, we need to get people who actually are presiding over those programs together.

And so I think it is where the U.N. needs to go in the 21st century, is have more of those technical discussions where people who are dealing with threats inside their own borders come together.

But to your question on why, I think it is, of course, a combination. First, there are major issues of state capacity and state weakness. Many of the countries from which foreign terrorist fighters are coming are countries that have very poor border security, very weak intelligence services, to actually be able to track citizens and how they are moving.

And that gets to the President's West Point speech and, basically, his direction to all of us that we need to invest far more in partner capacity. Sometimes people focus on the military aspect of that, but the border security, the intelligence, you know, the kind of internal institution building, is extremely important.

And then political will is an issue in some countries and, in others, privacy concerns. And some of the European countries have really held back the amount of information-sharing that could be done.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you.

With respect to the efforts of the U.N. to protect LGBT individuals around the world, I would like to speak a little bit to that because, as you know, we have seen terrible increases in violence against members of the LGBT community in places all around the world.

And I know you have led some work at the U.N., and maybe it gives you an opportunity to talk about some of the successes as a result of our participation in the Human Rights Council, recognizing it is a flawed entity with a lot of criticism that you heard today at the hearing.

But I know that there has been some good that has come from our participation. So maybe you could speak to that briefly.

Ambassador POWER. Well, thank you. That is actually where I was going before we were interrupted before in response to Congressman Deutch's question. So I appreciate that.

You know, we have already discussed at length here some of the flaws or the structural issues with the U.N. Security Council. And time and again we find there or in the General Assembly, which is comprised—more than half of the U.N. member states are not democratic and are not necessarily rights-respecting. So the Human Rights Council can be a venue in which like-minded countries can come together to push the envelope on norms.

And in the case of women's rights, we all remember back in 1993 the Beijing Conference on Women. Women rights are human rights. The same shift has now happened on LGBT rights, where the declarations have been made, where resolutions that ban extrajudicial killings against various persecuted groups—now we have managed to insert those killed on grounds of sexual orientation or sexual orientation status—I think that is an example, again, of finding the institution—forum shopping, in a sense, within the U.N., finding the institution where you can mobilize the votes and then pushing the envelope.

What we have now just this month is the second report ever prepared by the High Commissioner for Human Rights on the treatment of LGBT persons. So for the first time, again, you have a norm that is important, but not everything. Implementation is what matters.

Then you have accountability to that norm: How are countries measuring up, actually documenting that for the first time? So people who have felt invisible in their societies and persecuted now know that the international community is watching and that we have their back.

Mr. CICILLINE. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I know my time is expired, but I might just submit a question and ask for a written response.

I am proud to be the co-chair of the Congressional Peacekeeping Caucus, which we just recently formed along with my colleague, Adam Kinzinger, so that members could discuss the implication of regional peacekeeping operations and their impact on U.S. foreign policy and national security.

So, if you could, Madam Ambassador, let us know what reforms you think are needed, what role the U.S. has played in supporting peacekeeping missions and what benefit do these international forces have to American strategic goals and national security and have U.N. peacekeeping missions been successful in carrying out their missions, it would certainly help guide the work of this new caucus and continue to hopefully be a supportive entity within the Congress for the work of the U.N. and its peacekeeping operations. And I thank you again.

And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman ROYCE. We are going to go to Mr. Ted Yoho of Florida and then back to Mr. Ted Deutch of Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Ambassador Power, I appreciate you being here.

You were talking earlier today about these are the kinds of conditions—we were talking about Syria and the Ukraine—kind of conditions and situations we see conflict in that the U.N. was created to prevent. You know, we look at Ukraine, Syria, over 200,000 killed, Afghanistan, Iraq, North Korea, Africa.You know, you can go on and on and on. Why has the U.N. not been more effective in preventing these?

I read a report today talking about the peacekeepers in Haiti, and there was over 220 examples of the peacekeepers trading phones and aid for sex, and, you know, they are supposed to be out there promoting this. Yet, this happens over and over and over and over again. Yet, we do a study to study it and there is no end in sight, it seems like. Why are they not more effective?

Ambassador POWER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. YOHO. And I think, more importantly, how to make them more effective.

Ambassador POWER. Right. Right. No. That is a question I ask myself every day.

I mean, first, the "they" is also us. Right?

Mr. YOHO. Right.

Ambassador POWER. We are part of the international system. So there are 193 countries, half of whom are not democratic. To some extent, the organization is going to reflect some of the dysfunction of member states who comprise the organization.

On the issue of sexual abuse, of course, there is no justification. There is not one country that would raise its hand and say they are anything but revolted by what happens. But, then, as was said, I think, by—maybe it was Congressman Smith earlier—when a peacekeeper from a particular member state is found or is alleged to have committed crimes against young people or against women or against men or boys, they go back to their home State and the only punishment exacted upon them is often just not getting to be part of that mission, not getting to continue to carry out the practices that they were carrying out.

So the reason I started my response to you by saying the U.N. is the sum of the efforts of the member states who comprise it is that, ultimately, our ability to change those horrific practices and that horrific lack of accountability is going to turn on what we achieve in the capital, in our strengthening of those institutions, in ensuring that those countries have the rule of law.

In a democracy, if somebody was accused of that, they would come back and they would face—I think, if it was an European or an American peacekeeper, they would go through a formal justice system. That is not what happens in a lot of these developing countries where those systems are underdeveloped.

So this is why investments, again, in the kind of institutions that we were talking about, also, in the context of foreign terrorist fighters is very important. But it is also why using our platform to denounce this, to never tolerate it, and to emphasize the one part of

the U.N. that we fund, which is the Secretariat, that, on the one hand, gets instruction from the member states—so it suffers from the same issue that I have described already—but has autonomy.

And for the Secretary General and his team to be investigating these abuses, to be sending people home, to be calling on those member states even publicly, if that is what is required, to investigate and to build on some of the internal—you mentioned studies. Nobody likes studies for their own sake. But when you find that a country has not actually prosecuted a person who has violated a child who has relied upon that individual for protection——

Mr. YOHO. Right.

Ambassador POWER [continuing]. You call that country out. You visit that country——

Mr. YOHO. I want to come back to that, you know, because that is where I think we need to go.

I want to switch over to Iran. You said the Obama administration led unilateral, multinational sanctions against Iran to bring them to the negotiating table on the Iran nuclear agreement.

What was the purpose of that whole negotiation? What we were trying to prevent?

Ambassador POWER. The negotiation or the sanctions?

Mr. YOHO. Well, the sanctions. What was the whole point of that? I know it was to bring them to the negotiation table. But with the Iran nuclear negotiation now, in your mind, what are we trying to accomplish?

Ambassador POWER. We are trying to deny Iran a pathway to a nuclear weapon.

Mr. YOHO. Okay. That is what everybody says, but, yet, we are beyond that. Because, you know, I have had expert after expert over 2 years sitting right where you are at saying that Iran has enough material for nuclear bombs now.

Henry Kissinger came out and said that. George Shultz said that. We had a retired general last week say they have enough right now. And I think we are beyond that.

I just don't see, you know, in good faith how we can support this agreement. I would think that sanctions should be back in place. And you said that President Obama has snap-back authority—with his pen is what you said.

Do you really have the expectation that a snap-back would be effective? You know, I mean, they are not even coming clean now. So why would we go forward?

And if we do find out, you know, and it is, you know, more evident that they have not held up to their end of the condition, do we really think that we are going to put these sanctions back in place with snap-back?

Ambassador POWER. First of all, again, there is no deal. We are still negotiating a lot of the terms of the deal. And as you can see from some of the public commentary, there are significant differences that remain.

And our red lines are red. And we are not going to take a deal where we can't come to the American people and say that we have achieved the objective that those sanctions——

Mr. YOHO. I am out of time.

But a red line is they can't have nuclear weapons, but they already have.

Ambassador POWER. They don't have a nuclear weapon.

Mr. YOHO. Well, the experts disagree with you.

Ambassador POWER. I don't think there is an expert who says Iran has a nuclear weapon.

Mr. YOHO. No. They have the capacity right now to have that. So I think we are beyond that point, trying to prevent that which we can't instead of preparing for that which will be. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. We go now to Mr. Ted Deutch of Florida for his remaining 2 minutes.

Mr. DEUTCH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Ambassador Power, thank you again for being here. Thank you for staying to give all the members the opportunity to discuss these important issues with you.

I just had two final points in my remaining time.

First, you had said earlier in response to a question about the specifics of snap-back that Congress will be briefed if a deal is done. And I would just make the request of you and the administration that, rather than waiting until there is a deal that is done, that this is the time, over the next couple of weeks especially, when it is so important for the administration to brief Congress, to let us know what is happening, so that, one, we are aware of what is happening, two, we can chime in, we can have our questions answered and, most importantly, so that no one is surprised with the idea that a deal will simply be dropped upon us at some date on or after June 30. That is just a request.

And, finally, I wanted to thank you for your efforts in working with the Israeli Ambassador to the United Nations to put together the first General Assembly special session on anti-Semitism. I am grateful for your invitation to allow me to participate.

Some of the important topics that we covered that day were the anti-Israel bias in some parts of the United Nations, the growing BDS movement, and thinly veiled anti-Semitism there, and the other forms of anti-Semitism that in recent months have manifested themselves in violent and deadly attacks in Brussels and Paris and Copenhagen and elsewhere.

And my question is: After that special session on anti-Semitism, after that conference, when there were more than 60 countries who participated, what has been done? What have you done? What has the U.S. delegation done in order to move forward with some of those important discussions that took place then: How to combat anti-Semitism, how to help nations around the world understand that anti-Semitism in their countries isn't just an issue as it affects the Jewish community, but, ultimately, when there is hatred, anti-Semitism in the Jewish community is often just the canary in the coal mine? And if you could talk about what has happened since.

Ambassador POWER. Thank you, Congressman. And thank you for coming to that session.

On that issue—and I will come back to your point about the Iran deal in just a second—it was truly a historic session.

I mean, when you think about what the General Assembly not only has done historically in terms of its resolution equating Zionism and racism, but, also, what it does annually—this last year

with 18 anti-Israel resolutions, all of which were voted against—to be in that chamber I think was extremely important not only for the Government of Israel, but for the United States and for many of the countries that helped shepherd that session forward. It wasn't easy.

In terms of follow-through, I think we have to be careful not to confine discussions of anti-Semitism to meetings on anti-Semitism.

So what we are doing at the Human Rights Council, in the General Assembly, when we talk about other human rights challenges that we are facing in the world, we are always, again, coming back to anti-Semitism, documenting what has been done, who has done what.

We are still doing a lot of advocacy, including by our anti-Semitism envoy, Mr. Forman, in capitals to try to get governments to do what we have done, which is to appoint a special envoy also dedicated to this effort and somebody preferably very plugged in in the center and not somebody, again, you kind of throw off to the side and keep marginalized from the mainstream of decision-making because there are issues of prosecution, of education, again, of community outreach and so forth that are central to this and require real political will from the top.

So a lot of our outreach has been in capital and at the United Nations. Again, we are seeking to mainstream this issue so people know you don't get a clean bill of health on human rights when you are simultaneously encouraging anti-Semitism.

On the Iran deal—and I know we are both out of time here—I would just note that what I really meant was that fundamentally this deal is going to come. Back here people are going to be studying it. They are going to be asking questions.

But, as you know, we have been briefing this deal at every turn. And I believe specifically on the snap-back mechanism, if members have not received adequate, you know, insight into how we are looking at that and what the range of options are—and, again, any one of them I think would achieve the shared objective we have, which is to keep that within our authority—this is the one at the U.N. I am referring to—but, again, if there is any shortage of insight in terms of how we are looking at this, that is something I am eager to provide. I know Under Secretary Sherman or the Secretary would be as well.

But absolutely I take your point. We have sought to engage Congress throughout this process. I think there have been more briefings on this issue than any other on Planet Earth. But, again, if there is more information that we need to provide at this delicate stage, we would be happy to do so. Just in an open hearing may be not ideal.

Chairman ROYCE. Well, I might take some exception, Ambassador. I mean, from the standpoint of Congress, we do not feel we have received the details on these negotiations, as you know. But we have a conflict of visions, I guess, on on that.

We will go now to Mr. Curt Clawson of Florida.

Mr. CLAWSON. You don't have an easy job.

Ambassador POWER. I love my job.

Mr. CLAWSON. Thank you for coming, and thank you for your service to our country.

It sounds to me sometimes after listening today, which I did attentively both when I was in the room and when I was not, that the rest of the world gets a great deal here.

The oil companies get to run great surpluses with us. We fund their economies. The manufacturing outsource in countries of the world, China being the top of the line, run great trade surpluses with us.

Then they all go to the U.N. and they pound on us. They pound on Israel. As I heard earlier from Congressman Deutch and others, not objective with respect to Israel, not objective with respect to slavery, not objective with respect to Cuba, just overall not objective.

And then, on top of all of that, we get to pay for it. So, in nominal terms, we are over 20 percent of the world's GDP. But, as understand it, we are paying over 20 percent of the cost to the U.N.

There is something wrong with this picture. It seems that we are not using our money at the U.N. to create leverage and nor are we using our markets to create leverage. So we fund everyone else's economy. In the global economy, we are the engine, and then we turn around and tolerate the kind of things that you have been talking about today.

Being Mr. and Mrs. Nice Guy doesn't seem to be working here. It feels like, from an economic perspective, people only understand leverage. And so, therefore, I am not clear why we don't use our economic and monetary leverage both at the U.N. and with respect to the global marketplace.

Am I missing something here in my synopsis? I am sure you are going to tell me I am.

Ambassador POWER. I would say a few things in response.

First, I understand the frustration. And one of the priorities that we have had at the U.N. is to get more countries to pay their fair share.

And I think you are going to see—you have seen over the last 3 to 5 years China's share, for instance, of U.N. peacekeeping, where the United States is the lead funder—but its share has gone up by more than 50 percent. And soon, in this next round of negotiations around the peacekeeping skills, you are going to see it go up another 50 percent, commensurate with its share of the global economy.

And that is the kind of distribution of resource provision that we need to see at the U.N. and as people graduate from being underdeveloped countries, they need to step up and take their share of the burden. And that is something, again, that is constantly being reassessed.

Mr. CLAWSON. Can I follow up on just that point?

With respect to China, I mean, the American consumer, via Walmart, is funding the building of their military and their economic prowess.

Do we ever talk not only about having them increase what they pay for at the U.N., but, also, do we ever want to use our marketplace to kind of level things out here?

Ambassador POWER. Well, just to stick to what I know best, which is the place I work and how we engage the countries that you have expressed concerns about, you know, the fact of the mat-

ter is we, as a Nation, as we saw with the Ebola crisis, have an interest in global health security, in part, because of the globalized economy, in part, because goods and people are crossing borders in the way that they are.

And so the notion that we can kind of take our marbles and go home and wish everybody the best and say, "Well, good luck with that" I think doesn't really get at the core national security linkages and human security linkages that exist in 2015.

I also would note on peacekeeping, which is the place where, again, it is fair to ask shouldn't other countries be stepping up more, that peacekeeping, while we are a major contribution, it is not our forces who are going into South Sudan and, you know, being on those bases and protecting civilians. It is not our forces in Northern Mali, more of whom have been killed this year than in any peacekeeping mission by IEDs and other things.

We are taking advantage of the global system as well in order to ensure that issues of shared security are being patrolled and manned by individuals, other than Americans and American families, because we have done more than our fair share over this last decade.

Indeed, the peacekeeping share that we pay still leaves the rest of the shares, even put to one side the fact that it is other countries' troops and police that are going to those dangerous places. Other countries are also paying 72 percent of the burden.

And if you look at NATO defense expenditures where Europeans really have not stepped up to allocate as much of their GDPs to defense as they should be, the figure is reversed. We are 80 percent of NATO's defense expenditures.

So I actually think, even though U.N. peacekeeping suffers from all of the flaws that we have described and that is why President Obama has launched this very aggressive initiative to try to enhance accountability and ensure that those missions have better capabilities to protect civilians and prevent sexual abuse and so forth, in terms of our interest and actually seeing atrocities be prevented, global epidemics stemmed at their source, radicalization prevented by virtue of actually having some stability, the rule of law advanced not least also because of corruption and some other things that we see, which don't help American companies seeking to operate in these environments, there are a set of investments there that are good for us.

And the United Nations helps us make them, but also helps us force multiply because what we invest we are able to leverage. It is still 72 percent on peacekeeping provided by others. In our regular budget, it is 78 percent provided by others.

Chairman ROYCE. We go now to Dr. Ami Bera of California.

Mr. BERA. Thank you, Chairman Royce.

And thank you, Ambassador Power, for both your service to our country, but your service over the years as a leading advocate on global human rights.

I am going to turn my questioning a little bit to internal politics within the U.N. as a body, it certainly has served us well throughout its history. But if we look at the makeup of the U.N. Security Council, you know, it does seem like it is time to revamp the permanent membership of the U.N. Security Council, certainly to in-

clude the G4 countries, you know, India, Brazil, Japan, and Germany.

If we take India, specifically, you know, soon to be the most populous nation on the planet, one of the fastest growing economies, certainly a critical ally of the United States, my understanding is President Obama has also publicly stated that he would be supportive of including India as a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council.

Can you give us a sense of how this body working with the administration might be able to work within the political structure of the United Nations to move forward, including more nations as permanent members, again, and recognizing the world that we are in in the 21st century?

Ambassador POWER. It is an excellent question. And because it is the 70th anniversary of the U.N., it is a question that many of my counterparts from around the world are asking this year specifically.

And there is no question that, when you have a body whose permanent membership hasn't changed in 70 years, you know, there are people on the outside who ask, "Well, is this the alignment of power and influence in 2015?" and it is hard to say that it is a perfect calibration.

I think the challenge is, while almost everybody is supportive of Security Council reform in the abstract, there are quite bitter divisions within the U.N. membership about just who should get those seats.

And while India has the support, the United States has made clear, President Obama made clear, as you know, on his trip that we can't imagine a reformed Security Council that wouldn't include India, there are other countries who are throwing everything they have at preventing that outcome.

And so what has not happened is you have not seen one version of Security Council reform that has gathered a majority of countries. And even this year, when there has been more action on this issue, you really haven't seen momentum, again, gather around any particular reform scenario.

The U.S. position is very clear. We, again, recognize some of the legitimacy challenges that the current Council poses particularly in terms of its permanent membership. We recognize the growth and the influence of countries like India, who, incidentally, also are one of the leading contributors to peacekeeping, so do a huge amount within the U.N. family and have a huge amount to offer as the world's largest democracy.

But we also are very focused on the effectiveness of the U.N. and efficiencies. And so we are also looking beyond that case at how countries would likely perform on the Security Council. We are looking at issues related to voting coincidence, which was discussed earlier, because, of course, we are looking for countries that share our approach to promoting international peace and security, to promoting human rights, to seeing the linkages between the humanitarian and the human rights, on the one hand, and the peace and security, on the other. It is not clear that this is going to move forward quickly.

Mr. BERA. As these discussions take place and the U.N. debates how to expand the Security Council, are there things that this body, Congress, can do that would be productive in helping move this along?

Ambassador POWER. Well, I probably should have noted that, in order for Security Council reform to take hold, this Congress would also have to ratify any reform package. So in the past, while the permanent membership has not changed since 1945, the size of the Council has. And that has to come before this Congress.

Maybe one thing that could be done as an intermediary step is to actually pass IMF reform because one of the things that these emerging powers look to is the Congress' ability to ensure that international—to support measures that would ensure that international institutions actually reflect 2015 measures of influence, including economic influence, as distinct from those from a decade or more ago.

And that has been stuck here, as you know, for some time, and I think would be a very important show of our attention to the rise of these countries, to the need for their voices to be exercised and, also, for the need for these countries to dedicate more resources to the comments because, just as they want more representation and more authority, we would also like to see them, per our last exchange, contribute more, you know, to everything from peacekeeping, to development, to humanitarian assistance, et cetera.

Mr. BERA. Great. Thank you, Ambassador.

Ambassador POWER. Thank you.

Chairman ROYCE. Well, thank you very much, Ambassador Power. We thank you for being with us this morning, and we also thank you for returning and for our brief interruption.

I look forward to continuing to work with you on the pressing issues raised here today, including the plight of the Rohingya refugees, on issues like peacekeeping reforms and the ongoing crisis in Syria and, of course, with you and the administration on Iran's sanctions.

The committee trusts the administration will be in close touch with us on these negotiations. We don't want to be surprised in the final agreement, given the position that Congress has taken on this, and especially the suggestion that the administration may be backing off its original demand that Iran submit to inspections of its nuclear sites at any time. This is important to us, as is this question of the lifting of sanctions not being on the front end as a signing bonus, but, instead, being over the long haul of what was supposed to be a 20-year agreement.

But we thank you again, Ambassador. And see you soon in New York.

Ambassador POWER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Whereupon, at 12:58 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

Material Submitted for the Record

FULL COMMITTEE HEARING NOTICE
COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-6128

Edward R. Royce (R-CA), Chairman

June 16, 2015

TO: MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

You are respectfully requested to attend an OPEN hearing of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to be held in Room 2172 of the Rayburn House Office Building (and available live on the Committee website at http://www.ForeignAffairs.house.gov):

DATE: Tuesday, June 16, 2015

TIME: 10:00 a.m.

SUBJECT: Advancing United States' Interests at the United Nations

WITNESS: The Honorable Samantha Power
U.S. Permanent Representative
United States Mission to the United Nations
U.S. Department of State

By Direction of the Chairman

The Committee on Foreign Affairs seeks to make its facilities accessible to persons with disabilities. If you are in need of special accommodations, please call 202/225-5021 at least four business days in advance of the event, whenever practicable. Questions with regard to special accommodations in general (including availability of Committee materials in alternative formats and assistive listening devices) may be directed to the Committee.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS
MINUTES OF FULL COMMITTEE HEARING

Day *Tuesday* Date *6/16/15* Room *2172*

Starting Time *10:13* Ending Time *12:58*

Recesses *1* (*11:32* to *12:04*) (____ to ____) (____ to ____) (____ to ____) (____ to ____) (____ to ____)

Presiding Member(s)

Chairman Edward R. Royce, Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen

Check all of the following that apply:

Open Session ☑
Executive (closed) Session ☐
Televised ☑

Electronically Recorded (taped) ☑
Stenographic Record ☑

TITLE OF HEARING:

Advancing United States' Interests at the United Nations

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

see attached

NON-COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

none

HEARING WITNESSES: Same as meeting notice attached? Yes ☑ **No** ☐
(If "no", please list below and include title, agency, department, or organization.)

STATEMENTS FOR THE RECORD: *(List any statements submitted for the record.)*

SFR - Rep. Gerald Connolly
QFR - Rep. Ileana Ros-Lehtinen

TIME SCHEDULED TO RECONVENE _____
or
TIME ADJOURNED *12:58*

Jean Marter, Director of Committee Operations

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

FULL COMMITTEE HEARING

PRESENT	*MEMBER*
X	Edward R. Royce, CA
X	Christopher H. Smith, NJ
X	Ileana Ros-Lehtinen, FL
X	Dana Rohrabacher, CA
X	Steve Chabot, OH
	Joe Wilson, SC
X	Michael T. McCaul, TX
	Ted Poe, TX
	Matt Salmon, AZ
X	Darrell Issa, CA
X	Tom Marino, PA
X	Jeff Duncan, SC
X	Mo Brooks, AL
	Paul Cook, CA
X	Randy Weber, TX
X	Scott Perry, PA
	Ron DeSantis, FL
X	Mark Meadows, NC
X	Ted Yoho, FL
X	Curt Clawson, FL
	Scott, DesJarlais, TN
	Reid Ribble, WI
X	Dave Trott, MI
	Lee Zeldin, NY
X	Dan Donovan, NY

PRESENT	*MEMBER*
X	Eliot L. Engel, NY
X	Brad Sherman, CA
	Gregory W. Meeks, NY
X	Albio Sires, NJ
	Gerald E. Connolly, VA
X	Theodore E. Deutch, FL
	Brian Higgins, NY
X	Karen Bass, CA
	William Keating, MA
X	David Cicilline, RI
	Alan Grayson, FL
X	Ami Bera, CA
X	Alan S. Lowenthal, CA
X	Grace Meng, NY
X	Lois Frankel, FL
X	Tulsi Gabbard, HI
X	Joaquin Castro, TX
X	Robin Kelly, IL
X	Brendan Boyle, PA

Statement for the Record

Submitted by Mr. Connolly of Virginia

The U.S. has long-concluded that supporting the United Nations (U.N.) is both a moral imperative and aligned with our national security interests. Since the U.N. was established in 1945, it has served as a platform for addressing global threats and responding to crises that demand coordinated, multilateral action.

The institution is now 70 years old and has grown to include 193 member states, 16 specialized agencies, and an annual budget of $8.4 billion for peacekeeping operations. U.S. engagement at the U.N. and fully funded U.N. dues ensure that countries like Russia and China do not co-opt the organization for their narrow interests.

U.N. growth and development have resulted in expanded capacity and increased expectations – expectations that, at times, have not been met resulting in devastating consequences. On the eve of the 20th anniversary of the genocide at Srebrenica in Bosnia we are reminded of the cost of failure or inaction by U.N. peacekeeping missions.

As a permanent member of the U.N. Security Council and the single largest contributor to the U.N. general and peacekeeping budgets, the U.S. has been active enforcing reform initiatives at the U.N. In the wake of Srebrenica for example, better deployment practices and a more clear authorization for the use of force for peacekeeping missions were part of the U.S.-led reform effort. The 120,000 active U.N. peacekeeping troops constitute the largest military deployment in the world, yet the operation must be nimble enough to prevent disasters in real-time.

Among its many non-peacekeeping obligations, the U.N. is currently facilitating progress on global climate change and preventing a nuclear-armed Iran.

In September 2014, the U.N. hosted the largest gathering of world leaders on the subject of climate change in history. The U.N. is uniquely suited to meet the challenge posed by climate change. The effort will require developed and developing countries to collaborate on long-term commitments to reduce greenhouse gases and promote sustainable energy goals.

The Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA) announced on April 2, demonstrates the important role the U.N. plays in the negotiations with Iran over its nuclear program. The U.N. has leveled sanctions against Tehran to help bring the Iranian regime to the negotiating table, and it will be the U.N. that will construct both sanctions relief and the enduring portions of the Iranian sanctions regime if a final deal is reached.

The current portfolio of U.N.-led international action is not without poor performances. Russia's position on the Security Council has blocked decisive action in Syria and Ukraine. The Assad regime continues to deploy barrel bombs and chemical weapons on civilian populations, and Russian-backed separatists commit daily violations of an agreement to cease hostilities.

I look forward to hearing from Ambassador Power on how the U.N. can overcome deadlock in some of the world's most intractable conflicts. The world awaits a clear articulation of U.S. policy towards the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in U.N. fora. Assad's blatant violations of the Chemical Weapons Convention seem targeted at the passage of U.N. Resolution 2209, and we have previously seen brutal dictators purposely defy the U.N. in order to destabilize international collaboration. Finally, how has the U.S. been able to use the U.N. as a soapbox to expound on Putin's aggression in Ukraine despite Russia's veto on the Security Council? There are few international situations that are not in the purview of the U.N., and the Committee welcomes a wide breadth of discussion.

Questions for the Record Submitted by
Representative Ileana Ros-Lehtinen
Ambassador Samantha Power
House Committee on Foreign Affairs
June 16, 2015

Question 1:

Please provide the numbers for each Fiscal Year from 2011 to the present that includes:

(1) The total amount of all assessed and voluntary contributions, including in-kind, of the United States Government to the United Nations and its affiliated agencies and related bodies.
(2) The approximate percentage of United States Government contributions to each United Nations affiliated agency or body in such fiscal year when compared with all contributions to each such agency or body from any source in such fiscal year.
(3) For each such United States Government contribution:
(A) the amount of each such contribution;
(B) a description of each such contribution (including whether assessed or voluntary);
(C) the department or agency of the United States Government responsible for each such contribution;
(D) the United Nations or its affiliated agency or related body receiving the contribution.

Answer:
The Department is currently preparing a report to Congress to provide this information, as directed by House Report 133-499, which accompanied the House State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations Bill, 2015. The Department is also preparing an Annual Report to Congress on U.S. contributions to international organizations as required by section 405(b) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Year 2003. The Department's reports on U.S. Contributions to International Organizations for fiscal years prior to FY 2014 are posted on its website at the following link: http://www.state.gov/p/io/rls/rpt/index.htm

Question 2:

The question was with regard to the UN sanctions against Iran – so that includes the UN Security Council Resolutions 1696, 1737, 1747, 1803, 1835 and 1929. Can you confirm that the sanctions that came about as a result of these resolutions, for example, but not limited to, the ban in UNSCR 1929 on Iran participating in ballistic missile activity, will not be lifted if a final nuclear deal is reached with Iran?

Answer:

If we are able to reach a deal, we expect that a new UN Security Council resolution would endorse its full implementation. That resolution would also terminate the provisions of previous UNSC sanctions resolutions upon verification that Iran has taken certain nuclear steps, as well as establish ongoing restrictions. We expect the new resolution will incorporate

important restrictions on conventional arms and ballistic missiles, which would stay in place for a considerable period of time.

Question 3:

When was the last time we reported Iranian sanctions violations at the UN to the Sanctions Committee? Is Iran providing Iraq and Syria arms and related material? Yes or no. Are the export and/or procurement of any arms and related material from Iran permitted under relevant United Nations Security **Council resolutions?** Yes or no. Is Iran providing arms and related material to Iraq? Yes or no. Have we reported these to the Sanctions Committee? Yes or no, and if no, why not?

Answer:

The UN Security Council resolutions related to Iran prohibit, inter alia, transfers to or from Iran of items related to proliferation-sensitive nuclear activities and nuclear weapons delivery systems, including ballistic missiles; the export/procurement of any arms and related materiel from Iran; and the supply of seven categories, as specified, of conventional weapons and related materiel to Iran.

We are certainly concerned that Iran continues to violate the UN sanctions imposed against it, including through illicit procurement and arms smuggling. Iran's trafficking of weapons, including to some of the most extreme and irresponsible actors in its region, remains a serious threat to peace. We continue to deter and respond to such violations, including through interdiction, sanctions and law enforcement measures, as appropriate.

We also have a longstanding dialogue with the United Nations on sanctions evasions issues related to Iran. We report violations and bring issues to the Sanctions Committee and the UN Panel of Experts' attention when we have releasable information and doing so would further our nonproliferation objectives. Other countries are expected to do the same. We continue to work closely with likeminded partners on the UN Security Council to urge the Security Council's Iran Sanctions Committee to follow up on reported violations of the sanctions.

○