```
1
        NEAL R. GROSS & CO., INC.
 2
        RPTS MILLER
 3
        HFA096000
 4
 5
 6
        RESTORING AMERICAN LEADERSHIP IN THE
 7
        INDO-PACIFIC
        Wednesday, April 6, 2022
 8
        House of Representatives,
 9
10
        Committee on Foreign Affairs,
11
        Washington, D.C.
12
13
14
15
             The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:11 a.m., in Room
        2172, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Gregory Meeks [chairman
16
```

of the committee] presiding.

17

18 Chairman Meeks. The Committee on Foreign Affairs will come 19 to order.

And without objection, the chair is authorized to declare a recess of the committee at any point. And all members will have five days to submit statements, extraneous material, and questions for the record, subject to the length limitations in the rules.

To insert something into the record, please have your staff email previously mentioned address or contact full committee staff. As a reminder to Members, please keep your video function on at all times, even when you are not recognized by the chair. Members are responsible for muting and umuting themselves.

And consistent with House rules, staff will only mute members as appropriate where they are not under recognition to eliminate background noise.

I see that we have a quorum. I now recognize myself for opening remarks.

Pursuant to notice, we meet today to examine the Biden administration's Indo-Pacific strategy, the blueprint unveiled on February 11 to ensure a free and open Indo-Pacific and advance broader U.S. policy and strategic interests in the region.

As a Pacific power, United States has enjoyed a long history of deep ties to the broader Indo-Pacific. And the Indo-Pacific is home to more than half of the world's population. It is home

to two-thirds of the world's economic output and 7 of the 15 largest economies.

The region boasts 7 of the world's largest armed forces and 6 of our key allies. It is the source of half of the world's greenhouse gas emissions. Indo-Pacific is becoming the center of gravity for international relations and will have the disproportionate ability to shake the trajectory of global affairs.

It is essential that not only we pursue a strategy that acknowledges the centrality of the Indo-Pacific to core U.S. interests but also reflects the growing importance of the region to global affairs. And throughout history in the Indo-Pacific, though our history in the Indo-Pacific goes back centuries, the shifting geopolitical and strategic environment as well as emerging challenges emanating from the region makes it critical that the United States continues to upgrade and expand our engagement in the region.

The United States is far from the only player vying for influence. Revisionist autocratic actors seek to disrupt and displace the current system and set the rules of the road where they become the sole beneficiaries. Russia's premeditated an unprovoked invasion of the Ukraine demonstrates its disdain for the rules-based international order.

And China has woefully abdicated its self-proclaimed role

as a responsible stakeholder by failing to condemn Russia's illegal war. And in the Indo-Pacific, China routinely coerces our friends and allies, uses military aggression to gain the upper hand in broader maritime and territorial disputes. It steals technology, bends the rules to protect its domestic industry, and commits human rights abuses on a grand scale, whether through its genocide in Xinjiang, its destruction of Hong Kong's autonomy, or its surveillance and repression of its citizens throughout the mainland.

As we witness this ongoing assault on democratic norms and the rules-based international order, America must work with our partners and allies to counter the PRC's problematic policies and preserve a free and open Indo-Pacific. An effective approach to the region will allow us to tackle 21st challenges, including the COVID-19 pandemic, climate change, the rise in disinformation, and supply chain disruptions, none of which can tackle effectively alone.

The previous administration's America Alone policies set high level and consistent engagement back. And it is critical that we put diplomacy back at the center of our foreign policy to address complex and urgent challenges emanating for the region. This is particularly important given North Korea's nuclear and missile provocations and China's increased economic coercion and aggression and the ongoing crisis in Burma. We must also ensure

that we bring our partners in ASEAN and those in the Pacific

Islands with us and help them to recover from and build resiliency

to deal with the transnational challenges such as climate change

and the ongoing pandemic.

The Biden administration Indo-Pacific strategy demonstrates that the United States' commitment to build in the capacity of our allies and our partners for a more stable and inclusive region and invokes tangible resources to the region to restore or global leadership.

America must commit deeper. America must be more expansive diplomatically and expand our diplomatic ties and engagement in the region. And that is exactly I see that this strategy and plan does.

I now yield back the balance of my time and I now recognize the ranking member of this committee, Mr. McCaul of Texas, for his opening remarks.

Mr. McCaul. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, Madam Secretary. I know you have probably been working day and night and dealing with Congress. I appreciate all your efforts, though. I know it is not an easy job right now.

Republican and Democrat administrations are in agreement that this region is America's top foreign policy and national security priority. This region has been a battleground between democracy and tyranny for decades. Today, the Chinese Communist

Party is trying to dominate the region and push the U.S. military out through military expansion and debt trap diplomacy.

Mr. Chairman, you tell this hearing of restoring American leadership in Indo-Pacific. And so I would like to make two points on American leadership in the Indo-Pacific because the Americans watching might be under the mistaken impression that we may have left. But first, we have been in Indo-Pacific for over 120 years since the end of the Spanish-American war.

Second, American's legacy in the Indo-Pacific is freedom and prosperity. In the Second World War, my dad's war, and other conflicts, Americans sacrificed their lives to keep this region free. And the results speak for themselves, an independent Philippines, thriving democracies in Japan, Korea, and Taiwan, and a strong ASEAN.

But the CCP is undermining this hard-won freedom and prosperity. Chairman Xi and Mr. Putin have formed this as we saw at the Beijing Olympics this unholy alliance of two dictators obsessed with rebuilding their empires. Their recent no-limits partnership endorsed each other's territorial aggression.

Putin has made his move. The question is will Chairman Xi make his. Taiwan is the front line, on the front line to maintain a free Indo-Pacific. A CCP controlled Taiwan would be an unprecedented blow to our economic and national security.

It would threaten the homeland, weaken our alliances, allow

the CCP to hold the world's economy hostage by controlling supply chains, including semiconductors. I believe they control about 90 percent of the semiconductors in Taiwan.

So I'm glad you are here today. I know you're busy and you have got a lot of other things on your plate and to answer our questions.

Just before and during Putin's invasion, the President, the national security advisor, and administration officials at all levels including yourself, Madam Secretary, went above and beyond to engage the CCP. But instead of joining the international community, I believe they double down on their loyalty to Vladimir Putin instead. And rather than condemn Russia, they helped spread Russia's disinformation. Rather than sanction Russia, they helped Russian banks avoid U.S. sanctions.

Mr. Chairman, our response to the CCP threat needs less talk and more action. Soon I will be introducing the Taiwan Deterrence Act to stand up a security assistance program for Taiwan. Putin's invasion of the Ukraine has shown us how critical it is to get our allies the weapons they need before an invasion and not after.

The invasion of Ukraine is also a reminder that we have the power to lead our allies in punishing and deterring our enemies. We can cripple our adversary's economy. We can use export controls to cut off technology they use to build their military and that they use to murder innocent people.

We can restrict the outbound flows of American investments into their brutal regime. Quite frankly, we have had crippling effects on Russia. I think we need to look at China and their quest for aggression.

If we truly want the United States to lead in the Indo-Pacific, we need to deal with the CCP from a position of strength. And I would be remiss if I did not mention the Iran nuclear deal and in particular the possibility of lifting the foreign terrorist organization designation on the IRGC. This is a terrorist entity that has blood of over 600 Americans on its hands, and it continues to plan and launch attacks around the world.

Delisting this organization is part of a political deal with Iran would undermine our sanctions around the world and it would give a free pass to terrorism. I know this is one of the options on the table, Madam Secretary. But I would urge you to resist that temptation. I think that would be a terrible mistake.

So I look forward to our discussion. And with that, I yield back.

Chairman Meeks. The gentleman yields back. And I would like to turn to our distinguished chair of the subcommittee of Asia and the Pacific. I yield one minute to Chairman Bera.

Mr. Bera. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It has been a busy year, year and a half in the region, starting with the ongoing pandemic

to the coup in Myanmar to the collapse of the Afghan government to now the invasion of Ukraine by Russia. And more recently, we are paying close attention to what's happening in Pakistan and Sri Lanka, real issues there.

That said, I think the administration has done a lot that we can be proud of, restoring multilateral coalitions, elevating the Quad to a leader's level, AUKUS, which will really help us with maritime security in the region. And we look forward to building off of all of that without mentioning China as we deal with what we see as an autocratic regime. But I'm optimistic about the region.

I think we're putting a lot in place foundationally that will help us address many of those crisis but also will lay a framework for a thriving, peaceful, prosperous 21st century.

But it really will take American leadership, American engagement.

And I think in a bipartisan way, I have enjoyed working with my ranking member, Mr. Chabot.

And we have got to have a long term American strategy for the region. So thank you and I'll yield back.

Chairman Meeks. Gentleman yields back. And now I recognize the subcommittee ranking member who I have the pleasure of working with very closely. And I would like to acknowledge how closely both the chair and the subcommittee and the ranking member works together in the spirit of this community.

210 So I yield to Ranking Member Chabot.

Mr. Chabot. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. We do enjoy working together in a bipartisan manner for the most part in this committee. And we appreciate that.

It's hard to overstate the significance of the Indo-Pacific.

Not only is it home to over half the world's population, but

it also produces more than a third of the globe's economic

activity.

Over the upcoming decades, the region will steadily grow in importance, making it absolutely critical that we get our strategy towards it right. While most of the countries in Indo-Pacific are focused on peaceful development, the Chinese Communist Party is seeking regional hegemony, dominance over the rest of us. Bewilderingly, however, powerful voices in this administration seem to think that the CCP is just one conversation away from being a responsible stakeholder or the solution of the crisis in Ukraine.

Let me be clear. The CCP is not a potential friend, not a responsible stakeholder, not a misunderstood partner. The Chinese Communist Party is a strategic and ideological adversary. They are our primary challenge in the Indo-Pacific.

- So I look forward to discussing whether or policy toward the region recognizes that fact. I yield back.
- Chairman Meeks. The gentleman yields back. It is now my

distinct pleasure and honor to introduce our witness. And I want to say first to our witness, thank you. Thank you for your service to our country.

Thank you for being available to this committee anytime that we call. You always rise to the occasion. And the House, you've been able to testify a number of our classified briefings and keeping us informed on what has taken place around the world. So I want thank you for your service.

The Honorable Wendy Sherman was confirmed by the Senate on April 13, 2021 and sworn in as the twenty-first and first female Deputy Secretary of State on April 14, 2021. Prior to assuming this position, Deputy Secretary Sherman was professor of the Practice of Public Leadership and director of the Center for Public Leadership at the Harvard Kennedy School. From 2011 to 2015, Deputy Secretary Sherman served as Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs.

Among her many diplomatic accomplishments, she was awarded the National Security Medal by President Barack Obama. She previously served at the State Department as counselor and special advisor to President Clinton and policy coordinator on North Korea and as Assistant Secretary for Legislative Affairs under Secretary Warren Christopher.

So without objection, all the witness' prepared testimony will be made part of the record. And I will now recognize the

Honorable Deputy Secretary Sherman to make her testimony. And she will recognized for five minutes to summarize her testimony.

Let me just say this early on to Members afterwards because when we get to questions, I know the Deputy Secretary has a hard 1:00 p.m. stop. So I am going to be strict with the gavel when we get to the questions and answers to allow as many members as possible to ask questions.

Madam Deputy Secretary.

266 STATEMENT OF WENDY SHERMAN, DEPUTY SECRETARY OF STATE, U.S.

267 DEPARTMENT OF STATE

Ms. Sherman. Thank you very much, Chairman Meeks, Ranking Member McCaul, Subcommittee Chair Bera, and Ranking Mr. Chabot, distinguished members of the committee all. Thank you for inviting me to testify today about the Biden-Harris administration's Indo-Pacific Strategy.

Even as we work every day, in lockstep with our Allies and partners, to support Ukraine and the Ukrainian people and to impose severe, coordinated costs and consequences on Russian President Vladimir Putin and his enablers, we are also continuing to advance our foreign policy priorities in every region of the world through sustained diplomatic engagement.

The United States is a proud Indo-Pacific nation. Our future is entwined more closely with the Indo-Pacific than with any other part of the world. The Indo-Pacific, as the chairman said, is the fastest-growing region on Earth. And it will be decisive to addressing virtually every priority issue -- from promoting strong economic growth, to combating the climate crisis, to strengthening global health security, to upholding the rules-based international order.

Our vision -- a vision we share with our Allies and partners across the region -- is to ensure the Indo-Pacific remains free

and open, and becomes more interconnected, prosperous, secure, and resilient.

These priorities are all reflected in the five pillars of the Indo-Pacific Strategy released by the White House in February.

First, advancing a free and open Indo-Pacific. We have seen increasing challenges to democracy, the rule of law, and human rights in the Indo-Pacific -- all of which threaten stability, transparency, and prosperity. To combat these trends, we are working to build the capacity of Indo-Pacific nations and regional institutions to build strong civil societies, combat corruption, and promote good governance, strengthen democratic systems, and promote human rights and a free and independent press.

We are also working to uphold and strengthen the rules-based international order, so that nations in the Indo-Pacific and elsewhere can make decisions free from coercion; ideas and people can flow freely; problems are dealt with openly and according to a transparent set of rules; and the seas and skies are governed according to international law.

Second, building connections in the Indo-Pacific and beyond.

America's network of alliances and partnerships is one of our greatest strengths. That is why we are prioritizing strengthening our collaboration in a variety of forums -- including with ASEAN, at the Pacific Islands Forum, and through the Mekong-U.S. Partnership. We elevated the Quad, created

AUKUS, appointed a Special Presidential Envoy to lead our Compacts
of Free Association, COFA, negotiations with the Freely
Associated States, and reinvigorated trilateral diplomacy with
Japan and the Republic of Korea.

Third, driving Indo-Pacific prosperity. The Indo-Pacific is home to more than half the global population and 60 percent of the global economy -- which means the prosperity of the American people is linked to the Indo-Pacific. We are proud the United States was selected to host APEC in 2023. As President Biden announced last year, we are working to develop an Indo-Pacific Economic Framework with our Allies and partners. We look forward to continuing to consult with Congress as we refine our economic approach to the region.

Fourth, bolstering Indo-Pacific security. Threats to our security are evolving. Members have spoken to that this morning. And our security approach must evolve with them. We are strengthening and deepening our five treaty alliances and other vital partnerships across the Indo-Pacific and working to enhance our capabilities -- as well as those of our Allies and partners -- to keep the peace, defend our interests, deter aggression and other threats, including in the maritime domain.

Fifth, building regional resilience. America's security depends on working with our Allies and partners to address shared challenges -- like the COVID-19 pandemic and the climate crisis.

In partnership with COVAX, we have donated more than 180 million doses of safe and effective COVID-19 vaccines across the region.

We are investing in clean energy and climate resilience across the Indo-Pacific -- creating good jobs in the region and supporting jobs at home, as well.

We look forward to working with Congress to ensure our work advancing the Indo-Pacific Strategy continues to be appropriately and fully resourced. I know there are many issues that members already have addressed today, including the PRC. And I will be glad to address your questions and our approach in our questions and answers. Obviously, it is core to what we are doing here.

I want to end, though, where I began, which is with Ukraine. What happens in Ukraine will have a bearing on the Indo-Pacific. Indeed, it already is, as countries battered by two years of the COVID-19 pandemic now must contend with rising prices for grain, energy, and fertilizer, all as a direct result of Putin's war of choice. These trends underscore the urgency of our work to build shared prosperity and resilience, including by accelerating the transition to clean energy.

We are also deeply concerned about the growing strategic alignment between Russia and the People's Republic of China, as represented in their February 4 joint statement. We have expressed those concerns directly to the PRC, as have our Allies and partners.

362	The strong and coordinated response from the international
363	community including nations in Indo-Pacific to Russia's
364	flagrant violations of international law and principles like
365	sovereignty and territorial integrity sends a strong signal that
366	such actions will not go ignored.
367	Thank you again for having me. I have been briefed here

Thank you again for having me. I have been briefed here to ensure time for questions. I look forward to answering those questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.[The statement of Ms. Sherman for the state

372 Chairman Meeks. Thank you for your testimony, Madam 373 Secretary.

I am now going to recognize members for five minutes each.

And pursuant to House rules, all time yielded is for the purpose of questioning our witnesses. I'll recognize members by committee, seniority, alternating between Democrats and Republicans.

If you miss your turn, please let our staff know and we'll come back to you. If you seek recognition, you must unmute your microphone and address the chair verbally and identify yourself to let me know who is speaking. I'll start by recognizing myself for five minutes.

Madam Secretary, ahead of Russia's invasion of Ukraine,
Putin and Xi released a joint statement announcing closer
strategic cooperation. And while China has maintained publicly
that it did not know about the invasion, it has tried to distance
itself from Putin's war, it has refused to condemn Russia and
has engaged in disinformation that supports Russia's
justifications.

So my question, Madam Secretary, is, what is the administration's assessment on whether China actively supported Russia and its invasion of Ukraine? And the President's call with Xi Jinping, he told the PRC that there would be consequences if China is found to be materially supporting Russia's war

efforts. Could you tell us what such consequences would entail?

Ms. Sherman. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I think when we all saw the manifesto before the Beijing Olympics, we were quite concerned. We were already concerned, but that increased the concern about what this partnership was really about.

It's interesting that the PRC has said publicly that this is a partnership, not an alliance as part of Xi Jinping trying to distance himself somewhat from what President Putin has done with his premeditated, unjust, and unprovoked invasion of Ukraine.

President Biden has been very direct with President Xi, as has Jake Sullivan with Yang Jiechi, as has Secretary Blinken with Wang Yi, as have I been with the ambassador here in Washington in quite long meetings, that if China in any way, shape, or form provides material support to Putin in this premeditated unjust and unprovoked invasion, there will be consequences.

I think one only has to look at the range of sanctions, more to be announced today, against Putin, against the economy, against individuals who are enablers, against elites, against oligarchs. Export controls, designations, sanctions that are not only from the United States but in unprecedented fashion, coordinated with our allies and partners, not just in Europe but throughout the world, gives President Xi, I think, a pretty good understanding

of what might come his way should he, in fact, support Putin in any material fashion. This is a very serious matter that we take quite seriously.

Chairman Meeks. Thank you. And I concur. One of the things that the administration should be absolutely praised upon is unity between not only as you said our European allies but our allies all over the world.

But a key component of our Indo-Pacific strategy in South Asia hinges on developing a more purposeful relationship with India. There are clearly obstacles to overcome and questions on both sides that must be adequately addressed for the promise of this partnership to be fulfilled.

But the potential of consequential U.S.-India relationship to me is worth the effort, although I have concerns when I looked at what took place in the abstention that India made in the U.N. So strategy says India is an engine for regional growth and development. And aside from its role in the Quad, how does the administration view India's role within and outside of South Asia, and how are you working through some of the immediate term obstacles like one that I just mentioned?

Ms. Sherman. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I quite agree with you that our having a strong relationship with India is critical to our goals and objectives in the Indo-Pacific for our own prosperity, security, and to address all of the challenges

in front of us, including local health and the climate crisis.

India by 2030 is going to be the largest everything -- the largest democracy in the world, the largest middle class, the largest wealthy class, the largest poor, the most elderly, the most young people, the largest everything. And they are a democracy, not perfect but neither are we, guite frankly.

Our relationship is complex. I think it's been quite important as many of you have mentioned that India now engages with us, Australia, and Japan, in the Quad, to try to move forward a set of objectives, particularly around things like global health and climate and ensuring prosperity for the region and economic prosperity. These things are quite important and we have an important defense relationship with India.

India has been in a tough place, and I agree with you. I would prefer them to have voted yes on the resolution at the U.N., and we have said as much to them quite directly. Secretary Blinken talks to External Affairs Secretary Jaishankar on quite a regular basis. I talk with my counterpart, Shringla, who is about to be replaced with a terrific diplomat who will succeed him.

So we've been very direct about our concerns. But India has a history of a relationship with Russia. Most of its defense equipment originally was from Russia. They rely on Russia for fertilizer which is critical to their agricultural development.

That's not to say we're happy with the choice they've made.

And we have pointed out to them that given the sanctions, they're

not going to be able to get Russian equipment. They're not going

to get to be able to repair their equipment or their weapons.

And indeed, we have built a very strong defense relationship with Russia, very important to our defense community and our defense sales, our joint cooperation with India. So they are a strategic partner for us and quite critical that we continue to develop this relationship. And they are a critical member of the Quad.

Chairman Meeks. Thank you. My time has expired. Now I'll recognize Mr. McCaul for five minutes.

Mr. McCaul. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And Madam Chair, thanks so much for taking the time.

First of all, this committee marked up yesterday a war crimes bill to hold Putin accountable, defining it for what it is. I want to thank the chairman for working with me. And we'll be on the floor today, and it will pass to send a message to Putin and the world that these are horrific war crimes.

And after Bucha, my God, the images that came out of there, horrific. And I'm quoting President Zelensky after he gave his tour of Bucha. And he says, quote, if we had already got what we needed, all these planes, tanks, artillery, anti-missile, anti-ship weapons, we could've saved thousands of people. I do

not blame you. I blame only the Russian military. But you could have helped, Zelensky said in his speech.

I agree with him. I think we waited too long to get these weapons in. I know you can't discuss the S-300 in this open environment and the anti-aircraft, anti-missile capability and systems. But I hope we are making progress because that is what they really need right now.

Shifting to Taiwan, I had breakfast with the Taiwanese ambassador this morning. And just like Ukraine, we're worried that Chairman Xi, after the chairman of this committee mentioned, this unholy alliance at the Beijing Olympics standing hand in hand together denouncing aggression from the West.

The same issue arises. Is Taiwan able to defend herself?

I think the answer is no right now, and I am worried about that.

I don't want to make the same mistake of waiting till after invasion because that's going to be too late.

And so I would like to just very quickly go through all the foreign military sales that the chairman and I have signed off on and the dates of notification going back to July of 2019 all the way to August of 2021. This includes Stinger missiles, aircraft. It includes torpedoes, Patriot systems, these high mobility artillery rocket systems, these Standoff Land Attack Missile-Expanded Response missiles, the harpoons which are very effective against anti-ship, field information communication

systems, and the self-propelled howitzer system.

Her biggest complaint to us is that while we have notified and signed off on these systems, they have yet to be delivered to Taiwan. Can you provide some clarity to this and what is the cause of the backlog? Because if Chairman Xi is on the same timetable here, I'm concerned about what could happen.

Ms. Sherman. Thank you very much. First of all, kudos to the committee, to you and the chairman on your not just acknowledgment but condemnation of the war crimes that have been committed.

Secondly, I want to share with this committee that the White House has just announced the following sanctions in addition to everything else we've done: full blocking sanctions on Sberbank, Russia's largest financial institution, and Alfa-Bank, Russia's largest private bank, prohibition of new investment in the Russian Federation, full blocking sanctions on critical major Russian state owned enterprises, full blocking sanctions on Putin's adult children, Lavrov's wife and daughter, and members of Russia's security council and many more.

So we have taken very decisive and very tough action today as you all did yesterday in your mark up. The acts in Bucha are so horrifying. And I think we all appreciate that there is probably more horror to come. So thank you very much for what you did in the committee.

And I also want to add, Congressman McCaul, that between the United States and allies and partners, for every Russian tank in Ukraine, there are or soon will be in Ukraine more than ten anti-tank systems for every Russian tank. So we have heard what President Zelensky has called for. And we are working day and night to offer whatever we possibly can along with our partners and allies. And if I were him, I would want everything and I would want it yesterday. So I certainly understand.

On Taiwan, terribly important as you point out. The United States sold more than 30 billion dollars' worth of arms to Taiwan since 2009. And thank you for outlining the authority of this committee.

We have more than 400 foreign military sale cases in implementation in Taiwan. We are looking at the entire defense trade enterprise to see where efficiencies can be made and how delivery timelines of defense articles can be improved. We are outlining defense trade priorities to Taiwan and to industry to increase transparency and predictability, expediting third party transfers, reviewing possibilities for arm sale exports from other countries, pushing for the conclusion of defense agreements related to defense trade, and looking at opportunities to improve Taiwan's indigenous industrial defense capability.

So since 2017, the U.S. has authorized with your actions over 18 billion dollars in foreign military sales for Taiwan.

In addition, direct commercial sales authorizations for end use by the Taiwan authority during this period has totaled 2.3 billion dollars.

So I certainly understand that President Tsai wants to see everything delivered as quickly as possible. And we are doing that. We are also urging Taiwan to focus on capabilities that would deter the PRC from taking Taiwan by force. This means a focus on capabilities that are cost efficient, mobile, lethal, resilient, and capable of operating and surviving in a contested environment.

Mr. McCaul. Just these asymmetrical weapons are vitally important. This is a backlog, and it's real. I would urge you to get those out.

In closing, RIMPAC, she also requested the Rim of Pacific Exercises. I would hope the administration would maybe consider Taiwan being a part of that.

Chairman Meeks. The gentleman's time has expired. And at that point, I allowed myself to go a little over, allowed Mr. McCaul go a little bit over. But I'm not going to allow anyone else to go a little bit over.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Chairman Meeks. And so make sure I'd ask my members and the witness to be mindful of the time. I now recognized Representative Ami Bera of California who's the chair of the

subcommittee of the Asian Pacific for five minutes.

Mr. Bera. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'll watch the clock.

I'm going to focus on other parts of the Indo-Pacific. But by

no means is that to express that I don't wake up every morning

with sadness about the tragedy that we're seeing take place in

Ukraine and with concern of the lessons that China and others

may take out of this or the concerns of the security of the people

of Taiwan.

But a lot happening in the region. And Madam Deputy

Secretary, we've had a chance to talk about what's unfolding in

Myanmar. And I try to look for a path forward and how we can

get to a cease fire. And I just don't see a clear direction.

If you could give us an update on what you're seeing there, it seems like the junta is really digging in as well as the resistance. And I've talked to ambassadors in the region and others and appreciate ASEAN's leadership here. But what would you like to see out of Congress and what can we do working with our ASEAN colleagues?

Ms. Sherman. [Audio malfunction] -- horrifying tragedy.

Indeed, Secretary Blinken recently looking back all the way to

2017 named what has happened to the Rohingya in Burma as genocide.

So we did that because we believe that accountability of the

past is critical for accountability for the present. And shining

a light on the crimes of Burma's military in the past also speaks

to what they're doing in the present.

The work with ASEAN and the travels that you all have made to countries in Southeast Asia who were part of ASEAN to urge them to follow through on the five-point consensus in a way that is real and inclusive. There have been forays to the capitol, but often to meet with junta leadership, not to meet with democratic opposition.

And so I would urge you to continue to press countries in ASEAN to move forward in a very pressing kind of way. Cambodia is the current chair. They have mixed ambitions here, and they need to be encouraged to say the least by other members of ASEAN to take the action that is necessary.

Both myself and Counselor Derek Chollet have tried to put a special focus on this. Derek has traveled maybe three times to the region. I have gone twice myself because we want to make sure that this does not last forever and that the world does not forget what is happening here.

Mr. Bera. Let me touch on another subject that doesn't get as much coverage but is no less important. You touched on it in your open, the second island chain, the Pacific Islands, and the importance of getting COFA completed. I'm glad to hear there will be a special envoy focused on this.

If you can give us an update, and then obviously we're watching the Solomon Islands very closely. And again, the South

China Sea is much more complicated today than maybe had we resolved some of this back in 2014. But we don't want to see that happen in the Pacific Ocean. If you could give us update on COFA.

Ms. Sherman. Right. The Pacific Islands are incredibly important. The Secretary even after the start of Putin's premeditated, unjust, and unprovoked invasion of Ukraine, went to Australia and to Fiji and went to Fiji for a meeting of Pacific Island nations.

All of these islands are under tremendous stress, not only economically and in terms of COVID, but they are barely above sea level. And so when we look at the climate crisis, these islands are quite, quite at risk.

We were very glad to just name as a Special Presidential Envoy a very seasoned foreign service officer, Ambassador Joe Yun, to be the Special Presidential Envoy for the COFA negotiations, and he will go forward. It's not that the folks who were doing this before weren't capable. They were. But we felt that we needed to raise the level of attention and our concern about this. In addition, we have an Our Ocean Conference coming up just in a few days to focus, co-hosted by the United States in Palau to bring attention to these global issues.

Mindful I have five seconds left. Let me say on the Solomon Islands that we are very concerned about the relationship with the PRC. We will be taking some action shortly to remind the

660 Solomon Islands how important --

Chairman Meeks. The gentleman's time has expired. And I
will recognize Representative Chris Smith of New Jersey who is
the ranking member on the subcommittee of Africa, Global Health,
and Global Human Rights for five minutes.

Mr. Smith. Thank you very much. Deputy Secretary Sherman, thank you for testifying and for your work at the State Department.

Let me just ask you if I could. I just left a major conference of the OSCE. I'm the Special Representative for Human Trafficking. And so I gave speech. That's why I was late.

But the UNHCR representative made a very powerful statement about the fact that we're not doing enough. He says it's not big enough and it's not effective enough to help the many, maybe millions, but certainly tens of thousands of unaccompanied minors and women who are vulnerable to the traffickers. And it's getting worse by the day.

And I hoping you can take back the importance of scaling up the efforts among governments and NGOs because it is a crisis with few precedents. And we're going to find out later all those women and children who are trafficked. People are holding up signs, this way if you want to get to a hotel. Next thing you know, they disappear.

So please scale that up. That was the message from the UNHCR. And my message was similar, but he had some very

actionable information about that.

Secondly, if I could, on March 8, I chaired a hearing of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission on war crimes against Putin to bring an action against him. And David Crane, as you know, the special prosecutor for Sierra Leone, he talked about four options that are available to us.

One is the ICC, but he notes that using this takes the United States pretty much out of the picture because we are not signatories to that. We signed it originally but not ratified it.

But he had a second possibility that he stressed very, very hard and that is that the U.N. General Assembly has the authority where there's no veto power by the Security Council, by Russia and China or China. And he said these hybrid tribunals like he headed up, they put Charles Taylor behind bars for 50 years, could also be done. And the key is to indict Putin now, right now.

So people around him will know that they too could still be indicted. But every time we have done tribunals, the indictments come long after the hostilities have largely ceased. So it is accountability, but it has no chilling effect on the ongoing commission of those crimes.

And finally, if you could, I am concerned by reports that our embassy in Guatemala, the apparent intervention and the selection of the country's Prosecutor General and the continued

heavy had by Ambassador, now Assistant Secretary Todd Robinson in violation of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

The current Prosecutor General Consuelo Porras has been very cooperative with regards to our anti-narcotics efforts. Last year, she extradited 63 Guatemalans to the U.S., including 54 drug dealers. DEA, Drug Enforcement Agency, has praised her for that.

And yet the apparent reason for the animosity against the current Prosecutor General is that she fired a political ally of Todd Robinson, Juan Francisco Sandoval. Ms. Porras has twice offered through official channels to provide the State Department with evidence as to why she fired him, yet the State Department is reportedly refused to receive it.

Why has that been the case, and will you accept it now?

And hopefully, even if it's in a confidential way, share that information with us about that.

Ms. Sherman. Thank you very much, Congressman. And thank you for your many years of advocacy on human rights. You have long been a leader in this arena and very grateful for it.

On the human trafficking, I could not agree with you more. It is a terrible, terrible problem and a growing one. We actually had a meeting on this yesterday to see what else we can do.

731 Uzra Zeye, the Under Secretary for this arena is very much

- focused on it as Julieta Noyes, our new Assistant Secretary for PRM. So please note that we completely join you in this concern and are upping our game and all of our partners and allies in doing so as well.
- In terms of war crimes, yes, the ICC is one vehicle.

 Although we are not a signatory, we can provide information.

 But there are other venues as you point out. The U.N. General

 Assembly is certainly one, but there are other accountability

 mechanisms, including the Human Rights Council. So there are

 many ways that we can increase accountability.

- And I think the fundamental thing which Secretary Blinken has said again and again is we will hold Putin and his enablers accountable for these actions. We all believe that Bucha is just the beginning of what we are going to see. And even before Bucha, this administration had said that war crimes had been committed in Ukraine. So I know this will be a high priority.
- On the issue regarding Guatemala, I don't know the details, Congressman. But we'll get back to you on it.
- Chairman Meeks. The gentleman's time has expired. And I'll recognize Representative Andy Levin of Michigan who's the vice chair of the subcommittee on Asia, Pacific, and Central Asia Non-Proliferation for five minutes. And I'll ask Mr. Malinowski to chair for a few minutes till I can return.
- 755 Mr. Levin. Thanks so much, Mr. Chairman, for holding this

important hearing today. It's great to see the committee

continuing to focus on Indo-Pacific as a critical region for U.S.

interests. Deputy Secretary Sherman, thank you so much for being

here today.

I want to focus on the Biden administration's goals for the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework and which countries the administration intends to include to meet the goals involved for us. My understanding of the IPEF is that we would like to bring countries together to counter China's influence in the region, rebuild more robust and reliable supply chains, and promote universal values such as labor rights and environmental protections.

Yet countries that might be aligned with the U.S. human rights like Australia and New Zealand previously express consternation about past trade agreements like TPP being framed as countering China and countries that might be more willing to embrace a counter China posture like Vietnam, Malaysia, Indonesia, or India would seem to be improbable partners for an agreement based on strong human rights and climate provisions according to the State Department's annual human rights reports for those countries.

So how does the administration plan to reconcile these competing interests and how you prioritize adherence to strong human rights standards, particularly labor rights, and climate

protections, when considering participants in the IPEF?

Thank you very much, Congressman. There are Ms. Sherman. four pillars to the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework: fair and resilient trade, including labor, environmental, and digital provisions; resilient supply chains; infrastructure, clean energy, and decarbonization; and tax and anti-corruption. have no made final decisions on membership. The framework will be open and inclusive to those partners that share our ambitions and commitments to high standards.

So I think, Congressman, the bottom line here is we are interested in things that will advantage and support American workers in everything that we do and the values of the United States of America. And so the concerns that you have raised are certainly ones that are on our minds as we proceed to fill out this Indo-Pacific Economic Framework.

Mr. Levin. All right. Well, thanks. So let's drill down a little on the human rights standards and how they will work in practice in the framework.

I feel too often we think of human rights protections as in competition or conflict with our security or economic interests when in reality strong human rights protections can be an essential enabling factor for sustainable security and equitable economic growth, the kind of American values you were talking about. And strong labor protections for workers in each country

can ensure that all workers within the framework won't be exploited for cheaper wages or harsher working environments, thus preventing a race to the bottom in helping economic security grow for everyone.

So how will the administration's framework build in strong rights protections at the foundation of the agreement? And what will happen if participating countries are found to be in violation of those standards, particularly standards for workers?

Ms. Sherman. Thank you very much, Congressman. All of the details of how we are going to fill out the IPEF are not fully resolved yet. But I can assure you that ensuring that this is high standard agreements, understandings, projects, work together will be at the foundation of everything that we do.

We are about making sure that there is a free and open and interconnected Indo-Pacific with high standards that ensure the prosperity, security, and stability of the United States of America and our interests in them. And certainly, workers' rights, labor rights, human rights are at the core of that. President Biden said at the beginning administration that human rights would be at the center of our foreign policy, and indeed they are.

Mr. Levin. All right. Well, so in the little bit of time I have left, I just want to -- I assume that the framework is going to be non-binding. So I think we really have to figure

out ways to have mechanisms to enforce labor standards. I'd
certainly encourage us to look to what we did with USMCA as kind
of a floor in this regard so that we can really make sure that
we are raising the votes for all people and certainly the workers
of this country.

Thanks. Mr. Chairman, I think my time has expired, so I yield back.

Mr. Malinowski.[Presiding.] Thank you. I will now recognize Representative Chabot of Ohio, ranking member of our Asia-Pacific subcommittee. Thank you.

Mr. Chabot. Thank you very much, and thanks for being here today. As you may know, I'm one of the co-chairs of the Congressional Taiwan Caucus and one of the founders of that caucus about 20 years ago. And as we all know, Taiwan faces a very serious threat from the Chinese Communist Party and has for some time now.

And as the ranking member already talked about, there are currently substantial delays in the delivery of key weapons systems to Taiwan, many of which were approved by Congress and which the United States encouraged Taiwan to buy in the first place. And I don't want to go through all that again. But I know in communicating in various ways with the Taiwanese officials that it is very frustrating, and we need to do something about that.

It's very serious. Congress and the administration have to work together on that. We've seen in Ukraine how critical it is that we get the weapons to who has threatened Ukraine — in the case of Russia and Taiwan, in the case of the PRC — ahead of time, way ahead of time. Hopefully, that will deter the military action from ever happening, just as nuclear weapons have prevented nuclear wars from happening over time.

You need to have these things ahead of time. And I'm not promoting nuclear weapons. But we've got them and the Russians have got them, the Chinese, and others. But we need to make sure that we stop whatever the log jam and whatever the delays have been. We've got to get the weaponry to Taiwan. But I'm not going to ask you to respond to that. Let me get to something else.

One of the many reasons that the world has condemned Russia's invasion of the Ukraine and almost universally is because it's a clear violation of a state's sovereignty, in violation of the U.N. charter. Now it might be more difficult potentially to build a similar coalition around Taiwan if China would invade because the Chinese Communist Party and the PRC has spent years promoting the lie that Taiwan is part of the PRC which it is absolutely not part of China nor has it ever been.

What actions is the administration taking now to build a coalition in support of Taiwan's freedom?

Ms. Sherman. Thank you very much, Congressman. For over

four decades, for over 40 years, the U.S. One China policy has
been guided by the Taiwan Relations Act, the Three Joint
Communiques, and the Six Assurances. President Biden himself
voted for the Taiwan Relations Act.

And I mention it because it has some critical principles to the points you are making. The United States will continue to assist Taiwan in maintaining a sufficient self-defense capability. And I take your opening points about making sure that we get weapons to them to be able to do that.

The United States would regard any effort to determine the future of Taiwan both other than peaceful means a threat to the peace and security of the Western Pacific and of grave concern to the United States and that the United States will maintain the capacity to resist any resort to force or other forms of coercions that would jeopardize the security or the social or economic system of the people on Taiwan.

That's what the Taiwan Relations Act is all about. Our commitment as you know is rock solid and it is bipartisan. We encourage all U.N. member states to join us in supporting Taiwan's robust and meaningful participation throughout the U.N. system and in the international community.

Taiwan's exclusion undermines the important work of the United Nations and specialized agencies and related organizations. When, in fact, countries like Lithuania and

- 900 Australia are coerced to not recognize Taiwan, not to engage with 901 that economy, with that region, jurisdiction, they, in fact, are 902 really trying to stand with those countries --(Simultaneous speaking.) 903 904 Mr. Chabot. Let me cut you off there for a second. 905 almost out of time. I wanted to get in one more --906 Ms. Sherman. Yeah. 907 Mr. Chabot. -- question here. When the U.S. -- both 908 candidates for both parties were opposed to TPP, the 909 administration is now working on the Indo-Pacific Economic 910 Framework. Taiwan is such a strong ally of ours and an important 911 country, and I don't say that by accident, in the region, 912 absolutely should be part of that framework. 913 Will Taiwan be invited to join the Biden administration's 914 Indo-Pacific Economic Framework? 915 (Simultaneous speaking.) 916 Mr. Chabot. If not, why not? 917 Ms. Sherman. As I said, we just haven't made final decisions 918 on membership, and the framework will be open and inclusive to 919 those partners that share our ambitions and commitment to high
- 921 Mr. Chabot. You absolutely should invite Taiwan.
- 922 Ms. Sherman. I hear you. I'll take that back.
- 923 Mr. Chabot. Thank you.

standards.

920

924 Ms. Sherman. Thank you.

- 925 Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] Thank you. The chair now 926 recognizes Representative Susan Wild of Pennsylvania for five 927 minutes.
- 928 Ms. Wild. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Deputy 929 Secretary Sherman, good morning.

In 2021, the International Trade Union Confederation, the ITUC, once again named the Philippines as one of the ten worst countries in the world for working people. According to the ITUC report, workers and their representatives in the Philippines remained particularly vulnerable to violent attacks, intimidation, and arbitrary arrests. Twenty-eight union representatives were illegally arrested and detained in March and December, and seven union leaders were killed between March 2020 and April 2021.

And to be clear, these attacks are sanctioned by President Duterte's government which both targets the labor movement directly and allows attacks against labor organizers to occur with impunity. Given the Biden administration's very strong support for the labor movement here at home, does the administration agree that the systemic attacks on the Philippines labor movement are completely unacceptable?

Ms. Sherman. Thank you very much, Congresswoman.

Counselor Derek Chollet was just in the Philippines and covered

a wide range of issues, including our concerns about such actions.

And that will always be something of concern to us, absolutely.

Ms. Wild. Well, thank you. My next question was going to be whether the administration had taken any explicit steps to raise these concerns at the highest levels of the Philippines government. I assume from that answer that your answer would be yes?

Ms. Sherman. Yes.

Ms. Wild. And what was the response, if you know, of the Philippines government to raise these concerns?

Ms. Sherman. I think as you probably well know,

Congresswoman, this is an ongoing conversation with the

Philippines which is about to see an election and not sure how

it will go. But I think some of these challenges are likely to

continue no matter how it goes.

And look, Philippines is a very important treaty ally of the United States. And we need to build a strong relationship given what they do, their strategic position in the world. They are part of the Indo-Pacific, the basing and their key importance to us in terms of our defense.

And so this is a complex relationship and one that we have to work at very hard. And it's why Secretary Blinken asked Counselor Chollet to make sure that we actually had sent a 7th Fleet principle there. And I suspect before many months are over

972 I will be going there myself.

Ms. Wild. Well, I appreciate that. I will say that this is an ongoing source of concern for me. I recognize the great importance that the Philippines has to us in all of the areas that you just described. But I also think that if we are going to be a leader in human rights, we cannot ignore human rights violations occurring in our Allied countries around the world.

I would like to propose that the administration consider hosting an international summit on labor rights that would feature representatives of the labor movement from the Philippines and other countries around the world where labor organizations are most at risk in order to highlight the U.S. commitment to the right to organize. And I don't expect you to respond to that on the spot until you're willing to do so. But I would respectfully request a written response to that proposal.

Ms. Sherman. Thank you for that idea, Congresswoman. We will give you a response. And I should also mention that we all support Maria Ressa, a really extraordinary journalist who has not only gotten a Nobel Peace Prize but has met with Secretary Blinken and continues to be a tremendous person to bring transparency to the system in the Philippines.

Ms. Wild. And I commend the administration on that. I just don't ever want us to lose sight of the fact that there are still grave human rights violations occurring. And I maintain that

the best way for us to be a leader on human rights issues is to demand that our allies exhibit a recognition of human rights and that they abstain from infringing -- infringing is a mild word -- systemic attacks on labor and journalists and so forth.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. Thank you very much, Secretary Sherman.

Chairman Meeks. The gentlelady yields back. And now I recognize Representative Joe Wilson of South Carolina who's the ranking member of the subcommittee on the Middle East, North Africa, and Global Counterterrorism for five minutes.

Mr. Wilson. Thank you very much, Chairman Greg Meeks, for your bipartisanship. And this is truly a time we all need to be working together. And Madam Secretary, thank you for your service.

I'm so grateful that we now have the Indo-Pacific, not just the Pacific. It was a recognition by President Donald Trump of the significance of India, the world's largest democracy. And today, I had the extraordinary opportunity to host a breakfast delegation of the new transition government of South Korea, Dr. Jin Park and Tae-yong Cho.

How fortunate we are. What an example of the difference between democracy in South Korea and the failure of Communist, Socialist, Totalitarianism of North Korea. And I'm the only member of Congress and I want to give credit to former Congressman

1020 Curt Weldon. He had me on a delegation. I've been to Pyongyang
1021 and Seoul. Gosh, what a contrast. And working with them, I'm
1022 very happy for you.

Now at the same time, it's so inspiring to see the people of Ukraine defending themselves and their families against the mass murdering Putin regime. And then Volodymyr Zelensky, what an incredibly courageous person and the Winston Churchill of our time who deserves a bust, I believe, in the Capitol just like Winston Churchill has a bust in the U.S. Capitol.

And the allies are working together. But a problem has been that our allies want to be back-filled for whatever Soviet equipment that they have. And we have extraordinary allies -- Bulgaria, Slovakia, and Slovenia -- that want to provide. But of course, they have to have a back-fill. And what is the effort made to facilitate back-fill for their protection?

Ms. Sherman. So thank you very much, Congressman. And I met with that transition team as well. And I think that President-elect Yoon of South Korea will be a terrific partner, an ally of the United States. And I too have been to Pyongyang and to Seoul.

And so I understand exactly the point that you are making about the difference. And let's remember, at one point, the Republic of Korea had authoritarian leadership. And they, instead built a democracy that is just getting stronger and

1044 stronger every year.

In terms of back-filling, we are talking with our partners and allies of each of these requests and seeing what is possible.

We understand that countries want to support Ukraine but don't want to leave themselves vulnerable. So we are taking this on a case-by-case basis and seeing what is doable.

Mr. Wilson. Well, thank you, and please facilitate that. It's so mutually beneficial for the people of Ukraine and the world. And additionally, as you indicated that South Korea went from an authoritarian regime to the democracy that it is today, I actually have faith in Russia and the Russian people.

And that's why I've introduced bipartisan legislation that would provide for immediate refugee status for any person in the Russian military or diplomatic corps or Russian Duma that would defect that they would be given immediate refugee status to the United States. And if they brought over military equipment and delivered it to Ukraine, they could get up to 100,000 dollars. And so we should not give up on the people of Russia.

But sadly -- and I can't believe it, and I appreciate Chairman Meeks bringing this up. India, the world's largest democracy, should be standing firm with the other democracies. We're in a conflict that has been identified by President Biden of totalitarianism against democracies.

So either we stand for democracy's rule of law, or we'll

be facing around the world destabilization by governments' rule of gun. And so how can we make an effort to replace the oil that India depends on and the military equipment that they've depended on from Putin? This is just so illogical for the extraordinary country of India, the wonderful people of India to be overlooking, abstaining. That's incredible. That's such an insult to the people of India.

Ms. Sherman. Thank you, Congressman Wilson. I addressed this a little bit earlier to say that our relationship with India as you point out, the world's largest democracy is critical in so many areas. We've had very direct conversations with them about how we can address their very legitimate needs for their country.

And I think that there's progress being made to see what we can do to be supportive to them while at the same time urging them to be more forthright regarding what's happening in Ukraine.

I did note that they made comments, not surprising, about the horrors that have taken place in Bucha.

And so I think we just have to keep working at this relationship and understanding the complexity of it and helping to support India to really understand what is in their national security interest.

Mr. Wilson. With three million Indian Americans, the most successful immigrant group in the United States --

1092 (Simultaneous speaking.)

1093 Chairman Meeks. The gentleman's time has expired. I now 1094 recognize Representative Dina Titus of Nevada for five minutes.

Ms. Titus. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Madam Secretary, thank you for being here. I often meet with ambassadors from some of these other countries. And they tell me when they're working to develop infrastructure projects or defense investments that they often turn to China instead of the United States. We saw this with the recent agreement with the Solomon Islands in China.

They always say, well, if we had an alternative with the U.S., we would do that. Could you talk a little bit about maybe the Development Finance Corporation and the Millennium Challenge and what maybe Congress can do to make those programs more flexible and more attractive to some of these places as an alternative to China?

Ms. Sherman. Thank you, Congresswoman. It's a really good and important question about why countries turn to the PRC when we really would like them to turn to us. And I want to say that although I expect that the Solomon Islands has been very straightforward that it's going to sign this agreement, they have not done so yet.

And we certainly want the Solomon Islands to know their importance to us. And we have done investment in the Solomon

1116 Islands. So we hope this is an ongoing conversation.

On the DFC, I think we've done some very important things.

We were just talking about India, half a billion dollars for solar farms project, other investments in India, terrific DFC investments in other places in the world. MCC just got a compact signed in Nepal, even after a very aggressive effort by the PRC to stop the Nepalese from signing that MCC compact. So these vehicles are terribly important.

The DFC has a lot of steps that countries have to step through. And I think we all should look at whether in fact all of the steps in each of these arenas are what they ought to be to make sure we are agile and flexible. It is why we've introduced the B3W effort which is bringing private investment to the area of high standard, climate-aligned, transparently financed infrastructure to Indo-Pacific economics, mobilizing private capital, why the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework is important to, again, raise up understandings and work together with countries.

I think too that countries are finding that the PRC comes with some strings that end up not being in their interest where they take out a loan, default on it, and then the PRC seizes the assets. And it turns out to be a liability for a country, not an asset. That certainly has been experienced in Africa where the PRC brought in its own people, didn't transfer technology,

1140 didn't transfer capabilities.

And so African countries ended up with large debt without the infrastructure they needed or infrastructure that was regulated in a way that it didn't crumble five years later. So we've got work to do to become more agile, to become more flexible, to be able to move faster in the ways that you suggest. But we do have tools. We do have vehicles. And we have diplomats all over the world in all of our missions working very hard.

And the last point I'll make which I make in the Senate more than I make here which is please, please, please get our ambassadors confirmed. Because when we have a Senate-confirmed ambassador, they are seen differently by countries. They are more aggressive. They advance our interests. They push the envelope.

We need all of our ambassadors in place. And so urge your Senate colleagues to get the job done. Thank you.

Ms. Titus. Well, thank you. If as you look at these different programs and you see that they need some flexibility or some changes in all these steps and red tape that are required, please come to us if there's something that Congress can do that you can't do internally. Maybe we can work together to be sure that they are used to their maximum potential and that countries don't have to choose China as an alternative.

1163 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I'll yield back. And I look

forward to working on this with the Department.

1165 Chairman Meeks. The gentlelady yields back. I'll

1166 recognize Representative Darrell Issa of California for five

1167 minutes.

Mr. Issa. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And Secretary, a couple of quick observations and a number of questions. As you know, as the JCPOA as we exited it, it did not change the fact that Iran was bound by the JCPOA and continued with our European partners.

So if that's the case, then the fact that just a few months or just about the time President Biden was being sworn in when Iran announced that it had achieved 20 percent refinement or continued on past the 3.67 that it contractually bound to. They, by definition, are not trustworthy to keep the JCPOA which they were bound by with our European partners. Clearly, they continued terrorist attacks. They continue even till today with the recent attacks, both in Iraq and of course the attacks on Saudi Arabia using their proxies.

Having said that that's who we're dealing with, can you assure us as a representative of the State Department that you will, one, become transparent as to the details of the agreement?

Because at this time based on both classified and open briefings, as far as I can tell, the deal will be identical to the original deal, recognizing that that's Iran's stated position and that

appears to be where we're negotiating is from a position of
weakness where we cannot get any improvements or further
assurances.

But can you commit that you will not lift sanctions on the Uranium Revolutionary Guard Corps? Can you commit that you'll work with Secretary Blinken and the President not to waive weapon sales from Russia to Iran? Can you commit to advising Secretary Blinken and the President not to waive oil sales transferred between Russia and Iran?

Could you commit as part of this process that you would not allow transfers of nuclear materials between Russia and Iran as part of this deal? And could you commit that you would at least use your efforts not to have reactor plans, schematics, or blueprints moved between Iran and Russia? Lastly, could you commit that the JCPOA, if it's reentered, would not allow for a continued activity such as the enrichment of uranium which now exceeds 20 percent?

I know I gave you a lot. But I would prefer to give you all of them and then you can just say yes to all of them that you would commit to.

Ms. Sherman. Thank you, Congressman.

Mr. Issa. And Chairman, I'm glad that was funny for you because, on one hand, I know the answer is probably no. But I do sincerely believe that these are the areas that Congress should

insist that some aspect of this, particularly relative to Russia as a partner, be included since we are currently effectively defending a country at war which means we effectively are involved in a war with an actor that our own President has called a war criminal.

Ms. Sherman. Congressman, you raise very serious concerns, and I take them very seriously. And I will say this about the JCPOA. President Biden said that his interest is to return to compliance for compliance if Iran would be compliant with the JCPOA.

And those negotiations are not over. And when I was a negotiator for the original JCPOA leading a phenomenal team and working with then Secretary Kerry and with my European colleagues and the PRC and Russia at the time, it was very critical for people to understand that nothing is agreed until everything is agreed, that it's about are you 20 percent there or 90 percent there. It's binary. You either get there or you don't.

And so I don't think we know the outcome yet of whether in fact we will get a return to compliance for compliance. I absolutely believe that we should be transparent with Congress. And I know that Rob Malley who now is the lead negotiator with the team and Bret McGurk from the White House. I've done briefings up on the Hill, and I'm sure they will do many more and share those details as this comes together.

1236	And I want to make one I agree that the situation with
1237	Russia is now very complicated. I would note that at the time
1238	we were negotiating the original JCPOA, Russia took Crimea. And
1239	so it was a very bizarre situation where we were negotiating with
1240	the Russians at the same time they were doing things that were
1241	horrible and certainly not as unspeakable as what they are doing
1242	now.

So yes, it's complicated. But we will be transparent with you. We will take the concerns you've raised with great seriousness.

1246 Chairman Meeks. The gentleman's time --

1247 (Simultaneous speaking.)

1251

1252

1253

1254

1255

1256

1257

1258

1259

1248 Mr. Issa. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

1249 Chairman Meeks. I now recognize Representative Dean
1250 Phillips of Minnesota for five minutes.

Mr. Phillips. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Greetings, Madam Secretary. I want to associate myself with the remarks of my colleague, Mr. Issa, relative to the JCPOA. None of us what to see a nuclear armed Iran for obvious reasons. I think that's a comprehensive statement for Congress and I know for the administration.

But we already have a nuclear armed tyrant in the

Indo-Pacific and that's North Korea, of course. What is our

strategy relative to containment? They just tested their first

1260 ICBM since 2017. Saber-rattling continues, and I'd like to hear

1261 from you about what our strategy for containment is vis-a-vis

1262 North Korea but a little bit more broader proliferation.

Ms. Sherman. Thank you, Congressman. There's no question we share your deep concern about the DPRK. There have been 13 launches. The last one as you noted, all believe was an intercontinental missile, ballistic missile.

We expect that there are likely to be more. And as one of your colleagues mentioned earlier, the transition team for President-elect Yoon of South Korea is here. And this is very much been part of their discussions with everyone with whom they have met which is to ensure that we take some strong action to let the north know that they can't just keep doing this without any consequences, that we take actions that shows we have a credible deterrence against any attack by North Korea.

At the same time, we, the South Koreans and the Japanese, all believe that we should make it clear we also have an open channel for dialogue without preconditions to end the specter of what the North Koreans are doing. So it's practical. It's calibrated.

We are moving on all of those vectors simultaneously and critically in a trilateral fashion with Japan and the Republic of Korea because strength comes from partnerships and alliances.

It's true where Ukraine is concerned. It's true where the DPRK

1284 is concerned.

Mr. Phillips. And in your estimation, these strong actions that might still be in the toolkit, are any of them actionable or achievable without Chinese support?

Ms. Sherman. I think they are. But I also believe that the PRC believes above all else that stability is critical. And so we have said to them and will continue to press on them and have our allies and partners press on them, that this is not taking action that will lead to a stable and prosperous Indo-Pacific.

This is not good for the PRC anymore than it's good for all the rest of us. And having a nuclear armed North Korea is not in China's self interest. So I can't tell you, Congressman Phillips, that we have an answer today because it's evident that the North Koreans right now are intent on spending what little money they have while their people starve, probably facing another famine, probably having a horrendous COVID outbreak that none of us really know about because they've kept it so quiet.

So I can't tell you today we have solved this problem or will tomorrow. But we're working at it quite hard. Ambassador Sung Kim is here for consultations. We'll be consulting with his Japanese and South Korean colleagues in Seoul shortly and their ongoing consultations as well to see what else we can be doing.

Mr. Phillips. And can you share any specific examples of

other, quote-unquote, strong actions that remain in the toolkit that had not been employed yet vis-a-vis North Korea?

Ms. Sherman. Well, I think they're a whole range, everything from sanctions, some of which we have imposed already, to actions like the South Koreans took after the most recent launch to do their own missile launches to say we have a deterrent, the exercises that we do, the trilateral relationship statement and actions at the U.N. Security Council to hold the North Koreans accountable in the committee that looks at non-proliferation, to make sure that we stop any material going into North Korea that can be used for the development of missile technology or nuclear technology.

We have done a good job as I must say Steve Biegun who was my predecessor. Good professional, worked very hard to ensure that North Korean workers who went abroad and sent remittances back that we got to countries and told them to send those North Koreans home. Don't allow them to have that chain of financial support for North Korea. So we try to work this in every domain.

Mr. Phillips. I just got ten seconds. Any carrots that you contemplate relative to changing behavior?

Ms. Sherman. Any what?

Mr. Phillips. Carrots instead of sticks --

Ms. Sherman. Well, I think we have --

1331 Mr. Phillips. -- to change behavior?

Ms. Sherman. -- said to them that we are open to diplomacy.

We have let them know in appropriate ways things that might come

their way if we can get to a different place.

- 1335 Chairman Meeks. The gentleman's time has expired. I now recognize Representative Scott Perry of Pennsylvania for five minutes.
- 1338 Mr. Perry. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Secretary,
 1339 for being here. Is the Biden State Department policy regarding
 1340 China a failure?
- 1341 Ms. Sherman. No.

1334

1347

1348

1349

1350

1351

1352

1353

- Mr. Perry. It's not? Okay. I want to go through a
 timeline with you. Last July, you were on a trip and you were
 handed a list of 16, as alleged, erroneous U.S. policies toward
 China, 10 cases of concern to be rectified before ties could
 improve. So that's July of 2021.
 - The in October, China and Russia for the first time ever conducted joint naval drills in the western Pacific around Japan.

 And then in November -- no. Well, November 15, the President and Xi had a virtual summit where the President tried to wind support for our position vis-a-vis Ukraine. Then in November or later in November, China and Russia sent bombers into Japanese and South Korean ADIZ.
- Vladimir Putin and Xi have met more than 30 times since 2013.

 And I suspect you're aware that Xi calls Putin his best friend.

L356	Subsequent to that, the Department of State held a one and a
1357	half hour meeting with China's ambassador, Qin Gang, where he
L358	was given U.S. intelligence regarding Russian armored unit
L359	placement.

And then December of 2021, there was more information exchanged throughout December regarding U.S. intelligence which was given by China to Russia. There were four of these meetings including one where you, Madam Secretary, were present. February 4, Putin arrived in Beijing for the winter Olympics.

And then on February 7, Xi and Putin announced that the two nation's friendship has no limits and issued a joint statement pledging what is described as unprecedented cooperation. And then on the 24 of February, Russia invaded Ukraine.

Whose idea was it to give China the intelligence we had on Russia?

Ms. Sherman. Congressman, I don't think this is probably the appropriate forum to talk about intelligence matters.

Mr. Perry. I'm not talking about the intelligence itself.

I want to know who made the decision.

Ms. Sherman. I understand. But you are presuming that we shared intelligence in a particular manner. And I'd rather have that conversation --

(Simultaneous speaking.) Mr. Perry. I'm happy to have that conversation with you behind closed doors. But it's also been

reported that methods and sources were compromised. Did the

State Department compromise sources and methods?

Ms. Sherman. We never compromise sources and methods, Congressman.

Mr. Perry. In determining whether the policy is correct, it says in the most recent release of the Indo-Pacific Strategy that we're competing with the PRC, competing and managing competition. Admiral Luo Yuan in 2019 said sinking two U.S. aircraft carriers would kill 10,000 American soldiers. What the United States fears the most is taking casualties. We'll see how frightened America is. And of course, you probably know Ambassador Qin Gang just this year said it's most likely if we support Taiwan independence or continue to will involve China and the United States, the two big countries in a military conflict.

I've heard your testimony here this morning and you talked about climate change on numerous occasions. Do you know that the Chinese already claim to have success in elevating presidential climate on John Kerry who's a genocide apologist to be in charge of the Biden overall China strategy? Is that true?

Ms. Sherman. Congressman, I appreciate that you have a perspective on the Biden-Harris administration policy towards the PRC. Let me be clear. As Secretary Blinken has said, there

are three elements to that policy. Yes, to compete and to win, to invest in our country so that we can win the future vis-a-vis the competition in a responsible manner.

Second, that we challenge China where we must. That is in areas like the South China Sea. There are more aggressive action towards Taiwan and very many other areas. And third, to cooperate in those areas where it is in our self interest to do so to ensure that we have a planet for my grandchildren --

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Mr. Perry. Do I don't want you to be responsible. I agree with you about that. But a central demand in the list handed to you was that the United States no longer challenged China's domestic Marxist-Leninist political system. Now for my whole life or at least since Kissinger went to open up China allegedly and then their entry into the World Trade Organization, et cetera, et cetera, we've had a policy in the United States that somehow open markets and relations with the West would change China.

Has the United States government lied to or been wrong about that policy that whole time? Because it's not happening.

Ms. Sherman. I hear you loud and clear, Congressman, and I'd urge you to sit down and have that conversation with Secretary Kissinger. I think that we all understand that life's a lot more complicated.

1427 Mr. Perry. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield.

1428	Chairman Meeks. The gentleman's time, and I try not to
1429	intercede as the chair of the committee. But it's hard for me
1430	not to just say that President Xi gave PRC's first ever friendship
1431	medal to Mr. Putin in 2018. Donald Trump was President. Didn't
1432	hear anything about that.

President Trump invited Mr. Putin to the White House.

Didn't hear anything about that. The Foreign Minister Lavrov visited the White House in 2017 when he was President and allegedly gave information to him that no one else that was classified.

No one said anything about that.

But I will try to refrain. And I'll recognize Mr.

Representative Gerry Connolly of Virginia for five minutes.

Mr. Connolly. I thank the chair. And yes, there's so much to remember from those momentous four years. Hard to get it all in, in one hearing, like taking Clorox to cure COVID. I seem to recall President Trump -- actually, one you left out there maybe, Mr. Chairman -- praising Xi Jinping on his management of COVID and the virus coming out of Wuhan early on.

Welcome, Ms. Sherman. So glad to have you here again. A couple of questions. One is what's your view about what China is taking away from what Russia is doing in Ukraine? I'm the co-chair of the Taiwan Caucus. And there's concern that China could take away from our point of view the wrong lessons.

What's your view? What's the State Department's view about

that? And presumably, we're communicating warnings to the

Chinese Government appropriately.

Ms. Sherman. Thank you, Congressman. Indeed, we are. The President in his conversation with Xi Jinping, Jake Sullivan with Yan Jiechi, Secretary Blinken's with Wang Yi, mine on my trip as well as when I met with the ambassador here.

We want to try to make sure that PRC takes away the right lessons. And I hope that what they have seen is that United States has partners and allies throughout the world and that we all believe in sovereignty, territorial integrity, and the right of countries to make their own foreign policy choices and decisions, that we believe in an international rules-based order that has added space, a belief in human rights and making sure that everybody plays by the same rules.

That if, in fact, we have said quite clearly that we believe stability across the Straits is critical, that certainly no country should be taken by -- not country, no entity. We see Taiwan as a jurisdiction. We have an unofficial relationship with them. So we don't see in our One China policy that the mainland taking Taiwan by force is acceptable and certainly doesn't lead to stability along the Taiwan Straits or stability in the Indo-Pacific.

And so we hope that the PRC understands that any such action would see a response from the international community, not just

from the United States. That most countries in the world -- in fact, two U.N. General Assembly resolutions, one, 141 countries, 140 countries at the time of this invasion premeditated, unprovoked, and unjust invasion by Putin voted in support of Ukraine and in support of those principles and of the international rules-based order and the need for President Putin to bear consequences. So we hope the PRC takes the right lessons from that.

Mr. Connolly. We hope so. As you know, NATO is updating its strategic concept and the intention is to adopt revisions, new strategic concept in May in Madrid.

The current strategic concept that's been in place for the last decade still refers to Russia as a strategic partner -- clearly, that's not true -- and doesn't even mention China.

Apparently, China doesn't exist in our orb in terms of anything to be concerned about. Clearly, that has to change.

What guidance is the State Department, the United States government, providing NATO with respect to how to formulate the relationship we ought to be having and how we ought to be looking at the Chinese challenge?

Ms. Sherman. There's a lot of discussion going on about that, Congressman. And the Secretary of State is in Brussels today for a NATO meeting. Some of the discussion will be about heading towards Madrid in the strategic concept for 2030.

I think everybody understands that we're in a different world, that what has happened has scrambled the geopolitics of this world. And we all are going to have to think about where we are and what that means for the future. So I think you're quite right that things are going to change.

Mr. Connolly. Yeah. And my final point, yesterday, the House of Representatives in an overwhelming bipartisan vote voted for a resolution calling on NATO as part of that strategic concept to create a center for democratic resilience within NATO itself. I commend it to you and I urge the State Department, and Julie Smith has been doing a great job in Brussels. But we need to get behind this, especially after what's happening in Ukraine. I thank the chair.

Chairman Meeks. The gentleman's time has expired. I now recognize Representative Ann Wagner who's the vice ranking member of the full committee for five minutes.

Mrs. Wagner. Thank you, Chairman Meeks, for hosting this critical hearing. And Deputy Secretary Sherman, it is good to see you again. And we want to thank you for your time and service.

The United States and our allies are navigating an inflection point in world history. Russia's war on Ukraine has demonstrated the high stakes of the struggle between the democratic world and its authoritarian adversaries. But we need to be clear that China, Russia, Iran and their partners sowed the seeds of this

1524 conflict long ago.

Authoritarian governments have made a deliberate choice to attack foundational practices, beliefs, and laws of the free world. And today we are seeing the tragic consequences of that decision. Our adversaries are watching our responses to Russia's invasion of Ukraine.

They had hoped to see a fractured, weak West. And instead they learned that the U.S. and our allies are more united and more determined to protect the free world than we have ever been. But this crisis is far from other.

And Putin and all members of his criminal regime that bear responsibility for his horrifying assault on an independent and peaceful nature and should suffer the consequences of their actions. We will send a message to the bullies and authoritarians standing alongside Putin that we will not tolerate aggression against a sovereign nation.

The People's Republic of China should take note, it must be held accountable for its many violations of sovereignty and international law in the Himalayas, the South China Sea, the East China Sea. It cannot continue to threaten Taiwan's right to determine its own future. And it must immediately cease its egregious violations of human rights. And I include in this what I would call genocide.

Department Secretary Sherman, I want to take this

opportunity to ask you for a status update on some of the provisions of fighter jets, of tanks, of surface-to-air missiles, specifically functioning as S-300s, to Ukraine. I recently had the privilege of traveling to Poland and the Ukrainian border.

And I saw firsthand what the Ukrainians are up against.

And President Zelensky has repeatedly asked for tanks and fighter jets and surface-to-air missiles. But the Biden administration has claimed that Russia could deem these systems escalatory. Now that the world has seen the horror of Russia, Russian war crimes committed in Bucha just yesterday, how can this administration continue to argue that any weapon system for Ukraine is escalatory or provocative?

Is the United States policy on providing these critical assets evolving, I'll say, in light of what we are learning about the horrifying situations on the ground in Ukraine, Secretary?

Ms. Sherman. Thank you very much, Congresswoman. The United States has provided over two billion dollars in security assistance to Ukraine. And for every one Russian tank between the United States and our allies and partners, there are ten tanks that have been supplied to Ukraine.

We can go into detail, and I did this in a classified briefing. And my colleagues from the Department of Defense and the Joint Chiefs went through it in great detail in a classified briefing with all members of the House about each weapon system,

- where it was coming from, what its issues were, a lot of discussion
- about those, migs and why it's been so difficult to get them in.
- This is a decision that is up to Poland in the end. All of this
- 1575 --
- 1576 (Simultaneous speaking.)
- 1577 Mrs. Wagner. What about -- because of my time -- the
- 1578 surface-to-air missiles, the S-300s? And I'm right over here,
- 1579 Madam Secretary.
- 1580 Ms. Sherman. Yes.
- 1581 Mrs. Wagner. The S-300s -- the functioning S-300s, I'm
- hearing they're 1984. They're not functioning. So what's the
- 1583 --
- 1584 (Simultaneous speaking.)
- 1585 Ms. Sherman. I think, Congresswomen, I can brief you
- 1586 further about the S-300s in a different setting. But we
- understand the importance of them.
- 1588 Mrs. Wagner. Okay. Well, I would appreciate that very,
- very much.
- 1590 Ms. Sherman. Sure.
- Mrs. Wagner. I don't have much time left. I want to ask
- a question about the PRC and what they may be hoping to gain from
- the current prices in Europe. But I'm going to submit it for
- the record given the fact that I am out of time and I yield back
- 1595 to the chair.

1596 Chairman Meeks. The gentlelady yields back. I now
1597 recognize Representative Colin Allred of Texas for five minutes.

Mr. Allred. Good. I thought you were going to skip me,
Mr. Chairman. Madam Deputy Secretary, it's great to see you
again. Thank you for coming to speak with us.

And this is an important region in the world. I was there in November. We visited South Korea and Japan and also Taiwan.

Mostly the discussion as you can imagine revolved around China.

And I've been kind of wanting to avoid the idea that China is ten feet tall and that we are falling behind. We have some unique abilities to bring to the table, particularly our alliances and our economic power. And speaking with our allies, I think there's a lot of concern over our withdrawal from TPP and where we were going to go and how were we going to economically engage with them going forward.

And I see it as also part of a deterrent strategy with China as important as it is for us to continue to shift our resources to the Pacific on the military side. One the economic side, I think this is maybe our strongest tool. And so I wanted to discuss the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework that the administration has put forward which I think is intended to set a positive agenda for economic coordination in the region.

I'm just wondering what countries you envision participating in that framework, what the breadth of the membership will be,

and how its role will play in our overall Indo-Pacific strategy.

Ms. Sherman. Thank you very much, Congressman. And let
me quickly correct something I said to Congresswomen Zeldin.

And I think I said it maybe earlier as well. It is not that we have ten tanks for every one tank. We have ten anti-tank weapons for every Russian tank. So I wanted to correct the record. I don't want to leave a misimpression. So sorry for taking some time, Congressman.

On the Indo-Pacific framework, we haven't made final decisions on membership. The framework will be open, inclusive to those partners that share our ambitions and our high standards.

And that's what we're doing here.

I think it's also important for people to understand that this is not a traditional trade agreement approach. It is a much broader approach and is about really a worker-centric trade policy that includes novel areas such as supply chain resiliency that go beyond traditional trade agreements. And I think this quite critical to the future for all of us.

Mr. Allred. While I understand that it is going to go beyond, I would like to see us have a trade agreement. And those countries are moving forward without us now. And I think there's a U.S.-sized hole there. And in many ways, China wants to fill that.

Just really quickly, do we imagine that Taiwan may have some

- inclusion in that framework?
- Ms. Sherman. As I said, we haven't made any decisions.
- But I've heard both from you and from other members this morning
- 1647 your perspective on that decision.
- Mr. Allred. Okay. Well, I certainly think they should be.
- And with the supply chain issues that we're talking about, they
- have an important role to play in that. And I think we need to
- 1651 continue to build kind of a wall of our democratic allies,
- partners, and the economies that we can bring to the table in
- this region. And with that, I'll give you some time back. Thank
- 1654 you.
- 1655 Chairman Meeks. The gentleman yields back. I now
- recognize Representative Brian Mast of Florida for five minutes.
- 1657 Mr. Mast. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, ma'am, for
- 1658 coming today. The administration is working on negotiating a
- 1659 nuclear deal with Iran again. We agree on that?
- 1660 Ms. Sherman. Yes.
- 1661 Mr. Mast. Yes, ma'am. I want to talk a little bit about
- what you know about negotiation. Probably easily in this room,
- 1663 you've sat with Iranians more than anybody. And so you do have
- an opinion on this that should be valued.
- 1665 You stated about the first Iran negotiations, and you said
- this passionately, we had to make sure our military was arrayed
- in such a way to say that we are serious. If we have to take

military action because nothing else works, we will. We made

sure that the Iranians knew that we had weapons that could

penetrate Fordow. We helped oil producers more oil to compete

with Iran.

At that time, as you mentioned already, Russians were taking Crimea while you were negotiating the Iran deal. But now we have Russia aiding in part. United States of American negotiates the Iran deal, totally different situation.

So I want to start with the first point. What can you say that this administration -- something that you said was so crucial for credible negotiation with them. What can you say that this administration does to array our military in such a way that they are taken serious so that the Iranians know that if nothing else works that we will take military action and use weapons that would penetrate Fordow?

Ms. Sherman. Congressman, I believe that diplomacy is often supported by a credible threat of force. And I think that everybody in this room would agree that the United States military is the finest, strongest, broadest, deepest military on the face of the earth.

Mr. Mast. Agreed, ma'am. And I don't want to interrupt you, but I don't want to filibuster this time. There's a difference in administrations. The Trump administration, whether you like them or not, had an incredible military prowess,

took out Soleimani, other things that we can talk about, negotiations with North Korea, you name it.

What is this Biden administration doing to show Iran that they are arrayed in such a way to say to them that we are serious and that if we have to take military actions because nothing else works, that we will and that they're well aware that we have weapons that can penetrate Fordow and others things?

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Mr. Mast. What is this administration doing?

Ms. Sherman. They know that today as they knew it then, Congressman. There's nothing different in that statement or the veracity of that statement today as it was then.

Mr. Mast. Ma'am, you'd have to think we're all naive to think nothing is different today. Obviously, the world oil markets and what this administration has done with what rubs up against their long-term climate goals is totally different, as was different than what you were doing to negotiate with Iran.

What they did in Afghanistan in the withdrawal from Afghanistan, our intelligence throughout the region, what they're doing with Ukraine, what they're doing right now with Russia who is just like they were attacking Crimea during the Obama administration is now attacking Ukraine during the Biden administration. This is a totally different world.

So you'd have to think we're naive to think that this

- administration right now is doing something to array the United

 States military in such a way to say that we are serious, that

 if we have to take military action because nothing else works

 to prevent them from getting a nuclear weapon, then we will.

 And I would love a specific example.
- Ms. Sherman. So I would say, Congressman, two things. I 1721 1722 think if you take to General Milley who testified, I think, yesterday, he would tell you that we have the capacity to do 1723 1724 exactly what I said we had the capacity to do back in 2015. 1725 Secondly, I think you will have seen in the Secretary's meeting 1726 in the Negev Desert with Abraham Accord partners and Israel that 1727 our partnerships and alliances are as important in our 1728 negotiations with Iran as they are in our standing up to Putin
 - Mr. Mast. So one more question on that. You're going to defend your point of view, rightly so. You believe that if Iran were to be on the cusp of a nuclear weapon right this moment that General Milley would launch an attack, use military action as you said was so important for you to be able to negotiate.
- 1735 Ms. Sherman. Congressman --

in Ukraine.

1729

1730

1731

1732

1733

1734

- 1736 Mr. Mast. You have to say that credibly.
- 1737 Ms. Sherman. Congressman, I'm not going to deal today in 1738 a hypothetical because --
- 1739 (Simultaneous speaking.)

- 1740 Mr. Mast. That's what you did previously.
- 1741 (Simultaneous speaking.)

- 1742 Chairman Meeks. The gentleman's time is expired. And I'll
 1743 recognize Representative Tom Malinowski of New Jersey who's the
 1744 vice chair of the full committee for five minutes, and he can
 1745 do that right here because I got to run. I have to run to the
 1746 floor. I'll be back.
- Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] I want to say thank you, Mr.

 Chairman. But I'd at least temporarily be addressing myself.

 Thank you, Madam Secretary.
 - So we've had a bunch of conversations and debates and votes on the Hill in the last couple of weeks on funding our domestic and international vaccination and public health efforts. I wanted to ask you about that as it pertains to the theme of this hearing. We've talked a lot about the importance of the United States competing, leading, winning the future.

My point of view and I assume you would agree with this is that the horrific catastrophe of this pandemic has also presented us as the country that invented these vaccines and has the capacity to save hundreds of millions of lives around the world with a strategic opportunity that is unparalleled in our experience, maybe not since the end of the Cold War have we had such an opportunity. The President has said we should be the arsenal of vaccines. We've done a lot. But I'm not sure if we've done

enough to be able to say we're seizing that opportunity.

Indonesia, for example, 100 million Western vaccines, 35 million that we've donated, 200 million from China, Bangladesh, 90 million Western vaccines, 158 million from China. And other countries, the ratio is a little bit better. In Vietnam, Turkey, Sub-Saharan Africa, about 194 million doses from the Western brands donated compared to 28 million from China. And yet still, 194 million, when you think about the population of Africa, is a drop in the bucket.

USAID has asked us for about five billion dollars. That request came in December. That was not to step up our efforts. That was just to maintain the current, I think, insufficient effort. And the Senate zeroed out that funding which if we allow that to stand, we're at basically no effort going forward this year.

So I want to ask you about this from a strategic perspective. So set aside the obvious public health arguments for doing this. Can you talk a little bit about in terms of our competition with China some examples of when and how we have benefitted from when we've been able to provide this sort of assistance and how you feel we as a country are constrained right now by the lack of resources?

Ms. Sherman. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, for raising this issue. The President, the Secretary, virtually all of you

have been clear that nobody is safe from COVID until everybody
is safe. We have seen that time and time again with variance
from other countries making its way to our shores and having
another surge.

Without additional funding to support getting shots into arms around the world, we will have to cut short our efforts to turn vaccines into vaccinations. As you've noted, we've already donated over 500 million doses free of cost with no strings attached which is quite different from what the PRC has done. We have done so to more than 110 countries and economies around the world, sole purpose to save lives.

But by June of this year, we estimate that we will have obligated the majority of funds under the Initiative for Global Vaccine Access, Global VAX. That means we will have to begin to ramp down the initiative. By August or September without additional funding, all of our related Global VAX efforts will end.

Without additional funds, the administration would be unable to extend search support to 20-plus additional under-vaccinated countries that will need intensive support this year to get shots in arms. This will devastate our ability to ensure those countries can effectively deploy safe and effective vaccines. We will also be unable to provide lifesaving supplies, tests, therapeutics, oxygen. You go on and on.

1812	Laving large unvaccinated populations worldwide will
1813	increase the risk of new deadly variants emerging that could evade
1814	our current vaccines and treatments. And I think everybody
1815	probably saw in the morning paper the discussion going on among
1816	scientists and medical researchers about how to make sure vaccines
1817	can work for all of the variants that are coming our way and will
1818	be sustainable over time.

- 1819 Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] I'll stop you with a very quick question.
- 1821 Ms. Sherman. Yeah.
- 1822 Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] Where will those countries

 1823 turn?
- 1824 Ms. Sherman. Those countries will turn to the PRC.
- Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] Thank you. And I think
 that's the key point here. Again, the public health argument
 should be obvious enough. But how can we and all of us, I think,
 agree on this aspect? How can we voluntarily lose this
 competition to the Chinese Communist Party? I can't imagine it.
- Very, very quickly. Very different issue. Does the
 administration intend to fill the position of North Korea Human
 Rights Envoy?
- 1833 Ms. Sherman. Yes.
- 1834 Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] I yield back my time and 1835 recognize Representative Tim Burchett of Tennessee.

1836 Mr. Burchett. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Ma'am, thank you
1837 for being here. I wonder why hasn't the Biden administration
1838 nominated Ambassador to Ukraine?

Ms. Sherman. Congressman, we are very lucky that Kristina Kvien is our chargee d'affaires. She is doing a simply spectacular job under the most difficult circumstances. I certainly understand why it would have been great if we had decided on that nominee to be a permanent ambassador.

These things take time to make sure you have the right person.

And right now, I'm quite glad that we have the sustainable commitment of Chargee D'affaires Kvien and her team. They're doing a great job.

Mr. Burchett. Okay. And I'm wondering will India's neutrality in Russia's war on Ukraine and the country's general friendship with Russia have any effect on our policy towards India -- U.S. policy towards India I guess I should say.

Ms. Sherman. Thank you, Congressman. I've addressed this a couple of times so far today. But it's very important, so I have no problem addressing it again.

Our relationship with India is a very critical one. They're the largest democracy in the world. We have a strong defense relationship with them. They are part of the Quad with Australia and Japan, and we are moving forward on many achievements that are critical to Indo-Pacific prosperity and security. We

1860	obviously would prefer that India move away from their long-term
1861	history of nonalignment, G77, partnership with Russia.
1862	Mr. Burchett. Aren't a lot of their weapons, though,
1863	weaponry
1864	Ms. Sherman. Yes.
1865	Mr. Burchett they're made in Russia, correct?
1866	Ms. Sherman. Yes, we have to told them that it'll be very
1867	hard for them now to get spare parts or to get them replaced.
1868	They have increased their defense relationship with us and
1869	defense sales and co-production efforts. And I think this is
1870	a great opportunity for that to surge in the years again.
1871	Mr. Burchett. Seems like it's sort of an extension of
1872	China's Belt-and-Road. They use their weaponry, and then they're
1873	stuck with them. And then they have to buy the parts from them.
1874	Are we working with any of our allies to try Putin for war
1875	crimes? I hear a lot of talk about it, and we talk about the
1876	horrors. We shouldn't be surprised at what Russia does. If you
1877	know anything about history, they're very brutal.
1878	They're brutal on their own people. They're brutal on
1879	people they conquest throughout history. It's just gone on and

They're going to talk about all these things where they've lobbed missiles into this group or that group which are horrible

gone on. And personally, I think war crimes started when they

cross the border.

and horrific and the torture. And of course, it looks like
they've killed a lot of innocent civilians and just very careless
kind of attitude they take about it. But I'm wondering if that's
a possibility.

Ms. Sherman. Congressman, Secretary Blinken named Russia as having perpetrated war crimes, even before the horrifying video that's come out of Bucha and what people have faced. And we expect to see much greater -- even more horror as this unfolds.

I think that there will be actions for accountability, whether that's at the ICC, at the U.N. Human Rights Council, U.N. General Assembly, our own efforts in that regard. The President has already said that war crimes have been committed here. Our lawyers and others are collecting evidence. Other countries around the world have offered to collect evidence to meet legal thresholds for that accountability. It is a very high priority.

Mr. Burchett. Okay. Thank you. One last question. I'm wondering we've seen all the horrific things the Russians have done. And I put those at Putin's feet 100 percent and the crimes committed in Bucha.

And how can this administration continue to argue any weapon system is escalatory or provocative? Those seem to be the words we use a lot now. And I'm sure the lawyers or the think tanks have come up with that. If you can answer that real quick, ma'am, I'd appreciate it.

- Ms. Sherman. Sure. I think it's not just about escalatory.

 The President has been very clear that he does not see American

 troops in Ukraine, and NATO does not see its troops in Ukraine,

 that we want to supply the Ukrainians with everything they need

 to defend themselves.
- And so we also look at what is needed and what, in fact,
 might drag us into that conflict. And he's made the commitment
 that we will not do that. And certainly if a convoy is taken
 out on NATO territory, we're going to defend that country to every
 inch of its soil as the President has said. But these are hard
 and touch decisions.
- 1919 Mr. Burchett. Thank you, Chairman. I yield back none of my time.
- 1921 Ms. Sherman. Thank you.
- 1922 Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] You have four seconds, so

 1923 thank you for giving those to us. I now recognize Representative

 1924 Brad Sherman of California for five minutes --
- 1925 Mr. Sherman. Thank you.
- 1926 Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] -- plus four seconds.
- Mr. Sherman. I want to start with a couple observations,

 first speaking up on the gentleman from New Jersey's comments

 on the need for us to provide at least five billion dollars to

 international vaccination efforts. Obviously, this is the moral

 thing to do. Obviously, it's a thing to do to assure our role

in world leadership.

But if we were just exclusively selfish, we'd recognize that the impact on our economy of shutdowns and disease in all of the middle income and poor countries of the world has an impact on us of far more than five billion. But even more than that, I would hope that the U.S. Senate would be on team human rather than on team COVID and recognize that every time anyone in the world gets this disease, that means the disease is replicating. When it replicates, it can mutate, and the next variant can come back to the United States.

I feel that so many senators just aren't able to contemplate the difference -- Republican senators I might add -- the difference between billions and trillions. But if we have trillion -- if you just look at the economics. We have trillions of dollars at stake in not having another variant. And the cost of vaccination is measured in the single digit billions.

The other observation is one that I hope that China would observe. We have three major allies east of China: Taiwan, Japan, and South Korea. And we have for the better of a century been successful in persuading them not to develop nuclear weapons.

China has one ally in that region, perhaps only ally in the world. They have been remarkably unsuccessful in persuading

North Korea not to develop and expand its nuclear weapons program and the delivery systems. There's a lack of symmetry here, and

the Chinese need to understand that our success in preventing
our allies from going down the nuclear road is dependent on them
extending some real efforts not only in the sense of fairness.

But as North Korea flexes its nuclear weapons muscle, that is
a reason for countries near North Korea to develop their own
nuclear deterrent.

My question is on the free association compacts we have with the Pacific Islands. This is a hearing on the Indo-Pacific.

And these small countries literally geographically dominate the Pacific.

In the 1980s, we developed these compacts. We now see China trying to poke its nose in the area. We see the risks of climate change. The current compacts expire in 2023 and 2024. And President Biden has named Ambassador Yun as special envoy on the compacts of re-association.

The Departments of State and Interior need to get their work done and give Congress enough time -- not always an efficient institution I might add -- to enact any provisions. What is the targeted conclusion date for these critical negotiations?

Ms. Sherman. So thank you for raising the compact. We, as you noted, have named Ambassador Joseph Yun as Special Presidential Envoy for compact negotiations. He'll lead the negotiations with support of a team composed of representatives of all relevant agencies. And certain economic assistance

including certain federal programs provided under the compacts
as amended ends in 2023 as you've noted.

We are focused on negotiating the provisions which are expiring and doing it in a timely fashion which is why we named this presidential envoy and consulting with Congress along that process.

Mr. Sherman. You got a target date?

Ms. Sherman. I do not have a target date for you. But I know when they're going to expire, so we got to get it done.

Mr. Sherman. Don't expect us to be efficient. We need efficiency on your end. Second, the Rohingya, we've now declared this to be a genocide, yet we continue to provide economic development in smaller quantities to the government of Burma-Myanmar. Since this is a government perpetuating a genocide, can we turn that off. And I'm excluding from that food and medicine, but I'm certainly including all economic aid and economic development aid.

Ms. Sherman. So Congressman, I'd have to look at the particular funding streams that you're referring to. We certainly don't as you don't want to turn off food or medicine or anything that really is helping the people.

(Simultaneous speaking.)

Mr. Sherman. All of our aid helps the people. But whatever aid we're providing economic development also helps the

government.

2021

2022

2023

2024

2025

- 2005 Ms. Sherman. I appreciate that.
- 2006 Mr. Sherman. And that's money that could be spent on so 2007 many other disasters happening elsewhere.
- Ms. Sherman. Yeah, I'm not aware of what particular funding you're talking about. So I'd be glad to have a follow up with you.
- 2011 Mr. Sherman. We'll do a QFR. But we did not provide 2012 economic aid to Germany in 1940.
- 2013 Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] Thank you. Chair recognized 2014 Representative Mark Green of Tennessee.
- Mr. Green. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member.

 And I want to thank Deputy Secretary Sherman for her testimony today. The future of freedom across the globe is increasingly under attack. As the world is still reeling from President

 Biden's failed withdrawal from Afghanistan, our adversaries are on the move.
 - Russia seized the opportunity to invade Ukraine. China is increasing its aggression toward Taiwan and Iran and North Korea, continue down their dangerous nuclear paths. There's no doubt that American influence has been greatly diminished by the countless blunders committed by this White House.
- 2026 Most of all, there's an erosion of the decades long
 2027 commitment to what has brought this country prosperity and the

world security, peace through strength. Deputy Secretary

Sherman, you served under the Obama administration where you acted

as the lead negotiator of the 2015 Iran nuclear deal. Earlier

this year as the Deputy Secretary of State, you were sent to Europe

to persuade the Russians, not to invade Ukraine. Unfortunately,

those efforts failed.

However, it's not too late to stop this bad deal with Iran.

It didn't work when we did it last time, and it won't work now.

Iran is an enemy of the United States and the free world. And

it's just crazy to rely on its oil exports as it was to rely on

Russia's exports.

Iran is the foremost state sponsor of terrorism. And they don't comply with international agreements. In fact, Iran has already violated the current deal with the Biden administration through its ballistic missile development program and uranium enrichment.

And under this new deal, we're potentially freeing up billions in Iranian assets, allowing them to export millions of barrels of oil per day, and giving them enough uranium to make a bomb in three years. All of this for what, to acquire Iranian oil rather than rely on American energy that President Biden has actively stifled since day one of his Presidency.

It's not too late for the State Department to reject this horrible deal. I'm going to go off script here for just a second

which always makes my staff a little concerned.

2053 Ms. Sherman. Same thing happens to me when I go off my talking points.

Mr. Green. I get it. I get it. I had some friends killed in Iraq, a lot of friends. I was there twice, and I think of those improved explosive devices that were created by the Iranians and given to the Iranian militias and the Shia militia. And it just seems unconscionable to me that we would sit down at a negotiating table. Instead, the administration needs to take a page from Ronald Reagan's playbook, peace through strength.

And I'm reminded of President Zelensky's recent address to Congress and his thinly veiled cry for help from the Biden administration. And I quote, I am addressing President Biden. You are the leader of a great nation. I wish you to be the leader of the world, end quote.

The world is a lot more dangerous than it was just a year and a bit ago. President Biden is failing to lead. This administration needs to lead the world. And right now, our country is in trouble. The world is in trouble.

My first question is from a purely national security perspective. Is it better for the United States to produce its oil or to buy oil from Iran?

2074 Ms. Sherman. Congressman, thank you for your service, not only as a member of Congress --

- 2076 Mr. Green. Thank you.
- 2077 Ms. Sherman. -- but as a serviceman as well. Let me be
 2078 clear. The negotiations for a return to compliance for
 2079 compliance in the joint comprehensive plan of action is not about
 2080 oil. It is about ensuring that Iran cannot obtain a nuclear

weapon.

That has been a bipartisan ambition over the course of several administrations because as dangerous as Iran is -- and I would agree with you on that. There's state sponsorship of terrorism, their maligned behavior in the region, their targeting by militias and proxies. All of that is horrible. But Iran with a nuclear weapon would be able to project even more power into the region and would deter some of our allies and partners in pushing back against Iran.

2090 (Simultaneous speaking.)

2091 Mr. Green. If I could, though, real --

2092 Ms. Sherman. -- is about ensuring they not have a nuclear weapon.

Mr. Green. I appreciate that. But unfortunately, they violated it last time with their ballistic missile program, their uranium enrichment. Now we're talking about letting Russia whom we've sanctioned build a 10 billion dollar nuclear plant for the Iranians.

I want to switch subjects real quick because I only have

- half a minute here. What would you guys do differently in your negotiations to prevent Ukraine from being invaded? Have you taken some notes down on lessons learned, and what would you do differently?
- Ms. Sherman. I think that right now we are very focused on helping President Zelensky and the Ukrainians ensure that they have a country, that they have their sovereign territory, that they have their future. There will be many lessons learned out of this, Congressman. And I hope we will learn those lessons together.
- 2110 Mr. Green. Thank you.
- Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] Thank you. And if I may add one comment, I think one of the most extraordinary things this administration has done, and I've sometimes been critical of it, was to warn the world, including to warn the government of Ukraine about the near certainty of this invasion. Many people did not believe it.
- 2117 (Simultaneous speaking.)
- Mr. Green. Mr. Chairman, I would agree with you on that.
- 2119 We are in agreement there. Thank you.
- 2120 Ms. Sherman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
- 2121 Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] I now recognize
- 2122 Representative Ted Deutch of Florida for five minutes.
- 2123 Mr. Deutch. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Deputy Secretary

Sherman, nice to see you. Thanks for joining us today. I want to talk about a couple of issues, and I want to start with the premise that I think we all share, that human rights needs to be front and center in our foreign policy.

And the President signed legislation to ban imports from China's Xinjiang region, punish the Chinese Government for genocide of the Uyghurs. This is as critical an issue today as it was at the end of December when the President signed that legislation into law. And I would just start by asking you for any updates that you can provide on the administration's efforts to address this ongoing atrocity.

Ms. Sherman. Thank you. And indeed, an ongoing atrocity it is. And the Secretary early on called this a genocide and the administration and the President as well.

We have certainly called upon the PRC authorities to immediately release all arbitrarily detained people, abolish the internment camps, cease forced sterilization, end all torture, stop prosecuting Uyghurs and members of other ethnic and religious minority groups in Xinjiang. We have delivered this message forcefully and directly to President Xi, to Yang Jiechi, to Foreign Minister Wang Yi, to the ambassador here, me directly in my meetings in Tianjin with Xie Feng and with Foreign Minister Wang Yi.

We continue to work with our partners and allies to promote

accountability for this in every way that we possibly can. We coordinated the imposition of sanctions and other actions by the United States, United Kingdom, Canada, European Union. It sends such a strong signal that the PRC then put sanctions on members of European Parliament. But we stayed together to make sure that people understand that we will take the reaction and the response, but we will not back away from what has occurred here and the accountability that must be achieved.

Mr. Deutch. I appreciate it. I would just ask one follow-up to that. Is there movement on or is there a reason the U.S. hasn't accepted Uyghurs as prioritized refugees at this point?

Ms. Sherman. I don't know the answer to that question,

Congressman. I will get you an answer.

Mr. Deutch. There are a lot of us who would be interested in that response. Appreciate that. Let me turn, Madam Deputy Secretary, to the fact that, as a lot of my colleagues have already mentioned, the war in Ukraine has pulled the world's attention west.

And there are those in the region that I spent a lot of time focused on in the Middle East and continue to question U.S. commitment to the region. How has China viewed accusations of U.S. pullback from the Middle East particularly when we know that China is always more than happy to sell its weapons to our

partners. And does China see an opening in the Middle East?

Ms. Sherman. I think the PRC looks for an opening everywhere quite frankly. And one of the things I think we've all come to understand is they are present and aggressive on every continent in this world. And that's certainly true in the Middle East as well, though I think -- and I know you know this quite well, Congressman -- the Negev Summit that just occurred that Secretary Blinken attended showed the solidarity among many nations in the Middle East to work together, not only to push back threats but also to increase prosperity of the people in the region.

Mr. Deutch. I do, and I appreciated that and in particular the Secretary's participation and leadership there. Last question, do you believe that the administration's strong leadership and rallying support for Ukraine in standing up against Russia, does that strong leadership seem to our partners in the Indo-Pacific region to be what they should expect from the U.S. vis-a-vis China, or do they view it as limited to a Western conflict?

Ms. Sherman. Oh, I hope they don't see it as just about a Western conflict. The United States has worked very hard to affirm ASEAN's centrality, to support APEC, to create a new mechanism, the Quad, Japan, Australia, the United States, and India, to underscore the East Asia Summit, APEC, to say that regional alliances, partnerships are very critical.

2196	We obviously have critical treaty allies in the
2197	Indo-Pacific. So I hope people understand that what President
2198	Biden said when he became President that we were going to establish
2199	our partnerships and our alliances, once again, we thought they
2200	were valuable, that they mattered, that we have done so and we've
2201	done so in every part of the world.

2202 Mr. Deutch. Thank you very much. Thanks for being with 2203 us.

Ms. Sherman. Thank you.

Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] Thank you. The chair recognizes Representative Andy Barr of Kentucky.

Mr. Barr. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Deputy Secretary
Sherman, thank you for being here today. I just came from the
Financial Services Committee where I had an opportunity to ask
Secretary Yellen this same question about the gapping loophole
in our sanctions regime on Ukraine related to energy-related
transactions.

There's a general license that OPEC has included in the sanctions on Russian banks and the Russian Central Bank that allows for energy-related transactions to continue to flow through to Moscow, admittedly for sensitivities with our European allies who are overdependent on Russian energy. But this is what is financing this war. These energy-related transactions are supplying Putin with the hard currency that he needs to execute

this unprovoked aggression against the innocent people of Ukraine.

Department, shift approach here and consider my legislation, the No Energy Revenues for Russian Hostilities Act, which would create an escrow mechanism which is similar to what we do with Iran.

It would allow for specific waivers where some transactions would be allowed to go through by Treasury to help our European allies.

But then the proceeds of those transactions would go in an escrow and released to Russia only for humanitarian purposes if they withdraw from Ukraine, kind of a carrot approach, not just a stick.

Ms. Sherman. What did Secretary Yellen who knows -- (Simultaneous speaking.)

Mr. Barr. She was open to it, and Adeyemo was open to it as well. I want to know what the State Department thinks.

Ms. Sherman. The State Department works very closely with Treasury on making these kinds of judgments. I think,

Congressman, you may not have heard yet that we, in fact, did full blocking sanctions on Sberbank today. So I think that you've also seen Germany take action regarding Gazprom and that financial channel yesterday. So I think that everyone is thinking through concepts like you've put on the table. And I hope we will continue

2243 Mr. Barr. Thank you.

Ms. Sherman. -- to work together to see what we can do.

Mr. Barr. Thank you for your open mindedness on that because Zelensky is asking for tougher sanctions. This is the way to do it. I urge your consideration.

Security aid to Ukraine, I appreciate the announcement of additional 100 million dollars in security systems for Ukraine from last evening. That is the right direction. But there's still more than a billion dollars left in funds that Congress has appropriated for Ukraine to back-fill stocks.

I'm talking about Javelins and Stingers. And by the way, this is not just for Ukraine. Representative Hsiao, Taiwan, there's several orders for Stingers that have not yet been delivered to Taiwan. We need deterrents. We need it now. What is the status of delivering these weapon systems to our allies under siege, both Ukraine and Taiwan?

Ms. Sherman. Congressman, we were looking at each one of those cases in terms of Europe, case by case to see what we can do and what's appropriate for us to do and what's possible for us to do, and working with our partners and allies because it's not just about us. There are 30 countries involved in providing weapons to Ukraine.

And where Taiwan is concerned, we are very, very focused on what Taiwan needs. And I'll be glad to get you an update on deliveries.

2268	Mr. Barr. They need that now. They need that now. And
2269	I'd encourage the State Department to move with haste on that.
2270	What about inclusion of Taiwan in the Indo-Pacific Economic
2271	Framework? I think that would be a strong signal that we stand
2272	with Taiwan.

Ms. Sherman. I have heard that from a number of members, both bipartisan today. We haven't made any final decisions yet about membership. And we'll certainly take advise from Congress under advisement.

Mr. Barr. I think that's a very important signal to send.

If we're moving forward with this economic framework, we cannot exclude Taiwan. I think that would be an invitation for aggression.

The other point is -- and this is out of your jurisdiction but more of an editorial comment to the USTR. We need a bilateral trade agreement with Taiwan.

Final question on Oceania, again, kind of echoing my colleagues. Last month, the Solomon Islands announced the drafting of a security agreement with China. We know China has its eyes set on Oceania. And yet it was not until just two weeks ago that Ambassador Yun was appointed as the Special Presidential Envoy. We need action and we need action now. Your reaction?

Ms. Sherman. We are very concerned about the Solomon

Islands. We are quite engaged with them. We are very glad that

- we now have a presidential envoy. And Ambassador Yun is raring to go and underway. And we shared the concerns, and he will be a terrific compact negotiator.
- 2295 Mr. Barr. Thank you. I yield back.

2308

2309

2310

2311

2312

2313

injustices.

- 2296 Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] The chair recognizes 2297 Representative Omar of Minnesota, five minutes.
- Ms. Omar. Thank you, Chairman. The Biden administration's

 Indo-Pacific strategy says that the United States has for a long

 time seen Asia merely as an arena for geopolitical competition.

 I'm grateful to see that framing. I agree.
- One of the things I think was profound, moral, and strategic
 mistake in the last Cold War was our support for brutal dictators
 in the name of having a common enemy. I would hope that most
 Americans look back at our long relationship with Pinochet in
 Chile, Suharto in Indonesia, Rios Montt in Guatemala, and feel
 the same determination. I do not want to repeat those historical
 - What worries me is that this time we seem willing to let Modi be our new Pinochet. Some in the foreign policy world seem eager to let Duterte or Marcos be our new Suharto. In the whole Indo-Pacific strategy, there are only two references to human rights.
- One of those is a reference to how China is undermining them.

 Nobody doubts that. China's human rights record is atrocious

2316	and that is well known. But I ask, what about Modi in India?
2317	How are we promoting a free and open region by supporting Modi?
2318	So I ask you, why has the Biden administration been so
2319	reluctant to criticize Modi's government on human rights?
2320	Ms. Sherman. Congresswomen, President Biden said when he
2321	became President that human rights would be at the center of our
2322	foreign policy. And I can assure you in every interaction I have
2323	had with any government where we have concerns about their human
2324	rights record, it has been part of that dialogue. That is true
2325	for the Secretary of State. That is true for the President of
2326	the United States.
2327	I wore this pin this morning for a reason. This eagle was
2328	Madeleine Albright's signature pin. It has her signature on the
2329	back of it. She was a dear friend of mine, a business partner,
2330	but also my boss when I was Counselor for the State Department.
2331	She fought for democracy and human rights her entire life.
2332	She was so proud that President Biden made human rights at the
2333	center of his policy. So I can assure you that every single
2334	Ms. Omar. So what do you think
2335	Ms. Sherman person at the State Department raises
2336	these issues and presses them.
2337	Ms. Omar. What do you think is the root of that reluctancy

to call out Modi's government for the human rights violations

2338

2339

there?

Ms. Sherman. I think it is important that we talk with countries with whom we have multiple interests about our human rights concerns, that we meet with civil society, that we deal with these issues, that we support NGOs who are pressing, that we support journalists and the freedom of journalists. We mentioned earlier today the Secretary just met with Maria Ressa who has spoken out and gotten a Nobel Peace Prize for it but also threats against her life on a constant basis, that we reinforce voices for human rights in countries, even where we have many other agendas with the government of those countries.

I think you will see that everywhere. When I went to India the last time as the Deputy Secretary of State, I met with the LGBTQI+ community. I have to tell you five years ago, no such meeting would exist. And it is partly because of the advocacy of NGOs and civil society and our affirmation of them that people have more freedom than that once had. And we will continue to pursue this agenda in every way possible.

Ms. Omar. I really appreciate that sentiment. And I push because when your predecessor was here, I asked the same question. What will it take? How much does the Modi administration have to criminalize the act of being Muslim in India for us to say something?

And I ask you again, what will it take for us to outwardly criticize the actions that the Modi administration is taking

- against its Muslim minorities in India? Because when we remain
 silent and the situation gets out of control in the way that it
 did with the Rohingyas, we, all of a sudden, show our interest
 in whatever genocide that's taking place. But we have an
 opportunity now to lead and make sure that there is a deterrence
 in the actions that they are taking as our partners.
- Ms. Sherman. Congresswomen, I agree. The importance that
 we stand up for every religion, every ethnicity, every race, every
 quality of diversity in this world and certainly in our own
 country. We are not perfect either. I stand up for the rights
 of minorities and difference here in this country. And we have
 to do so around the world.
- 2376 Ms. Omar. I do hope we make a practice of standing up, not 2377 just to our adversaries but to our allies as well.
- Ms. Sherman. Absolutely, absolutely.

2382

2383

2384

2385

2386

2387

- 2379 Ms. Omar. Thank you, and I yield back.
- 2380 Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] I recognize Representative 2381 Meuser of Pennsylvania.
 - Mr. Meuser. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much,
 Deputy Secretary Sherman, for being with us. Deputy Secretary,
 has the Biden administration learned from this crisis that what
 many do describe radical Green New Deal policies and basically
 an assault on domestic energy, have created dangerous
 vulnerabilities for transatlantic security.

- 2388 Ms. Sherman. I'm not sure what you're referring to,
 2389 Congressman.
- 2390 Mr. Meuser. The weakening of our national security and our
 2391 economy through assault basically on our domestic energy policy
 2392 which is, in the end, causing us to purchase from Russia. You
 2393 really don't know what I mean, Deputy Secretary?
- 2394 Ms. Sherman. I understand what you're saying. I think our
 2395 oil importation from Russia is about one -- it's a very small
 2396 percentage of our --
- 2397 (Simultaneous speaking.)
- Ms. Sherman. But to your point, I think that the Europeans would say to you that one of the things they have learned is that their reliance on Russian oil and gas made the vulnerable. And I think they would say to you that it proves the point that we have to look at renewable sources of energy.
- 2403 It's not that oil and gas aren't going to continue to be 2404 important for some years to come. It is absolutely true there 2405 will be a transition. But it is also absolutely true that if 2406 we want a planet for our grandchildren --
- 2407 (Simultaneous speaking.)
- 2408 Ms. Sherman. -- you have to have renewables and move in that direction.
- 2410 Mr. Meuser. That's fine. So the administration will 2411 support U.S. fuel industries and LNG exports that will enable

- 2412 U.S. energy independence. Is that something that --
- 2413 (Simultaneous speaking.)
- 2414 Ms. Sherman. We already have.
- 2415 Mr. Meuser. We already have? Okay.
- Ms. Sherman. Sure. We already have.
- Mr. Meuser. Madam Secretary, look at the price of gasoline.
- Look at the depletion. We're well over a million barrels a day
- less. That's inaccurate. No data supports the comment you just
- 2420 made. We're still purchasing oil from Russia as we speak.
- 2421 Ms. Sherman. The issues that we face in terms of the price
- of gasoline is multi-faceted. And --
- 2423 (Simultaneous speaking.)
- Mr. Meuser. Not really. If we were energy independent,
- it would've stayed very, very stable. See, if you want to
- complicate the issue, that's one thing. But if we want to
- simplify it, because it's such a catastrophe for most American
- 2428 families, we can do that too. Energy independence with a
- transition towards green new energies and renewables is a
- reasonable, economically feasible plan. But the radical
- 2431 policies that have taken place, okay, have --
- 2432 Ms. Sherman. What has been --
- 2433 Mr. Meuser. -- changed.
- 2434 Ms. Sherman. What has been radical, Congressman?
- 2435 Mr. Meuser. We have hundreds of thousands of less barrels

2436	being produced locally. T	There's an assault on the financial
2437	community based upon any i	involvement they had with the oil
2438	industry. There's no perm	mits being issued.

2439 Pipelines are not something that's being passed. I'm not 2440 going to go through it all. But everything I just stated is 2441 completely factual.

You know what? I didn't expect that. I thought there would be some reasonableness to the realities of our economy and our national security. But I guess I'm not going to receive that.

Can I ask you this? The Biden Administration promised -- you know what? I'm just going to yield back. I'm going to yield the reminder of my time to Representative Kim. Thank you.

Mrs. Kim of California. Thank you, Mr. Meuser, for yielding. I'll switch gears just a little bit. And I want to thank you, Madam Secretary, for committing earlier to appoint a special envoy on North Korea human rights issues.

However, I heard the same thing from Secretary Blinken a year ago in this very hearing in the seat that you are sitting. And since then, we have seen zero progress on an appointment since then. So I know you've spun this earlier, but I would like to hear from you. Will it be the end of this year? Could we get a firm commitment on this?

Ms. Sherman. I can't give you a time table today because we want to make sure we find the right person, Congresswomen.

- 2460 And we are --
- 2461 Mrs. Kim of California. I think we're hearing the same thing
- 2462 from --
- 2463 Ms. Sherman. I appreciate it. I'll try to get you a more
- 2464 specific answer.
- 2465 Mrs. Kim of California. Sure. All right. Well, I just
- 2466 want to conclude by saying that the North Korea -- we understand
- the North Korean people are suffering enough. And if we are
- 2468 actually serious about addressing the human rights abuses,
- globally, we need to follow through with an action. And I hope
- that both parties in Congress, Democrats and Republicans alike,
- 2471 we agree. The administration needs to make this a priority and
- appoint someone in the immediate future, hopefully soon. Thank
- 2473 you.
- 2474 Ms. Sherman. I understand your point completely. And I
- think the horrifying situation for the people in North Korea
- 2476 deserve that.
- 2477 Mrs. Kim of California. Thank you. I yield back.
- 2478 Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] Thank you. Just a note, U.S.
- oil imports from Russia significantly increased between 2016 and
- 2480 2020. So I assume there was a radical Green New Deal attack on
- 2481 U.S. oil production during those years. I now yield to
- 2482 Representative Abigail Spanberger of Virginia for five minutes.
- 2483 Ms. Spanberger. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And

I want to thank you for being here today. It's just a follow up to one of my colleagues asking a question.

Is it correct -- and I will give you the source. I'm on
the U.S. Energy Information website that's eia.gov for anyone
following along at home. The U.S. total annual crude oil exports
have increased every year since 2010 and reached a record high
in 2020.

I know this isn't within your portfolio. But is there any reason to think that these statistics are incorrect?

Ms. Sherman. No. And in fact, Congresswomen, one of my colleagues just reminded me. We're producing more oil domestically now than any other country. And as I think everyone knows, we now are releasing a million barrels a day from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve which is unprecedented and have mobilized the rest of the world to follow suit.

Ms. Spanberger. And one more thing, again, outside of your normal purview, Madam Deputy Secretary. But the U.S. crude oil imports fell to about 5.88 million in 2020. So U.S. oil imports feel in the year 2020. Also, any reason to doubt the figures from this --

Ms. Sherman. No.

Ms. Spanberger. -- site? And also notably, the United States was a total net energy exporter in both 2019 and 2020.

Ms. Sherman. Sounds correct to me.

2508	Ms. Spanberger. Fantastic. And Mr. Chairman, I'll want
2509	to supply some of this documentation for the record.
2510	[The information offered by Ms. Spanberger follows:]
2511	
2512	**************************************

Ms. Spanberger. Madam Deputy Secretary, thank you so much for being here. I have some questions about supply chains and semiconductors. Certainly the semiconductor supply chain will be critical to U.S. and economic global security for decades to come.

We know that China is currently trying to expand and has been for some time, control over parts of that supply chain by taking control of, among other things, critical minerals. And we also know that some of our key partners are important nodes in the supply chain, be it Taiwan, South Korea, Japan.

So are we as a country prepared if there's some geopolitical instability within the Indo-Pacific that could disrupt this supply chain, create shortages, or make other challenges — create challenges within these nodes? And are we activity developing contingency plans to prepare for such a potential risk?

Ms. Sherman. Thank you for raising that. The supply chain is one of the critical nodes of the Indo-Pacific Economic Framework. And quite obviously, semiconductors which are so critical to so much of what we do in the world and our future is very much a part of that and the critical minerals that are the inputs for that as well.

Our Under Secretary for Economic Affairs, Energy Affairs,
Jose Fernandez has this as his highest priority. We are working
very closely with Japan, South Korea, with Taiwan to look at this

issue. And we certainly have seen American manufacturers rethink
their own approach to semiconductors and manufacturing of
semiconductors and making sure that we have access to the critical
minerals as necessary.

Ms. Spanberger. Wonderful. And totally switching gears, thank you for your answers on that. We have a lot of people — and I know some of my colleagues have already touched on it — make consistent comparisons or parallels between the Russian invasion of Ukraine and risks to Taiwan from the People's Republic of China.

So I want to just pull us back from this discussion and say generally speaking, do you think these two situations are analogous? Making these comparisons, are there factors we should be considering that present differences? And are there any risks from potentially putting these two potential conflicts in the same bucket?

Ms. Sherman. So I think each situation in national security and foreign policy is sui generis. Everything is different. Context is different. Time is different, where the world is at that point, what the geopolitics are.

So they're each sui generis. At the same time, we hope -- and I said this earlier today -- that the PRC gets some lessons learned out of this. I think that many people in the world were surprised at the strength of our alliances and partnerships.

2561	I think that Putin fully expected that NATO would fall apart,
2562	that the European Union would be divided. And instead, what Putin
2563	has gotten is a strengthened NATO, a strengthened alliance, a
2564	stronger EU taking unprecedented action that they have never taken
2565	before. The EU set aside money to help countries pay for weapons
2566	to be sent to Ukraine. They've never done that before.

We've had countries around the world change what they do.

Japan has changed what it has normally done, New Zealand.

Switzerland who has always been neutral, always, became

non-neutral in the circumstances by calling out Russia.

So I hope there's some lessons learned that sanctions bite, that we will keep them coming, that there will be consequences for actions, that force is not the answer. Force is not the answer, and that the international rules-based order matters.

And we're going to stand up for it.

Ms. Spanberger. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] Thank you. So we're going to do two more rounds, five minutes. Deputy Secretary Sherman has been very generous with her time, not just today but in repeatedly coming back to us. And I want to encourage you to keep on doing that by keeping our commitments.

So we're going to go to Representative Pfluger and then Representative Houlahan and cut it off there. And I apologize

to members who did not get a chance to ask if there are any still left in the queue. So Representative Pfluger for five minutes.

Mr. Pfluger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Deputy Secretary, thank you for being here. Before I start with my questions, please pass my sincere gratitude to President Biden for meeting with Paula and Joey Reed last week for 40 minutes. It's incredibly important that we get him home. He has tuberculosis. He's coughing up blood every minute. Vladimir Putin knows this. We need to bring him home. We will support the administration in this.

Ms. Sherman. Thank you.

Mr. Pfluger. Last week, I introduced H.R. 7139 which is Removing Arms from Terrorists Through Sanctions Act. This legislation would codify the previous administration's executive order which basically implemented sanctions designed to prohibit rogue states from transferring weapons to Iran.

Defense officials have recently testified to Congress that China wants to sell arms to Iran. And under the sunsets of the 2015 deal, the U.N. arms embargo has expired as of October 2020. So in response to the executive orders, my bill would codify that executive order from the previous administration to threaten the second sanctions on China and any firms that were intending to transfer arms to Iran.

So can you assure us that executive order will be kept in

- place as part of any deal that you're working?
- Ms. Sherman. Congressman, we take a look at every piece
- of legislation. We certainly share your interest in there not
- be technology transferred and weapons transferred to Iran that
- in fact can be used against our interests. And so we'll take
- 2614 a close look at that.
- 2615 Mr. Pfluger. Can you assure us that it will be kept in place?
- 2616 Ms. Sherman. I can't assure you because --
- 2617 Mr. Pfluger. You are the expert.
- 2618 Ms. Sherman. -- I need to look at the exact language.
- Mr. Pfluger. You are the expert on the Iranian nuclear deal,
- 2620 yes?
- 2621 Ms. Sherman. I don't know. I certainly --
- Mr. Pfluger. You've been part of this for seven or eight
- 2623 years.
- Ms. Sherman. -- worked on the Iran nuclear deal. That's
- 2625 correct.
- 2626 Mr. Pfluger. Right. I think everyone in the country knows
- that you orchestrated the 2015 deal and now we're part of the
- orchestration of this deal. Can you assure us that this executive
- order will remain in place?
- 2630 Ms. Sherman. Congressman, I need to look at the executive
- order. I need to look at your language.
- Mr. Pfluger. Mr. Chairman, I would respectfully urge this

committee to bring this forward. I mean, if we're serious about
deterring Iran and therefore any rogue actors like China, we would
also consider this. I mean, it's very disappointing that you
don't know what the language is of that.

And I have serious questions about this deal in general.

I think we're in glove safe land right now and extremely
disappointing that you're not able to comment on that deal and
on the efficacy of whether or not that executive order mean within
the deal that you are negotiating.

Shifting gears, the energy security and given the importance of the Indo-Pacific and especially knowing what our national security strategy says, what can you tell me about what the strategy is for the administration to ensure that products like LNG get to our partners and allies?

Ms. Sherman. I think it's very important that we help our partners and allies through this energy crisis. The President as I just noted a moment ago has done an unprecedented release from the strategic petroleum reserve and gotten countries all over the world to match our efforts so that we can help consumers everywhere and particularly in our own country, of course, to lower these gas prices. So I think this is something we all are working on collectively in a bipartisan fashion. It's quite critical.

Mr. Pfluger. Do you believe that the oil and gas executives

- 2657 are price gouging Americans?
- 2658 Ms. Sherman. Congressman, I'm not knowledgeable enough to 2659 make that determination.
- Mr. Pfluger. Well, your comments on the SPR indicate that
- 2661 you are.

2670

2671

2672

2673

2674

2675

2676

2677

- Ms. Sherman. I am not an expert in this arena.
- 2663 Mr. Pfluger. Okay. Well, that's good to know. We've had
 2664 a lot of discussions on energy security in this hearing. And
 2665 across the hall, there's another hearing where that's being
 2666 suggested.
- Just theoretically, are we more secure today than we were two years ago, this country, under the policies that have been implemented?
 - Ms. Sherman. I obviously believe, Congressman, that

 President Biden is doing everything he possibly can and succeeding
 in ensuring the security of the United States of America. That's
 my solemn obligation. That's his solemn obligation as the

 President of the United States. And he takes it as a solemn
 obligation. You should know him well enough to know that when
 he took that oath of office to secure our country, he took it
 seriously.
- Mr. Pfluger. I hope that you will consider the text of the previous administration's executive order that does deter China, that does deter those types of actions from transferring weapons

2681	into the hands of the largest state sponsor of terror, one who
2682	actually fired weapons onto or nearby our own facilities in Erbil,
2683	Iraq.

Ms. Sherman. I share your concerns, Congressman, and I will look at your legislation.

Mr. Pfluger. Thank you. I yield back.

2687 Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] Chair recognizes
2688 Representative Houlahan, Pennsylvania.

Ms. Houlahan. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, Madam Under Secretary Sherman for this conversation. I very much appreciate your testimony, and I appreciate that you noted in that testimony the impact that Russia's invasion of Ukraine is having and could potentially have on the Indo-Pacific region.

We know that China violates Taiwan's airspace and territorial waters regularly, not to mention the repressive tactic in Tibet and the atrocities that they're committing against the Uyghurs and Xinjiang. I don't believe that Russia's inability to easily dominate Ukraine will necessarily indicate to China that continuing their destabilization efforts is a bad idea.

I also don't think frankly that the United States has done nearly enough to help support Ukraine in their effects to repel the Russian incursion. And I'm afraid that if China does indeed invade Taiwan in the future that we will be having these exact

same conversations and the exact same delaying discussions about it and when to provide aid or send weapons to the people of Taiwan as they suffer as well.

Can you please speak to what actions the United States is currently taking or perhaps should be taking to support Taiwan and to make sure that an invasion is an unappealing as possible to China?

Ms. Sherman. Congresswomen, we share your concerns that China not consider taking Taiwan by force, that there would be -- and we have said they know that there will be consequences for their back-filling Russia and what is happening in Ukraine by giving them any kind of material support. And we have been quite clear publicly that we believe that it is I wrong and that there will be a reaction if the PRC tries to take Taiwan by force.

United States sold more than 30 billion dollars' worth of arms to Taiwan since 2009. We have more than 400 foreign military cell cases in implementation. Since 2017, we've authorized with your support 18 billion dollars in foreign military sales to Taiwan.

In addition, direct commercial sales authorizations for end use by the Taiwan authority during this period totaled over 2.3 billion dollars. The Departments of State and Defense are looking at the entire defense trade enterprise to see where efficiencies can be made and get those articles to them more

quickly. And we've talked today about ensuring those timelines speed up.

We've also had very direct discussion about what kind of capabilities Taiwan needs. They're known as asymmetric approaches. The President has been very thoughtful about this. He sent a delegation to Taiwan of former senior U.S. security officials led by the former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Admiral Mike Mullen.

The selection of those individuals sent an important signal about the bipartisan U.S. commitment. It was quite a bipartisan delegation. And our commitment to Taiwan is democracy and demonstrates that our commitment to Taiwan remains rock solid. We'll continue to support Taiwan with training and encourage an innovative and asymmetric security posture to help them in their self defense.

Ms. Houlahan. Thank you. I guess what I would want to emphasize is that we could've probably had similar conversations about Ukraine a while ago and felt as though we were doing everything we could then as well. And we clearly have not been -- we now know that's not the case.

And so there's just so many parallels and analogous situations here that we can learn from. And there are really strong teaching moments that we should be experiencing right now. And so I just really don't want to see us being here in this

2753 situation on the other side of the globe.

With my remaining minute, you also mentioned in your

testimony that you've expressed concerns to the PRC about their

growing strategic alignment with Russia. Could you share to the

degree that you're able to their reaction and what is the plan

to continue to discouraging them from aligning further with

Russia?

Ms. Sherman. The President was very direct with Xi Jinping, Jake Sullivan with Yang Jiechi, the Secretary with Wang Yi, I with the ambassador here that there would be consequences if they provided material support. We now have Ambassador Nick Burns out of quarantine. As our ambassador to the PRC, he is delivering this message as well.

We are very focused on making sure that they understand what choices they're making here. And for a country that has long said that they believe in sovereignty, territorial integrity, the right of countries to choose their political system and their own foreign policy, we hope they will apply that here as well.

I think we've all seen indications that they are conflicted somewhat. That's not to say they don't see Russia as a partner.

I'm not naive. They do.

But they've also been public to say it is not an alliance.

And they certainly -- I think even in the meeting the other day

-- were horrified by what happened in Bucha. Who could not have

- 2777 been by seeing that video?
- 2778 So I think this is an ongoing circumstance and relationship.
- 2779 And we're going to have to keep working at it. Thank you for
- 2780 your question.
- 2781 Mr. Malinowski. [Presiding.] Thank you so much. Thank
- you, Madam Secretary. I'll just say in conclusion, thinking
- about Mr. Pfluger's question to you, are we safer?
- 2784 And it occurs to me that this contest that we're in with
- 2785 Russia over Ukraine did not begin in 2022. You could argue it
- 2786 began in 2014. The contest between the democratic and
- 2787 authoritarian world was underway in Syria ten years ago, in Hong
- 2788 Kong, in the South China Sea.
- We have not been safe for a very long time. But we are
- standing upright now with our allies, leading our allies, and
- demonstrating that without the United States, there would be very
- little hope for democracy in the world. So I'm very glad we did
- not listen to those who are saying we should pull out of NATO,
- we should pull our troops out of Asia, South Korea, and Japan,
- that we should pull our troops out of Europe. And that was a
- very, very close call.
- 2797 So thank you so much for your leadership, Secretary Blinken,
- and the President. Look forward to our next opportunity to have
- these discussions with you.
- 2800 And the hearing is now adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:06 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]