

Hearing Transcript

Senate Foreign Relations Committee Hearing on the Nomination of Gov. Haley to be U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations

January 18, 2017

CORKER:

The Foreign Relations Committee will come to order.

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

We have two very distinguished guests with us today from the state of South Carolina, Senator Lindsey Graham, Senator Tim Scott.

The way the order is going to work today, they will be introducing our outstanding nominee. They're going to say some brief comments. We're going to make some opening comments. As is the norm, I won't question at first; I'll save my time for interjections and we'll move directly to Senator Cardin.

But we welcome our nominee, we welcome our distinguished friends.

And with that, Lindsey, if you want to lead off we'd love to hear from you. It's a great honor to have you here in our committee.

GRAHAM:

Well, thank you. You're probably the only one who would say that.

(LAUGHTER)

I'm having a hard enough time staying on the committees that I'm actually assigned to, so I may drop by more often. John McCain would be real pleased to see me drop by here more often.

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

As to the U.N., I consider myself an internationalist. The chairman has been working on trying to deal with modern slavery. I think the U.N. is a body that can do a lot of good, but needs to be reformed. Most Americans are losing trust in the body. Twenty resolutions against Israel and six against the world at large is probably a body that needs to refocus on the world as it really is.

And I think Governor Haley will talk about her desire to stand up more forcefully for Israel. And I think it's time for America to stand up more forcefully for Israel in the U.N.

She'll talk about reform. I'm the chairman of the Foreign Operations Subcommittee on Appropriations with Senator Lee. We're in charge of the U.N.'s budget and the State Department's budget. And let me tell you a little bit about the body. PEPFAR and other programs that the U.N. administers has saved millions of lives. The new secretary-general, I had a long talk with him a couple of days ago, really encouraged by his vision for the United Nations. He was in charge of refugee programs throughout the world, so he understands the body, he's been out in the field.

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

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

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

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

Bottom line: America's voice in the United Nations needs to be strong. It needs to be somebody that can bring people together. It needs to be a voice that understands what America is all about. And I think Nikki Haley, our governor in South Carolina, is the right person at the right time. She represents a combination of intellect, determination, grace and an understanding of America that the world needs to hear.

I know that if she is the ambassador for our country to the United Nations, the United Nations will be better off and our country will be in good hands.

CORKER:

Thank you so much.

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

SCOTT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member and members of the committee. It certainly is a pleasure for me to be here introducing not only my governor, but my friend who I've gotten to know over many years.

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

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

(LAUGHTER)

And this year they were the number one team. They also are known as the Clemson Tigers and her daughter is a student at Clemson as well.

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

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

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

Under Governor Haley's leadership, South Carolina's unemployment rate hit a 15-year record low, new jobs in every single county in South Carolina, representing the greatest names in industry, from the Boeings of the world to expansions of the BMWs to the attraction of more investment from Michelin to Bridgestone. Nikki Haley during her term created over 82,000 jobs in South Carolina.

Nikki is also a champion of transparency and accountability in government, two things that I and many of us hope to see more of at the United Nations.

In 2015, as Lindsey has already mentioned, during some of the darkest hours our state has ever known, the Mother Emanuel massacre, Nikki Haley led not only as a governor, not only as a strong leader, but as a mother, as a human being that was impacted by such an atrocity. She led our state to come together with those types of leadership skills, bringing people together under the worst of times, under the most difficult conditions, is something that she specializes in. The United Nations will be better because Nikki Haley will be a part of it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CORKER:

Thank you both. I know that you have other business and you're welcome to go deal with that business. But we thank you for being here.

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

HALEY:

Thank you.

CORKER:

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

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

China is violating all kinds of international norms in the South China Sea, and yet the United Nations Security Council is unable to deal with that issue.

As a matter of fact, the United Nations Security Council has been unable to deal with the issues that it has agreed upon, its own resolutions, whether it's North Korea and the violations that are taking place and the halfhearted efforts that have taken place by members to really push and enforce strong sanctions.

In Iran, we have the same issue where an agreement has been reached, and yet Iran continues to violate, especially on ballistic missiles, something that, again, the United Nations Security Council had agreed to. And what's it done instead is continued to pursue anti-Semitic measures.

The Permanent Five have two members that actually are causing the world to be less stable, and that is Russia and China. So we've got a built-in issue here where any of those Permanent Five members can veto the actions of the rest and keep the United Nations from rightfully dealing with issues that need to be dealt with.

As a matter of fact, the gap between what the United Nations was meant to be and what it's become has never been wider at this moment in time. The U.S. is the largest contributor, 22 percent of the normal dues, we pay 29 percent of the peacekeeping dues or participation. We also give billions of dollars to other organizations that are affiliated. And yet, we see in the peacekeeping mission violations of sexual exploitation and abuse. And yet, again, it seems no real action.

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

While our former secretary-general, to me, in many cases, for me it was hard to determine if he even had a pulse when big issues were being dealt with by the world, I will say the new U.N. secretary-general, Guterres, seems to me to be somebody that really wants the United Nations to do what it was intended to do.

I had several very strong conversations with him over the last several days as the United Nations was dealing with some current business. And I have a feeling you're going to have a much better partner when confirmed to this position.

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

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

CARDIN:

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

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

HALEY:

Oh, it's my pleasure. Thank you.

CARDIN:

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

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

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

International institutions like the United Nations are under tremendous stress as the entire liberal international order of the last seven decades. The United Nations plays a vital role in the maintenance of the current international order, which has served the United States well since 1945.

As Ronald Reagan said, we must, in his own words, "determine that the U.N. should succeed and serve the cause of peace for humankind, for the stakes are high." I couldn't agree more with our former president. So we will need a strong, principled voice at the United Nations who is committed to reforming and strengthening it.

I firmly believe in a world where America works with our allies and partners, a world that is governed by just laws and institutions. A world where we champion our values both at home and abroad. And in many ways, the United Nations is the premier international forum to engage in such activities.

Much will be said about your experience today. And I am concerned, I must say, about your lack of foreign policy experience. And we'll talk a little bit more about that as we go through this hearing. One area where I was particularly impressed with your leadership was when you publicly called for the removal of the Confederate flag from South Carolina's state capitol, an effort that was ultimately successful. Your actions not only demonstrated your willingness to address hate and bigotry, but also your ability to build and work with coalitions, which will be critically important if confirmed to be our United Nations ambassador.

It is my hope that your shrewd political sensibility, history of coalition and consensus-building and desire to undertake new challenges will help you in the early weeks and months of your tenure should you be confirmed. If confirmed, you will lead the fight for American values at the United Nations by standing up against violations of international humanitarian laws, against war crimes, against human rights violations and against crackdowns on democracy and freedom of speech.

You will face complex challenges, like today's global humanitarian crisis. People are fleeing their homes on a scale not seen since World War II, all at a time when climate change, food insecurity and water scarcities are increasing tensions and instability across the globe. These are challenges that cut across borders, that the United States alone cannot meet. The United Nations is uniquely placed to address these problems, and we must engage it robustly to advance America's interests.

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

The United Nations has also launched the Sustainable Development Goals which, if fully embraced, could have a powerful impact globally on reducing human rights abuses, poverty and poor governance, in addition to reaching important benchmarks in women and children's health, economic development and education.

I was particularly proud to promote the U.S. leadership on goal number 16, which is special and unprecedented international commitment to improving governance and reducing corruption, which are critically important to U.S. national security interests. The SDGs as they are known are extraordinary and ambitious goals that can be achieved in concert with American diplomatic and development efforts. They represent among the best of what the United Nations can do as a convening power.

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

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

So let me share with you some areas where I hope we can work to reform and change the way the United Nations does its business. First, the United Nations must be fair. One of the persistent weaknesses across the U.N. system has been its biased and ugly approach to issues related to Israel. This must end. The responsibility for doing so starts with the members states and our ambassador, if confirmed, with your voice.

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

Second, Russia's cynical obstructionism in the United Nations Security Council must be addressed. I agree completely with Senator Corker. The war in Syria has resulted in more than 400,000 deaths and the displacement of millions. Russia has vetoed six U.N. Security Council resolutions

that could have reduced the violence, further exposing the vulnerability of the international system to Russia's aggression.

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

Third, U.N. peacekeeping must be strengthened. The United Nations peacekeepers deploy to conflicts around the world. And as a result, the United States doesn't have to do it alone. U.N. peacekeepers help end war, protect civilian populations and secure territory. But troop quality and effectiveness must be increased. And the United Nations must aggressively address sexual exploitation and abuse by U.N. peacekeepers. No other issues has so profoundly eroded the trust of local populations or the confidence of the international community.

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

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

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

South Sudan is a tragic example of the struggles in the U.N. and the international systems faced with corrupt, entrenched leaders who put their interests and lives ahead of the people with devastating results. Tens of thousands are dead, millions are being displaced or hungry and vulnerable. The Security Council members must resolve to use the U.N. as a platform and a voice to speak up for the people whose voices often go unheard, as well as those working hard on the front line.

We must do so not merely because it's the right thing to do. The United States has a profound moral obligation to lead on these issues, but also because it is squarely in our national interest to do this. The United States is better served when we address these issues through the United Nations than to face it alone.

For all of its shortcomings and, more importantly, for all the unsung good that it does, it's almost impossible to imagine a world without the U.N. For 70 years, it's where the world has come together to reaffirm norms and values and work through the most pressing, shared challenges facing humanity. Our national security is strengthened when we are at the table at the United

Nations and the United Nations is more effective when American leadership and values are on display.

In a time where the world is in turmoil, it is in the interest of the American people for the United States to support and maintain cultural alliances and institutions that create stability are more important today than ever before. We've already seen that instability and unrest bringing crisis to our own doors.

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

So let me just mention one last point. I was particularly disturbed by President-elect Trump's comments over the weekend about NATO as being obsolete, repeating a statement he had made earlier. Vladimir Putin wishes it were, but it's not. So I'm anxious to hear your views, Governor Haley, on NATO, on the importance of our alliances. We need to be reassuring our allies, not threatening to abandon them. With a strong and sustained U.S. leadership, the United Nations will continue to be the indispensable force for a better world. America's ambassador to the U.N. is essential to that effort.

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

HALEY:

Thank you.

CORKER:

Well, thank you, Senator Cardin.

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

I know you have a number of family members here. I've noticed members always treat nominees with much greater kindness when their family members are with them. If you'd like to introduce them, you're welcome to do so. We look forward to your opening comments and questions. Again, thank you for being willing to serve in this capacity.

HALEY:

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

I do have my family behind me because I've never been able to do anything without the support of my family. And so to my left, I have my favorite younger brother, Gogi Randhawa, who owns his own business and is an entrepreneur. I have my parents, Dr. and Mrs. Randhawa, who reminded my brothers, my sister and me every day how blessed we were to live in this country. I have my amazing husband, but also the coolest first man ever, but he is also a combat veteran, Michael is behind me. And next to him is one of my pride and joy kids and that's Nalin who is wearing a suit today, which he would prefer not wearing, but he does have his basketball shoes on.

(LAUGHTER)

So I pick and choose my battles as a mom. I have in my in-laws, Bill and Carol Haley, who have been an amazing support to me and a second set of parents to us as we've gone through struggles. And then I have my favorite older brother, Mitti Randhawa, who is also a combat veteran, and his wife, Sandra (ph). And then I have lots of friends behind them as well. And so I told them if I started to mess up, one of them needed to act like a protester. So we will see if that happens.

(LAUGHTER)

CORKER:

I think she's going to do very well at the United Nations

(LAUGHTER)

HALEY:

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

My story is an American story. I was born in Bamberg, South Carolina, the daughter of immigrant parents from Punjab, India. My parents had comfortable lives in India, but they chose to give up those comforts and move to America with just \$8 in their pockets, because of the freedoms and the opportunities this country offers. Our family's experience is unique, but it is also familiar because it is one that has been repeated many times by many people in American history.

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

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

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

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

While South Carolina will always be my home, I am eager to begin this new chapter. International diplomacy is a new area for me. There is much I am learning about the intricacies of the U.N. and its associated agencies. I don't claim that I know everything or that leadership at the U.N. is the same as leading South Carolina. But diplomacy itself is not new to me. In fact, I would suggest there is nothing more important to a governor's success than her ability to unite those with different backgrounds, viewpoints and objectives behind a common purpose. For six years that has been my work, day after day, in times of celebration and in times of great tragedy.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Nowhere has the U.N.'s failure been more consistent and more outrageous than in its bias against our close ally Israel. In the General Assembly session just completed, the U.N. adopted 20 resolutions against Israel and only six targeting the rest of the world's countries combined. In the past 10 years, the Human Rights Council has passed 62 resolutions condemning the reasonable actions Israel takes to defend its security. Meanwhile the world's worst human rights abusers in Syria, Iran and North Korea received far fewer condemnations. This cannot continue.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

After the passage of the infamous U.N. resolution equating Zionism with racism in 1975, U.S. Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan came to the unsettling realization that, as he put it, quote, "If there were no General Assembly, this could never have happened."

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

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

Some say we live in cynical and distrustful times. But I believe we all carry in our hearts a bit of idealism that animated the creation of the United Nations. I know I do. With your blessing, I will represent our great country in this international forum. I will do it in ways that I hope bring honor to our country, our values and our national interests.

Thank you very much for your time.

CORKER:

Thank you for those comments. We'll begin a seven- minute round including answers from the nominee. And we'll start with Senator Cardin and go to Senator Johnson.

CARDIN:

Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor Haley, first of all, thank you for your presentation. I find it very encouraging, very refreshing. You have hit points that I strongly agree with about being -- you say it's a clear understanding that it's not acceptable to stay silent when our values are challenged. You've indicated that to me when we were together in my office. Your point about America being the indispensable voice about freedom. So I'm very encouraged by your statements, so let me get specific, if I might, and talk a little bit about Russia.

Russia certainly has not been a voice for freedom under President Putin. A free country has free and fair elections and doesn't interfere with other countries' free and fair elections. Russia has not only interfered with our elections, they're interfering with other elections, including in Europe.

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

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

So my first question to you, speaking -- when you say that you will -- that staying silent is not an option, speak to me about Mr. Putin and Russia.

HALEY:

Well, thank you, Senator Cardin, for that question. And I think that Russia is going to continue to be at the forefront of a lot of issues that we have to deal with. What I will tell you is Russia is trying to show their muscle right now. It is what they do. And I think we always have to be cautious. I don't think that we can trust them.

I think that we have to make sure that we try and see what we can get from them before we give to them. They certainly have done some terrible atrocities when you look at things in Syria and how they are working with Iran. And I think that we have to continue to be very strong back and show them what this new administration is going to be. And it is going to be an America that shows exactly where we stand, what we are for, what we are against and how we're going to proceed.

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

CARDIN:

Does Russia have legitimacy in Crimea?

HALEY:

I don't think that -- I think what we saw with Crimea and Ukraine is a big concern because I think it is Russia trying to make sure that they are inserting themselves in places that they want to continue to insert themselves. The problem there is no boundaries with Russia. They don't have boundaries. They consider that whatever they want they will. It's the same thing with NATO. They don't want to see NATO become stronger or more powerful.

CARDIN:

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

HALEY:

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

CARDIN:

And talk to me a little bit about -- we have sanctions current against Russia?

HALEY:

We do.

CARDIN:

We've been able to get Europe to go along with those sanctions.

HALEY:

Yes.

CARDIN:

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

HALEY:

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

CARDIN:

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

HALEY:

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

CARDIN:

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

HALEY:

I'm sorry, I missed the first part of that question.

CARDIN:

President Duterte of the Philippines has sanctioned...

HALEY:

Yes.

CARDIN:

... extrajudicial killings.

HALEY:

Right.

CARDIN:

Does that violate basic human rights.

HALEY:

It does, yes.

CARDIN:

And you're prepared to speak up about that in the United Nations?

HALEY:

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

CARDIN:

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

HALEY:

Absolutely. I think that's who we are as Americans. And I think that's what we need to do to make sure that we continue to fight corruption because if we fight corruption we will move closer to peace.

CARDIN:

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

HALEY:

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

CARDIN:

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

HALEY:

No, there is not.

CARDIN:

Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CORKER:

Thank you.

Senator Johnson.

HALEY:

Thank you, Senator.

JOHNSON:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HALEY:

Good morning.

JOHNSON:

Governor Haley, welcome.

HALEY:

Thank you.

JOHNSON:

I want to thank you for your willingness to serve. I have testimony from your state senators and in outlining your own testimony here you've been a very effective leader in South Carolina, so you're obviously going to be leaving a state you love, a job you've performed well in, taking on a pretty significant challenge.

It's striking, quite honestly, to listen to the chairman lay out point by point how ineffective the U.N. has been, how Ranking Member Cardin says that the U.N. must change. It must be fair and people must be held accountable. In your testimony, you point out going back 40 years, then Ambassador Daniel Patrick Moynihan said if there were no General Assembly this could never happen. So you're taking on a challenge here to reform a U.N. that has been unreformable. Do you have a game plan for doing so?

HALEY:

It is what I have done all my life. I love to fix things. And I see a U.N. that can absolutely be fixed. There are reforms that need to be taking place in a lot of different areas. There are things that the U.N. does well, and we talked about the food and health organizations, what they've done with the AIDS epidemic, all those things have been very good. But we do have to look at certain issues.

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

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

So I see peacekeeping reform from the standpoint of not just those issues, also when it comes to the whistleblower issues. We've seen fraud, we've seen sexual exploitation, we've seen corruption of all kinds. And the whistleblower protections are not strong enough. People are still too afraid to speak up. We need to make sure that the countries that are contributing troops hold those troops accountable when they go and they make these violations. That's not happening. And they need to understand that if we have to pull out their country's troops altogether we will do that, because many of those countries actually make money off of the peacekeeping missions.

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

JOHNSON:

So to a certain extent, what you're describing is shining light on these situations, sexual exploitation, highlighting that to, you know, hopefully effect change and reform.

In testimony, you also talked about leverage and that would be the funding the U.S. provides. Would you have a particular game plan in terms of how we would use U.S. funding to the U.N. to gain that leverage to actually enact some reforms that, again, they've been pretty hard to enact over the last 40 years?

HALEY:

Absolutely. I think that we need to go into every part of the organizations of the U.N., but one in particular is you can look at the Human Rights Council. And you have to really question, what is the goal of the Human Rights Council when they allow Cuba and China to serve on those? They basically are protecting their own interests while they're going after other countries to make sure that they give them a hard time.

And so, do we want to be a part of that? Do we want to leverage funding for that and say we don't want to do that? We've done that with UNESCO before. And we've also, you know, we've got decisions to make on those types of organizations. And so I do think it can be leveraged and I do think it's something that we should be open about and it's something I look forward to exploring further.

JOHNSON:

So you won't shy away from threatening and actually enacting withholding U.S. funding to get real reforms out of the U.N.?

HALEY:

I won't shy away and I need your help to do it because I need to be able to say that I have Congress backing me up, saying that if this doesn't change the funding will stop. And I think that that could be great leverage.

JOHNSON:

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

HALEY:

I have given it a lot of thought and I think it's going to take time and I think it's going to take effort by more than just me. First, we need to go and make sure that we let Israel know that we are an ally and that we will be an ally. And it is important because what happened with Resolution 2334, it basically said that being an ally to the United States doesn't mean anything. And if we are a strong ally, if we always stand with them, more countries will want to be our allies. And those that challenge us will think twice before they challenge us.

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

And it won't just be me. It needs to be from this Congress, it needs to be from the National Security Council, it needs to be from the president-elect and we need to speak with one voice.

JOHNSON:

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

Certainly saw the consulate there in Jerusalem. Have you taken a position, would you support moving the embassy from Tel Aviv into that consulate? It's really just a matter of changing a sign. Is that something you -- would that be one of the actions we could take to repair the damage of that resolution?

HALEY:

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

JOHNSON:

So we've talked about U.N. reforms, we've talked about repairing the damage of that U.N. resolution. What other priorities, moving into this position, would you really concentrate on?

HALEY:

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

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

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

JOHNSON:

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

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HALEY:

Thank you, Senator.

CORKER:

Thank you.

Senator Menendez.

MENENDEZ:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor Haley, congratulations on your nomination.

HALEY:

Thank you, good morning.

MENENDEZ:

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

HALEY:

Thank you.

MENENDEZ:

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

So with that in mind I'd like to ask you a broad set of questions. I think some of these can be yes or no, others may require a little bit more of an answer, and then move to some specific areas.

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

HALEY:

In terms of?

MENENDEZ:

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

HALEY:

Yes, sir, I do.

MENENDEZ:

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

HALEY:

I think that -- are you referencing Israel and the Palestinian Authority or are you...

MENENDEZ:

No, I'm just saying, in general, as part of the rules-based order, do you believe that the inviolability of borders or a nation and its territorial sovereignty is an essential element of that?

HALEY:

I do.

MENENDEZ:

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

HALEY:

Again, I believe it's up to the circumstance, but yes.

MENENDEZ:

OK. So when you say up to the circumstance, what circumstances of violations of the international order would you believe there aren't serious consequences for and which ones should there be serious consequences for?

HALEY:

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

MENENDEZ:

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

HALEY:

Yes, I do.

MENENDEZ:

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

HALEY:

I think there should be consequences that we say. But if we're going to do that, we need to follow through on them and make sure they happen.

MENENDEZ:

I agree with you we should always follow through. But you do believe there should be serious consequences for violating them?

HALEY:

Yes.

MENENDEZ:

So in that regard, we have a series of sanctions that have been levied against Russia. Many members of this committee and others in a bipartisan basis have been promoting a new round of sanctions because of what they have continued to do in that regard, what they have done in Syria, what they have done in trying to interfere in our own domestic elections. And my question to you is, do you believe that those sanctions that are there should be preserved until there is a dramatic change by Russia? Do you believe that they should be enhanced knowing what we know today, forgetting about what may happen tomorrow? What is your view on sanctions as it relates to Russia?

HALEY:

I certainly think they should be preserved. And I don't think they should be lifted unless we've seen a strong change from the Russian government.

MENENDEZ:

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

HALEY:

Yes, I do.

MENENDEZ:

Let me ask you this. When you saw with the president- elect, I assume that in taking this role that has a global magnitude to it, you had some discussions about what the role would be like and whatnot. Did you discuss Russia with him?

HALEY:

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

MENENDEZ:

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

HALEY:

Russia came up, yes, it did just from the standpoint of that we were going to have issues with Russia.

MENENDEZ:

Uh-huh. No greater specificity than that?

HALEY:

No, sir, there wasn't.

MENENDEZ:

Did you discuss China?

HALEY:

Yes, we did.

MENENDEZ:

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

HALEY:

The same thing, just it was more about the issues that we had and the countries we were going to have them with, but it didn't go into detail as to what those were going to be.

MENENDEZ:

These two countries obviously are Security Council members.

HALEY:

Yes, they are.

MENENDEZ:

And part of your challenge is getting them not to be using their vetoes in ways that actually have undermined, in my view, the international order versus promote it.

You know, I totally agree with you when in your opening statement you said U.S. leadership is essential in the world, essential for the advancement of humanitarian goals, advancement of America's national interests. And when we fail to lead, the world becomes a more dangerous place. But I read some of the president-elect's comments that seem nothing short of denigrating towards our international commitments and international organizations like the U.N. I could read a litany of tweets, but I'll just choose two. "When do you see the United Nations solving problems? They don't, they cause problems." Then at the flip-side of that, he says, "China is filling the vacuum left by Obama at the U.N." So it's either an entity that is worthy of being used to help promote U.S. national interests and security interests or it's not. And if you're worried about, quote, unquote, "China filling the vacuum," it's because there's something worthwhile to pursue if you don't care about losing and having a vacuum filled if the entity is of no value.

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

HALEY:

I have talked to the president-elect about that. And when this position came up, he said that he wanted me to have a very strong voice in the U.N. and he wanted us to have a higher profile in the U.N. and to really use it to work. And so I do think that obviously, you know, any comments that the president-elect has made, those are his comments.

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

The other side of that is we still need both those countries. We're going to need their help. We need China's help when it comes to North Korea. We need Russia's help when it comes to ISIS. We've got to find ways to let them know when we disagree with them, we should not be afraid to say when we disagree with them. When we need to work with them, we should tell them exactly what the end goal is and how we need to work with them. And the way we will get those vetoes not to happen is to show how it's in their best interests for their country to make sure they do that.

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

MENENDEZ:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CORKER:

Thank you.

HALEY:

Thank you.

CORKER:

Senator Gardner.

GARDNER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Governor Haley, for your willingness to serve.

HALEY:

Thank you.

GARDNER:

And thank you to your family for being here today. And thank you for your leadership during a time of shame in this country and tragedy in South Carolina. You made America proud for your actions, so thank you.

HALEY:

Thank you. Thank you very much.

GARDNER:

Last week, we had an opportunity to hear from Rex Tillerson, nominee for secretary of state, to talk about the importance of U.S. global leadership. We had a great interaction about the need for the U.S. to share our values around the globe because nobody else will do it. In his testimony, he talked about security, he talked about liberty, he talked about prosperity and the great need to share those values because, in his words, he said, quote, "We are the only country able to project those values with authority."

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

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

The United Nations recently, as we've talked about here, passage of Resolution 2334, and I encourage everybody here to watch the video of the reaction of the Security Council after the United States abstained from our leadership. Raucous applause broke out in the Security Council.

Contrast that with the passage of Resolution 2270 at the Security Council, passage of a sanction against North Korea that has hundreds of thousands of people in political concentration camps, killing its own people, torturing its own people, starving its own people, and there was silence.

The world apparently applauds when we attack our ally, but sits by silently when we condemn dictators.

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

HALEY:

You know, I think that so much of this goes back to the fact that the world has seen us gray. They haven't seen a black-and- white of where we stand and where we don't stand. We need to stand and we need to stand strong. The world wants to see a strong America. That's what they were used to. That has faded. And it hit the ultimate low with Resolution 2334, because when it shows that we won't even stand with our allies, that's a sad day in America and it's a sad day for us in the world.

I do think that what we will now start to do is show our strength, we will not be afraid to stand up. When we decide to make an action, we're going to follow through with it and we're going to make sure that that's known.

And I don't think we will be shy about the values of America and about what we're trying to achieve in bringing peace to the world. And we have to be loud and strong about that and I intend to do that.

GARDNER:

Thank you, Governor Haley. And we've talked about the importance of projecting that strength and leadership.

HALEY:

Yes.

GARDNER:

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

HALEY:

Absolutely. We need as many allies and alliances as we can possibly get. And at this point it is a numbers game, it is about addition, because if we go and do sanctions, sanctions just by the U.S. doesn't work. Sanctions when we combine and work with alliances, that makes progress. And so, so much of what I look forward to doing is not just expressing the ideals of the United States and where we stand and the agreements and disagreements that we have, it's also building coalitions so that we look so strong everyone wants to be our ally.

GARDNER:

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

HALEY:

You should ask the people of my general assembly in South Carolina. I have no problem calling people out.

GARDNER:

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

In 2016, the Obama administration led and helped with those two security resolutions through addressing North Korea. Have we effectively enforced the North Korea sanctions, enforced sanctions on North Korea? We effectively made sure that they are effective as well as United Nations sanctions, the 2270 Resolution. Have they been effectively enforced?

HALEY:

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

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

GARDNER:

And what should we do with China in order to get them more active in enforcing the sanctions against North Korea and their ability to help denuclearize the North Korean regime?

HALEY:

I think that North Korea has started to do that themselves because China is now nervous. And China has already started to pull back economically. And China has the greatest threat to North Korea and they know that. And so what we have to do is let China know this affects China, this affects their region of the world, this affects us, not talk about it from our results and what it will do to the United States, talk about it in terms of China and really encourage them to say you are the one that can make a difference here. And I think that we just push them in that direction.

GARDNER:

Thank you.

Thanks.

HALEY:

Thank you.

CORKER:

Absolutely.

Senator Shaheen.

SHAHEEN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Governor Haley, congratulations on your nomination.

HALEY:

Good morning. Thank you very much.

SHAHEEN:

Thank you for spending some time with me yesterday.

HALEY:

I enjoyed it, thank you.

SHAHEEN:

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

HALEY:

Thank you.

SHAHEEN:

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

But I have to say that, unfortunately, as strong as I believe our ambassador to the U.N. can be, the president's words are often taken with much more weight. And I am disturbed by some of the president-elect's comments that are different than those positions you have enunciated here about the institutions that the United States helped created after World War II, about the U.N. He recently called it in a tweet "just a club for people to get together and talk and have a good time." In interviews this weekend, he criticized NATO. He was amazingly nonchalant about the future of the European Union and the Transatlantic Alliance. And I see the potential for real negative consequences because of that failure to recognize those institutions that have helped promote the security of the United States and have helped us as we've tried to lead in the world.

So I appreciate that you have said that you have the ear of the president and that you will be part of the national security apparatus. I think that's very important. But how will you avoid the conflict

between your efforts at the U.N. and the Security Council and the president-elect's tweets, the positions that he's taken on many of the issues that will come before the United Nations?

HALEY:

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

And so his comments are really coming from the fact that he does have a fresh set of eyes, he is looking at those things. But my job is not just at the U.N. My job is to come back to the National Security Council and let them know what I know, which is I want to bring back faith to the U.N. I want to show that we can be a strong voice in the U.N. I want to show that we can make progress and have action in the U.N. That's going to happen from my actions and from the things that I do. And that's how I will show him that the U.N. matters.

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

SHAHEEN:

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

HALEY:

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

SHAHEEN:

It's not a very good way to relate to Angela Merkel.

HALEY:

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

SHAHEEN:

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

HALEY:

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

SHAHEEN:

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

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

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

HALEY:

I will support any efforts that help educate, help plan, help let them know what contraceptions are in place so that we can avoid any other further action. I am strongly pro-life and so anything that we can do to keep from having abortions or to keep them from not knowing what is available I will absolutely support.

SHAHEEN:

Well, I very much appreciate that because I think sometimes the idea of access to family planning services is conflated with abortion and it's a very different issue. And this is a way to avoid abortions, unplanned pregnancies.

HALEY:

That's exactly right.

SHAHEEN:

So thank you very much for that comment.

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

CORKER:

Very briefly.

HALEY:

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

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

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

SHAHEEN:

Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CORKER:

Thank you.

HALEY:

Thank you.

CORKER:

Before moving to Senator Young, Senator Rubio asked me a question a minute ago. I know that this has nothing to do with today's hearing, but a lot of committees swear nominees and witnesses in and have them stand up and do that, and some don't. Whether they do that or not, they're bound by exactly the same obligations to Congress in that you have to tell the truth when you're in front of a committee. I know it came up relative to the last hearing we had and I just wanted to make sure everyone understood that.

Senator Young.

YOUNG:

Thank you, Chairman.

And thank you, Governor...

HALEY:

Good morning.

YOUNG:

... good morning, for your service in the past and your interest in continuing to serve.

HALEY:

Thank you.

YOUNG:

Article One, Section Eight of the Constitution grants to Congress the power to declare war. Going to war, of course, is one of the most serious decisions a nation can make. And the Founders explicitly gave that authority to make the decision to the American people through their elected representatives. The U.S. hasn't declared war since World War II and instead periodically relied on authorizations of the use of military force.

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

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

So I know Senator Kaine has actively engaged on this issue. Others have been involved in this fight for some time. I understand the details and wording matter of such an authorization or declaration as it were. I just want to go on the record early and clearly here in the Senate that I am in favor of Congress showing courage and exercising its constitutional responsibility with respect to an AUMF focused on ISIS.

Do you believe, with that long lead-in, that Congress should pass an AUMF, an authority for the use of military force against ISIS?

HALEY:

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

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

YOUNG:

OK. I wanted to see how you thought through that issue. I agree with measurables. That takes me to another topic. With the understanding that we can't defeat or take on the world's ills through hard power alone...

HALEY:

Agreed.

YOUNG:

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

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

HALEY:

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

YOUNG:

How will you divine what that one voice is? Will it be based on legislative sort of resolutions coming out of Congress and legislation signed into law by the president, directives of the executive branch that you'll take with you to the United Nations, is that how you'll determine what that voice is that you should echo?

HALEY:

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

YOUNG:

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

HALEY:

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

YOUNG:

Are there any incremental success measures, public opinion, polling, surveys, those come to mind for me. But I'm sure there are probably some other sophisticated tools.

HALEY:

It's hard to find anyone in America today that does not understand the threat of ISIS.

YOUNG:

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

HALEY:

Absolutely.

YOUNG:

I don't think we remind the American people and the international community frequently enough that a genocide has occurred here. Would you agree the U.N. Security Council has failed with respect to the Assad regime and the catastrophe in Syria, yes or no?

HALEY:

Yes.

YOUNG:

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

HALEY:

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

YOUNG:

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

HALEY:

Yes, I do.

YOUNG:

All right, thank you.

CORKER:

Thank you.

If I could, I can't let this pass. It would be my observation, and everybody has their own, that the AUMF issue has nothing whatsoever to do with courage, nothing. That if there was an authorization for the use of force that gave the president all means to fight ISIS and that was it, and it was, like, 12 words, you'd have, like, 11 votes. And if you had one that said he can use all means, but you can't do this, you can't do this, you can't do this, and you can only go into X countries, it would have 10 votes. And so the fact is that there's a divide. And we have an authorization that is legal, that everybody who has come before our committee has said is legal. And at a time when we did not want to show division, as it related to ISIS, it just seemed it was better, instead of getting to a hung place here, it was better to stand behind what most people believe to be a perfectly legal basis upon which to fight ISIS.

But I'm more than willing to take it up. There is a divide about whether the commander in chief should have all means available to him to fight ISIS. It's a philosophical divide. And I would just say one more time and say it strongly, it has nothing whatsoever to do with courage.

CARDIN:

Could I, Mr. Chairman?

CORKER:

Yes.

CORKER:

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

CORKER:

Yeah, there is. And, you know, the administration has made their point. I happen to have agreed with that point. I so want to say that Senator Kaine and Senator Flake have brought this issue up several times. I am more than willing to engage in a discussion. I just think that when you're going to authorize the president to do something, it's best for Congress not to micromanage what is being authorized in that regard. There's disagreement there and that's something that we might flesh out. But I just want to say one more time the courage issue hits a nerve, nothing whatsoever.

As a matter of fact, sometimes it takes courage to do the things that make sure that people see our country as being unified and not divided over something that I know we're unified on. Everybody on this panel wants to see us defeat ISIS. There are some issues we may want to resolve, but we're unified in that regard. And showing division is not something that I feel is particularly good for our country to do at this time. But I'm more than willing to debate it. You might want to say one other thing.

YOUNG:

Yes, to the extent I offended or impugned the courage of any of my colleagues, I, of course, want to go on record and say that wasn't the intent. But I do think that we'll have to lay into this issue, continue to very publicly exchange views on it. And I do think that that requires courage because it's an uncomfortable topic to broach. So thank you. With that, I yield back.

CORKER:

Thank you so much.

Senator Udall.

UDALL:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

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

HALEY:

Thank you.

UDALL:

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

The most discouraging is that he has insinuated or allowed the perception that the United States will no longer take a leadership role. And you're saying today, I think, that you're going to assert that role. That he would have cut off funding and would end our participation and important aspects of the U.N., this is not a formula for success. U.S. leadership is paramount. If we left a political

vacuum, it would likely be filled by countries that might not necessarily share our interests, such as Russia and China.

I hope that I am mistaken, and I hope you will be an advocate for U.S. participation in the United Nations. And I believe you've stated that here today.

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

HALEY:

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

UDALL:

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

HALEY:

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

UDALL:

And it sounds like you're going to stand strong and tough on this.

HALEY:

Without question.

UDALL:

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

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

HALEY:

I think that the climate change situation should always be on the table. It should always be one of the issues that we look at. But I do think that when we look at the Paris agreement, we should acknowledge what we do believe is right, but we don't want to do it at the peril of our industries and our businesses along the way.

As governor of South Carolina, what you would see is we'd work really hard to recruit a company from another country and then by the time they saw the regulations and the burdens that were put down on them, they started to pull back. We don't ever want it to interfere with our economy, but I absolutely think that climate change should always be on the table as one of the factors that we talk about.

UDALL:

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

HALEY:

I think that we want to work on the things that we believe work and benefit the world and the United States. But if we do see burdens that are costing our businesses, then I do think that that's something that I wouldn't agree with.

UDALL:

Well, are you committed to stay a part of the Paris agreement and work towards climate change objectives and goals?

HALEY:

Climate change will always be on the table for me.

UDALL:

Now, we talked earlier about U.N. Resolution 2334. this was a resolution about Israeli settlements. These settlements have been greatly expanded in recent years. The settlement dispute goes way, way back many, many years. In fact, Ronald Reagan said in 1982, and this is his statement, "The United States will not support the use of any additional land for the purpose of settlements during the transitional period. Indeed, the immediate adoption of a settlement freeze by Israel, more than any other action, could create the confidence needed for wider participation in these talks."

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

HALEY:

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

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

UDALL:

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

HALEY:

I understand...

UDALL:

... the U.N., the bipartisan policy our country has taken on settlements?

HALEY:

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

UDALL:

But the question is, are you committed to the bipartisan policy on settlements?

HALEY:

Yes, I am.

UDALL:

And the expansion of settlements. Thank you very much.

CORKER:

Thank you.

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

HALEY:

Yes, thank you.

UDALL:

Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman? The statement, and I'd like to put the full statement of our U.N. Ambassador Samantha Powers in the record at this point, she said specifically what you have said, the United States supports the two-state solution, many of the things that our ambassadorial designates say here. But the issue of the resolution, the issue of the resolution was about an expanded settlement policy and she has committed to stand with that bipartisan policy which I believe you answered the question yes when I said, are you going to stand with the bipartisan policy that has not only this administration, but every administration since President Johnson has supported on the expansion of settlements.

HALEY:

And I want to clarify because I don't want there to be any gray in this. What I think happened with 2334 was a kick in the gut to everyone. And so we can think what we want to think on settlements, but you have to go back to the fact that the U.S. abstention, when that has not happened since 2011 at all, against Israel was wrong. And I think the fact that we have not allowed the Palestinian Authority and Israel to resolve this themselves is wrong. And I think for the U.N. to have inserted themselves into that I believe is wrong. So I want to make sure that I'm clear on record as to saying what I think about Resolution 2334.

CORKER:

Appreciate it. I think there may be some factual dispute about your last statement. I think we had some discussion about that in committee. I just want to -- I don't want to leave that last statement hanging without a retort.

And with that, Senator Flake.

FLAKE:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HALEY:

Good morning.

FLAKE:

Good morning. Thank you for your testimony. Thanks for coming to my office and the visits that you've made. And appreciate also your family, great to have them here.

HALEY:

My pleasure, thank you.

FLAKE:

And appreciate the sacrifices they have made in the past for your public service and will make in the future, as well as the military service for our country.

I've seen examples of the U.N. working well and, obviously, seen examples of dysfunction. I happened to spend a year of my life, and my family, we went to the country of Namibia in 1989 to see U.N. Security Council Resolution 435 be implemented April of '89 to April of '90 and watched where the U.N. can work and work well. That was a process by which Namibia achieved its independence from South Africa. That resolution was passed a decade earlier, but it was finally implemented then. And Namibia is a fine democracy today, much owing to the United Nations and the role that the Security Council resolution played there.

And so I've seen it work, but also you've mentioned in your testimony many examples of the dysfunction. A lot of that has to do with the General Assembly or UNESCO and other organizations, but also plenty of dysfunction with the Security Council, and the failure, as has been mentioned, to take a position and take a state with regard to Syria will, I think, be judged harshly by history.

But let me talk just a bit about peacekeeping. We've seen examples there where peacekeeping has worked as well. U.N. peacekeeping forces along the Golan Heights, for example, for years kept the peace there.

A lot of peacekeeping now is done obviously in the continent of Africa. I have a particular interest, obviously, there. The U.S. contributes \$2.6 billion in peacekeeping activities. That's about 28 percent. Of the entire U.N. budget, it's about 22, but peacekeeping, as you know, it's even more of a disproportionate number. The next- highest is China with just 10 percent.

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

That is not going well. What can we do to make the situation better there? That's a particular focus of our peacekeeping activities.

HALEY:

With South Sudan?

FLAKE:

Yes.

HALEY:

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

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

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

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

FLAKE:

You mentioned 16 peacekeeping operations, nine of those are in Africa.

HALEY:

Yes, they are.

FLAKE:

The last six that have been approved by the Security Council are in Africa as well. And I'm happy to hear that you're going to delve in and see how we're doing with those.

What other metrics can be used? I know Senator Young mentioned that in terms of whether or not we're getting the bang for the buck out of our involvement.

HALEY:

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

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

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

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

FLAKE:

Well, thank you. I'm glad to hear you acknowledge the problems that we've had with these peacekeeping missions, to see the sexual abuse and whatnot going on there is just devastating.

HALEY:

It is.

FLAKE:

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

HALEY:

Thank you very much.

CORKER:

Thank you.

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

Senator Murphy.

MURPHY:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Governor Haley, for being willing to serve. Thank you for your history of speaking truth to power. I enjoyed the time we spent together discussing some of the issues you're going to face. Appreciate you being here before the committee.

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

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

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

I hear what you're saying, but can you understand why the world perceives the foreign policy to be the exact opposite of what you're articulating it will be?

HALEY:

I understand that any time there's a new administration there is always nervousness and there's always concern. It happened with President Obama, it's happened with presidents before that. That is something that is just natural. It's natural to the world to all watch the United States because we are such a leader, to see who is going to follow it. It's also natural for a candidate or an incoming president to look at everything and to say things. Once you govern it becomes very different.

And I think that what we have seen is that once the president- elect gets to hear from his national security team, I think what he says after that will be most important. And I think those are the focuses that we are going to have with the National Security Council and making sure that we educate, inform him of what we know, inform him of strategies and then go along with whatever decision he decides to make.

MURPHY:

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

HALEY:

Not all of it will change after Friday. But what I know is I'm going to control the part that I can. And what I can control is the U.N. And so I'm going to use the power of my voice in the U.N. to talk about America's ideals and our values and our strength and our freedoms. I'm going to talk to the president-elect about the U.N. and the opportunities for strategy in dealing with Russia and China and North Korea and Syria as we go forward. And I think that we are going to have a lot of opportunities to make that better.

And I do think that my counterparts as well are going to inform the president-elect on what they're seeing. And so, you know, that's how an administration works. You surround yourself with people who don't just say yes to what you think, they actually challenge you and they tell you of other opinions. And what I know about the president- elect is he actually will listen.

MURPHY:

Let me ask you about the future of the U.N. You've a lot of Democrats in South Carolina that don't get what they want all the time from the state legislature and from their governor. And so would you advise Democrats in the state legislature in the South Carolina to boycott the state legislature if they don't get what they want or for registered Democrats in South Carolina to stop paying their taxes if they don't get what they want from the state government?

HALEY:

Well, we have laws in place, so they can't just stop paying their taxes or they will deal with that. Legislators have been known to do whatever they want. And as governor, I've seen that happen. So it's two totally different things.

MURPHY:

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

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

And so I guess my question is, you're suggesting that we should pull funding from the United States if we don't win votes in the General Assembly.

HALEY:

I've never suggested that, sir. And if that's the way you took it, then that was not what I intended to say. I do not think we need to pull money from the U.N. We don't believe in flash-and-burn. It wasn't anything I considered as governor. It's not something I would consider as ambassador or anything that I would suggest back to you for Congress.

I think that what's important is we look at every organization, see if it's working for us, see if it's something we want to be a part of, and then I report back to you as well as to the president-elect on whether that's something we need to be a part of.

I know that he had made comments about the U.N., but those are not my feelings. And I don't think that's what's going to happen.

MURPHY:

I really thank you for that answer. I think it's a really important answer. And so I want to just maybe ask you to make that answer a little bit clearer. So you don't believe that we should be threatening to pull funds based on outcomes in the General Assembly that we don't agree with. You would pull funds if you don't think that programs are effective, but you wouldn't threaten to pull funds because we don't get the outcome that we want from the deliberative process.

HALEY:

Right. My job is to make sure that we work to figure out how we get the outcomes and to negotiate and to make sure that I'm working with those leaders in doing that. If, for example, we see in the Human Rights Council that Cuba is there and China is there and we're not seeing the human rights move in a way that America's values are supposed to, yes, I'm going to come back to you and I'm going to say this is a real problem, this doesn't follow our mission. I may go there and find out that there's a way to resolve that. And so with those, I'll come back to you. But no, I do not think we should have a slash-and-burn of the U.N.

MURPHY:

I appreciate that. I'll just note that since rejoining the Human Rights Council, we were out of it from 2007 to 2009, once we rejoined, special sessions on Israel dropped by 50 percent and

resolutions on Israel dropped by 30 percent. So engagement in these forums do matter. And I really appreciate your answer to the questions.

HALEY:

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

MURPHY:

Thank you very much.

CORKER:

Very good. Thank you.

Senator Portman.

PORTMAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And welcome to you and your family.

HALEY:

Thank you, good morning.

PORTMAN:

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

I was once a member of the U.N. Human Rights Subcommittee after the first Bush administration and after I left that administration, during that administration I served, and it was a very interesting experience. You know, you had some positives, which is talking about human rights. You also had some negatives, which is that human rights abusers used it for their own political purposes. And so I do think, in response to your question to Senator Murphy, that the opportunity for reform is obvious. And when all of our taxpayers are paying roughly 22 percent of the budget, I think they do expect to see a more efficient and an organization that's more objective and more in keeping with our values and, again, the values that so many other countries seek as well when they look at America's story that you represent.

We've talked about a lot of issues today. My view is that we're in a more dangerous and volatile world, in part because America has not led. And if you look at what's happening on the eastern border of Ukraine or with Crimea or in the South China Sea today or certainly what's happening Syria, you know, part of this is a lack of leadership. And I do think that you also see a crumbling of the very foundation of the post-World War II, U.S.-led security umbrella that has kept the peace.

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

HALEY:

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

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

PORTMAN:

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

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

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

HALEY:

Well, first of all, very proud to say as governor of South Carolina that we were the first state in the country to pass an anti-BDS law in our state. And so that was trying to really make the point of how important we think it is. I think as we go to the U.N., that is a point that has to be made. We have to look at the fact and call out the fact, why is it that the Security Council is so concerned with Israel? It is an obsession that they have with Israel where they don't have with North Korea, where they don't have with Syria, where they don't have with other things that are going on.

And so it is up to us to talk about the fact that you can't have boycotts against a country that is just trying to protect its people. And I think that you are finding an authority, not a state that is actually leading the charge on this. And I think that that's wrong. And I think that we're going to have to continue to really be more aggressive, call them out, let them know what's wrong and then find out what their answers are because there is no good, fair, honest answer on why they continue to pick on Israel and why they continue to allow these things to happen.

PORTMAN:

Let me talk briefly about the broader issue of Russia, China, other countries using disinformation and propaganda. There's been a lot of discussion about them meddling in our election here, which is a great concern of all of us. Publicly, I've heard the U.K. and Germany both express concerns even recently on this topic. Certainly when I travel in Eastern Europe, every country in the region is very concerned about this issue of disinformation and specifically the effort to meddle in democracies, fledgling democracies.

I wonder in your role as ambassador what you would intend to do about that. There's this new Global Engagement Center that's been set up at the State Department. Senator Murphy and I worked on legislation that was passed as part of the National Defense Authorization Bill to establish this. I think the U.S. is asleep at the switch. I think we have not kept up with the counter efforts that have come our way and to our allies specifically with regard to technology and being online. Can you comment on that and what you're willing to do as ambassador to push back against this campaign of disinformation that's being waged by some countries?

HALEY:

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

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

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

PORTMAN:

Thank you, Governor.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

HALEY:

Thank you, Senator.

CORKER:

Thank you, Senator.

Senator Booker.

BOOKER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor, it's very good to see you here. And I want to just thank you for bringing your family here. You add a proud level of diversity to the leadership of our country and I think it's needed. And I think your record is something in South Carolina that there are many aspects of it that I celebrate, particularly what I think you showed, especially in the wake of a horrific shooting, you showed grace and dignity dealing with the tragedy. And then you showed tremendous courage in removing the Confederate flag from the statehouse. And I've been in state of gratitude about that in particular, so thank you very much for showing a strength of leadership during very, very difficult times.

HALEY:

Thank you.

BOOKER:

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

HALEY:

So you're just here to say nice things about me.

(LAUGHTER)

BOOKER:

Touche, governor.

(LAUGHTER)

Let me just -- forgive me if some of these questions may have been covered before.

HALEY:

Understood.

BOOKER:

All right. So, Governor Haley, do you support a two- state solution?

HALEY:

I do.

BOOKER:

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

HALEY:

Yes. I mean, I think that we need to do whatever we can to protect the region. And I think that we need to make sure that we're doing all we can to go against the threats.

BOOKER:

Yes. And I'm grateful for your very strong, steadfast statements in terms of the support of Israel and pointing out what even a former U.N. secretary-general has pointed out about the biased nature of the U.N. against Israel.

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

HALEY:

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

BOOKER:

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

HALEY:

You know, I haven't had anyone talk to me about cutting off the aid. But I also think that it's like everything else I've said. We need to look at each and every mission, see what we're doing and see how we can make it more effective for the people in the area.

BOOKER:

OK. I want to switch real quickly to something you and I discussed together and I think it's important to do it on the record. We talked about the challenges of the LGBT community even here in the United States. We see 40 percent of all homeless youth in this country are LGBT youth. Fifty percent of LGBT youth miss school because of fear of bullying. On the international context, you see more serious challenges to the basic human rights and dignity of LGBT citizens of the world.

Ambassador Power has been a champion of LGBT human rights, she's really put it at the forefront of her work. She put the issue at the heart even of the Security Council, which is a pretty important and bold step. She said in a speech that LGBT rights are human rights, human rights are LGBT rights and human rights must be universal.

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

HALEY:

Thank you, Senator, for that question. I think it's very important that we talk about America's values. And when it comes to America's values and opportunities, we do not allow for discrimination of any kind to anyone. And that is something I will always speak loudly about. It's something that I will always fight for. And I think it's important that we never have to deal with

discrimination in this country and I don't want to see any other country have to deal with discrimination.

BOOKER:

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

HALEY:

I will be -- I will make sure that there is no one that is discriminated against for any reason whatsoever. And every person deserves decency and respect.

BOOKER:

Thank you very much. I know Senator Shaheen asked a little bit about contraception, if I may just drill down on that a little bit more. The United Nations announced in 2012 that access to contraception is also a universal human right and that can dramatically affect the lives of women and children in some of the world's poorest countries.

As you know, women who use contraception are generally healthier, better educated, more empowered in their households and communities and economically often more productive. And women's increase labor force participation, that is a result often of having access to contraception, boosts the nation's economies. This is giving women the power of contraception. It has a profound impact. Can you just speak generally in the remaining seconds that I have on how you will work with other countries to recognize the benefits of access to safe and effective family planning methods and support politics and policies that are supportive of family planning?

HALEY:

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

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

BOOKER:

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

HALEY:

Yes, I will.

BOOKER:

Thank you.

HALEY:

Thank you, Senator.

CORKER:

Thank you.

Senator Rubio.

RUBIO:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Governor Haley, welcome.

HALEY:

Good morning.

RUBIO:

Congratulations.

HALEY:

Thank you.

RUBIO:

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

HALEY:

Thank you.

RUBIO:

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

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

You testified as well that you believe that the war crimes that have been committed in Aleppo by the Russian military, you testified that the Russian government has helped Assad murder his own people.

In the Philippines, you acknowledge that the current president of the Philippines has conducted human -- involved in extrajudicial killings that violate human rights. And, of course, you acknowledge that the Human Rights Council of the United Nations, you called into question their legitimacy because of not just their membership, but their pattern of behavior over the last forever. And therefore, I imagine, by extension, believe that we should consider returning to the Bush policy of not being a part of it.

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

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

HALEY:

Absolutely. I don't think we should ever apologize for the American values. And I don't think we should ever shy away from talking about them. At the same time, I think it's very important that when negotiating with other countries and when we're dealing with them, they know exactly where we stand, they know where we support and agree, they know where we disagree and they also know what our intended goals are in terms of working together.

And that's what I've had to do as governor. That's what you do when you deal with legislators and international officials. And I think that's what we'll be doing there. But I don't think that we have to compromise one to get the other. I think we make sure that we always stand firm and strong for what we believe in.

RUBIO:

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

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

HALEY:

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

RUBIO:

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

HALEY:

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

RUBIO:

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

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

HALEY:

Right, I agree.

RUBIO:

So you continue to see it's important to understand and I think that's what the chairman was getting at when he talked about some dispute over the meaning of that resolution, that it in fact assumed

and accepted as fact the notion that basically any Israeli presence in Judea and Samaria constitutes a settlement. And so I think that's the key point. And I also think it's not true to say that this is the longstanding policy of the U.S. to somehow try to organize and utilize international organisms to force a negotiation what has in fact been a bipartisan commitment. And I think certainly what our partners in Israel would like to see is a negotiation between the two parties involved with assistance from the international community as a forum potentially, but certainly not by pre-imposing conditions and the like.

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

HALEY:

I would never have abstained. I don't like when legislators abstain. I certainly think that it has to be a huge exception when you do abstain. I think that that was the moment that we should have told the world how we stand with Israel. And it was a kick in the gut that we didn't.

RUBIO:

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

(LAUGHTER)

CORKER:

It always does.

(LAUGHTER)

Thank you for -- I thank you for reminding everyone who's tuned in that that is the case. Thank you. And thank you.

HALEY:

Thank you, Senator.

RUBIO:

Thank you, Governor.

CORKER:

And I would just say, I know that you all have a special relationship for lots of reasons and haven't been involved here. Senator Cardin and I were talking earlier and there's some things that -- you have very good instincts and you've been a governor. And I think going into an organization that needs reform, having been a governor, someone who solves problems, is something that's going to be very useful.

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

HALEY:

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

CORKER:

Thank you again.

Senator Kaine.

KAINE:

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

HALEY:

It's always nice to talk to a fellow governor.

KAINE:

Indeed. We're part of a once a governor, always a governor.

HALEY:

That's right, that's right.

KAINE:

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

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

HALEY:

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

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

KAINE:

So you agree that efforts to restrict the press would be a clear violation of not just the U.N. Charter, but American values.

HALEY:

Absolutely.

KAINE:

And that would include blacklisting members of the press corps whose coverage you don't like, ridiculing individual journalists who are...

HALEY:

Are you trying to imply something?

(LAUGHTER)

KAINE:

Not about you or imploring voters not to trust the media. That's sort of a violation of our leadership role in trying to promote a free press, wouldn't you agree?

HALEY:

We do always want to encourage free press.

KAINE:

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

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

HALEY:

I have not heard anything different.

KAINE:

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

HALEY:

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

KAINE:

And so if it's Palestinians actions or Israeli actions that you think threaten the bipartisan commitment toward a two-state solution, you wouldn't hesitate to speak out.

HALEY:

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

KAINE:

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

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

HALEY:

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

KAINE:

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

We had all this report about Russian effort to influence the American election. And it's not the first time. They did it with respect to Brexit, the Brexit election. There is significant discussion about what they may be doing with respect to the French presidential elections and with elections for the German chancellor as well. Would you be willing to speak out for the integrity of nations' electoral processes and work with colleagues to present a Security Council resolution counter Russia for their activity to try to influence the elections of other nations?

HALEY:

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

KAINE:

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

HALEY:

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

What we did was we gave the state sponsor of terrorism a pass that, even after 10 years, they will not be held to any sort of prohibitions on building nuclear weapons. And we gave them billions of dollars to do it. So I believe that if that has passed and if that is where it is, we need to hold them accountable and watch them as we go forward.

KAINE:

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

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

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

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

That's all I have. Thanks, Mr. Chair.

HALEY:

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

KAINE:

I appreciate that.

CORKER:

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

HALEY:

That's correct.

CORKER:

...and beginning in that place.

Senator Risch.

RISCH:

Thank you.

Governor Haley, thank you so much for agreeing to take this on. My good friend, Senator Kaine, I agree with sometimes and sometimes I don't. His description of the wonderfulness of this Iran agreement, in my judgment, is 180 from what the facts are in real life.

One of the primary objections that a lot of us had to the Iran agreement was something that you alluded to, and that is the fact that, although a lot of us, both publicly and privately, urged the administration to take Iran by the throat and if you're going to make them change their behavior, make them change their behavior. You can't take a bad kid in a classroom and say, look, you've been throwing spitballs, you've got to stop that and the kid says, well, OK, I'll do it. And they say and not only that, you're also throwing erasers around, what happened? And they say, well, the kid says, well, I'm not going to do that, but I will stop throwing the spitballs. You can't do that. These people needed to change their behavior and they have not changed their behavior. And your characterization of us giving billions of dollars to them, that they're going to be able to use to go out and finance terrorism, is absolutely accurate.

And my friends on the other side had their eyes absolutely closed on that as we went forward. And they were financing terror, they were the world's largest sponsor of terrorism when they were broke. What do you think is going to happen after we've given them billions of dollars? This is going to be awful.

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

Having said that, as far as the Iran deal is concerned, we've got sanctions in place that deal with other things than just the nuclear agreement. And I know a lot of people are just ignoring that, including Iran itself. It's complaining, oh, they're not agreeing, they're not doing what they're supposed to be doing on sanctions, but they forget they're still sponsoring terrorism.

The fact that they launched a missile in absolute contravention of the U.N. resolution that prohibited that, within days after it was signed, shows you how they feel about all this. So in any event, don't back down from where you are on that. Keep their feet to the fire.

HALEY:

I have no intention. Thank you.

RISCH:

Thank you. I'm glad to hear your comments about the reputation and confidence of the U.N. in America. You know, people on the East Coast don't have an understanding that there is that lack of confidence, there is a lot of disagreement as far as the U.N. is concerned. There are places in America where units of government have passed resolutions that declare they're a U.N.-free zone. That's how strongly they feel about the lack of confidence in the U.N.

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

I keep, you know -- my good friends on the other side and the media and everybody keeps saying, well, it's in violation of the Paris agreement. There is no American bound by one word of the Paris agreement simply because the president signed it. And when you talk to -- particularly when you talk to the foreign media, they just -- they -- their eyes just round and round. They say, well, the president signed it. They don't understand that we have three branches of government and the head of the second branch of government is just that.

The first branch of government has the power of the purse strings. And the job of the second branch of government is to execute the laws that we pass and to oversee the spending that we authorize. To somehow think that the second branch can create law and bind Americans to a law that has not been approved by Congress is outrageous.

The provision in the Constitution that says that all treaties, before they can become effective, have got to be approved by this body is incredibly important. And I hope and I know that you'll take that with you when you go to the U.N. and underscore that whenever the second branch starts talking about going off on their own.

We are much stronger -- we are much stronger -- if we have all of our branches of government in support of those kinds of things. So I can't stress that enough. In the last administration, we've had really nothing but disdain for this provision in the Constitution, which says that we have the power to either ratify or not ratify and agreement with a foreign power.

Let me just close here with -- and I don't mean this to sound the way that it does. You did make the statement that says, well, sanctions by us alone don't work. I want to -- our experience on this committee and on the Intelligence Committee I sit, I can tell you that sanctions by us alone do work. Now, I will agree with you they don't work nearly as well unless we've got everybody onboard. But because of our control over the financial and banking sectors on this earth, we can really have some substantial effect by ourselves.

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

So I'd just ask you to modify that and say that indeed they will work better if everybody's onboard.

HALEY:

And if I could clarify.

RISCH:

Sure.

HALEY:

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

RISCH:

Absolutely no question about it. And that was one of our objections, too, to the...

HALEY:

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

RISCH:

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

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

Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

HALEY:

Thank you very much.

CORKER:

Thank you. Thank you very much.

Senator Markey.

MARKEY:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

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

HALEY:

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

MARKEY:

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

HALEY:

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

MARKEY:

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

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

On the question of global health, in Haiti -- I talked to you about this in my office yesterday -- the United Nations peacekeeping force from Nepal actually introduced cholera into a country that had never had cholera before, in the year 2010, after the earthquake in Haiti. Eight hundred thousand people have contracted cholera, 9,000 have died from it. It was created by a Nepal peacekeeping

U.N. mission that actually brought that disease to the country by their introduction of it into the water system with their own human waste.

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

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

HALEY:

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

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

MARKEY:

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

HALEY:

Those violating countries need to be held accountable and they need to have that responsibility of resolving that problem, yes.

MARKEY:

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

HALEY:

Right. And there's two things and I don't know if you were in the room when I said. I think that, one, it's very important that we get other countries to contribute to our peacekeeping missions

because they have to have skin in the game, because when these things happen they will help the United States be more accountable, hold these peacekeepers more accountable, hold these contributing countries more accountable. And we should decide, should we use their peacekeepers again? Because I think that's another conversation that needs to be had.

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

MARKEY:

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

HALEY:

Yes.

MARKEY:

And the U.N. is deeply involved in ending conflict there. But much of the conflict is caused by poverty, is caused by disease. President Bush initiated a program, PEPFAR, to deal with the HIV/AIDS epidemic in Africa. Mr. Tillerson testified last week about his strong support for that program and pointed out that it should be continued and enhanced.

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

HALEY:

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

MARKEY:

OK, great. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CORKER:

Thank you, sir.

Senator Paul.

PAUL:

Governor Haley, congratulations on your nomination.

HALEY:

Thank you.

PAUL:

James Madison wrote that the executive branch is the branch of government most prone to war; therefore, the Constitution with studied care vested that power in the legislature. In the days of our Founding Fathers, it was very important who had that power, you know, distributed among the U.S. government. And I don't think they ever conceived of an international body compelling the U.S. to go to war.

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

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

HALEY:

Well, and thank you, Senator, for that question because I think it's an important one. First of all, I think that as we go forward with all the threats that we have in the world, understand that you're talking to a military wife and a military sister, where both of them have been in combat. And I think that we have to really be careful if we're going to decide to go to war.

But I also think that if we decide to go to war, it is important that we have the president-elect, the National Security Council, Congress, everyone moving in the same direction in order to do that. It will show our strength in the world when we do that. It will also give confidence to those military families that everyone is in agreement that we're doing the right thing.

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

PAUL:

You know, I agree with the sentiment, I'm not sure if we got to the specifics of would you vote for a resolution to send our soldiers, a U.N. resolution, to a war that hadn't been authorized by the U.S.

HALEY:

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

PAUL:

I would go one step farther in the sense that many say, well, we should have the advice of Congress and we ought to occasionally go down there and pat them on the back and talk to them. No, no, the rules are pretty specific. We don't go to war really unless Congress votes on war. And the reason I bring this up is we may well be in a situation, we're in a war right now primarily with ISIS in Syria and Iraq, that war has not been authorized. We've had no vote here on whether or not we should be involved in that war. Some try to stretch a resolution that said we could go after those who attacked us on 9/11. ISIS did not attack us on 9/11, they're not related in any way to anybody who attacked us on 9/11. So we have had no vote. And one generation shouldn't bind another generation to war, but that well could come before you.

Right now we're at war. You could say, well, we're already at war, we can send people there on the U.N. banner. Well, you shouldn't. I mean, we should say to you you should not vote for that. You should come back to us and say I'll vote for it gladly after Congress does their job and authorizes. But no U.S. soldier should ever fight under any international banner without a vote here by Congress. And I can't state that strong enough because that is a check, that is a check and a balance to try to prevent unnecessary war.

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

HALEY:

Well, Senator, I don't believe in the slash-and-burn approach. You know, as a governor you could never do that. That's not effective. I know many legislators will put bills out out of frustration. And I absolutely understand the frustration over Resolution 2334. But I think it's important that we are strategic in the way that we hold dues.

So yes, I do see a place where you can hold dues. I do think it needs to be strategic in nature. I would want to use Congress as my heavy and leverage in terms of doing that so that I could get members of the council to do the things that we needed to do. But yes, I do think there are times where you can withhold dues. I don't think you should slash and cut across the board because I don't think that will accomplish the goal.

PAUL:

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

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

And I hope as you become the U.N. ambassador, and I will support you, but as you become the U.N. ambassador, I hope you will consider that and that some of these questions aren't, you know, simple questions, but they're incredibly profound questions. And whether or not when we go to war and when we don't go to war, as you know, you have family members that will fight in these wars, you know, war is the last resort, so we don't want to make it easy. None of the Founding Fathers didn't want to make it easy to go to war, they wanted to make it difficult.

And then we go through consensus, but we don't go through consensus if the U.N. takes us to war. And I have a great deal of sympathy. There's a young man who is currently suing the U.S. military saying it's an unlawful order for him to take an order from the United Nations because it's a war that's not, you know, a war that's not been authorized here. And I have some sympathy for that, so I hope you will continue to ponder that and how important it is that we maintain the checks and balances of how we go to war.

HALEY:

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

Thank you.

CORKER:

Thank you for those sentiments.

Senator Merkley.

MERKLEY:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, Governor, for appearing today.

HALEY:

Thank you.

MERKLEY:

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

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

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

HALEY:

I actually think we need to have a lot of conversations with a lot of other countries. And that comes from the fact that North Korea is trying to exercise their muscle right now and they're trying to show their strength. And I think that while we have seen China start to pull away, we need to talk to China and let them know of the threat. We need to talk to other countries within the area and let them know of how strong of a threat this is. And we need to try and create a united front in approaching North Korea because North Korea will feel it if China puts the pressure on them. And I think that's very, very important because it is getting to a very dangerous situation.

MERKLEY:

So, Governor, last year in January, there was a fourth nuclear weapon test by North Korea and then in February a major ballistic missile test. And within less than a month of that, the United States was able to get China to agree to increase sanctions on North Korea that included mandatory inspection of all cargo going to and from North Korea and a requirement to terminate all banking relationships, and it lays out a whole -- and that became exactly the type of pressure you're talking about. But that Resolution 2270, do you think that was a step forward in terms of the U.S., China and the world saying to North Korea you've got to stop?

HALEY:

Absolutely, if followed. And that's the thing is they're not following that. And so actions need to happen from there.

MERKLEY:

So and then there was another nuclear test that followed that, in September, the fifth nuclear test. And the U.S. again went to work to really try to get the international community and China to push on North Korea. And what they did was put a hard, binding cap on North Korea's coal exports. This was considered to be the single-most-vulnerable point of pressure because it's their largest source of external revenue. And China did sign up and America signed up and we've got these mandatory inspections in place. And is that, too, a step forward in terms of pressuring North Korea?

HALEY:

Absolutely.

MERKLEY:

But as you pointed out, we've done this and then North Korea goes ahead anyway. And so in terms of the conversation, China has said it's onboard, it's agreed to this, cut all the banking relationships, inspect every piece of cargo, cut their ability to generate revenue. Is there -- should we specifically draw any sort of red line over the missile tests or the nuclear weapon tests? And if so, what would that be?

HALEY:

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

And so I think that we do need to see, where do we go forward?

MERKLEY:

I'll be very interested in hearing more of your thoughts after you're at the U.N., because we've been using the U.N. really aggressively on this particular topic. And at -- I went back after our conversation, I was surprised at the amount that had been done that I wasn't aware of when we talked in my office.

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

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

And one of the concerns, and it's related to several questions that were asked about whether the U.S. essentially holds its monetary support of the U.N. hostage, one of the concerns has been that China would love for us to do that because then they go from being almost at the top of the heap to being at the top of the heap in terms of their influence on the organization. Do you share the concern about China's kind of growing expansion of its power inside the U.N.?

HALEY:

I think that you have to look at, and this is a lot of what we discussed yesterday, you have to look at the fact that China is very different from Russia. Russia, as China, show their military strength. China's trying to show their economic strength. So their strategy is to go and help other countries,

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

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

MERKLEY:

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

You'll obviously be captain of the inside game. And I look forward to learning more from your viewpoints as that unfolds.

HALEY:

Thank you.

MERKLEY:

In my last few seconds, turning to the global warming, the National Intelligence Council has said that climate change is a wide-ranging national security challenge for the U.S. over the next 20 years. Do you share the view that global warming is a security threat to the United States?

HALEY:

I think it is one of the threats, yes. I don't think it's the most important, but I do think it is on the table.

MERKLEY:

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

HALEY:

I think there are many countries that look at climate change and what their effects are on all types of elements in the world. And so that's why I think it'll always be something on the table that we

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

MERKLEY:

My time has expired. Thank you.

HALEY:

Thank you, Senator.

CORKER:

Thank you.

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

Senator Barrasso.

BARRASSO:

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Congratulations, great to see you again.

HALEY:

Thank you very much, absolutely.

BARRASSO:

The last questioner just used the phrase we're using the U.N. aggressively. And I think this last administration has actually been using the U.N. aggressively to bypass Congress, to support Iran, to attack our closest ally, Israel, to attack American energy. So the question to you is, as our nation's top representative at the United Nations, I think you have to be committed to standing up for American ideals, American values, our standards, so can you talk a little bit about that, about your commitment to challenging the actions of the United Nations that run counter to our values, our interests and our ideals?

HALEY:

You know, and I think that that's a very good question because the United Nations, I think, has overstepped. And when you look at Resolution 2334, there is no better example of how they've overstepped. And I think that there is a role for the United Nations, and I think that is in negotiating deals, in telling what our story is and talking about America's values and ideals and freedoms and what makes us the best country in the world. And we need to continue to use the U.N. forum to show what we are for, what we are against and what we won't tolerate.

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

BARRASSO:

We are the largest financial contributor to the United Nations when you take a look at our nation. Our contribution is more to the U.N. budget than all of the other permanent members of the U.N. Security Council combined.

HALEY:

Yes.

BARRASSO:

We have an incredible debt in this country that I continue to hear about. I say, why are we spending money at the United Nations with this kind of debt? So can you talk a little bit about your commitment to safeguarding U.S. taxpayer dollars at the U.N. and the kind of transparency that we really need with regard to those funds?

HALEY:

Well, thank you, Senator. And in South Carolina, that was something that was very important to me because I think transparency breeds accountability and that needs to happen. We do pay 22 percent of the general fund. We are close to 29 percent on the peacekeeping fund, which is actually not what the law requires. We're supposed to be at 25 percent. And I think that when you look at that, every organization in government can always be improved and can always be efficient. And the way you get to that is through transparency. And we need to start showing how the money in peacekeeping is being spent. We need to start showing the programs that are happening in the United Nations and how that's being handled.

I think that there was good progress made in that they had inspector general oversight come in, but I think that's not independent. And as long as it's not independent, we're not getting the true facts there. So that's something that I'll also try and do is try and make that oversight council more independent so that no countries can weigh-in on that, so we can actually get to the heart of how we can fix the U.N. and make it more effective.

BARRASSO:

Can I just stay on the issue of the U.N. peacekeepers for a second? Because there have been horrendous reports of sexual exploitation and abuses being committed by the peacekeepers. It's unacceptable, it's outrageous that the United Nations peacekeepers are inflicting terrible atrocities on the people they're supposed to be protecting. You know, as the largest contributor of money, all of the things, can you talk a little bit about working to ensure that the United Nations holds these peacekeepers accountable in ways from the sort of things that we've been seeing with sexual exploitation and abuse?

HALEY:

Yes, Senator. And I spoke about this earlier. I think it is devastating when you have a child or you have a mother who see peacekeepers and are afraid. And that is something that can never happen. And I think that we absolutely have to strengthen the whistleblower protections because it is not working. People are too scared to speak up when they see something wrong.

I think that we have to really make sure that we are holding our contributing countries accountable because when their troops violate we can't just let them give them a pass. They have to actually be dealt with accordingly and then, in some cases, we have to look at whether that country should be providing peacekeepers at all because a lot of times they're doing it just to make money and it's not about whether they're protecting people.

And when someone goes in from the U.N. and when they present themselves, people should feel safe and people should feel protected. They should not be scared and they should not be leery of what's happening. And we can't say that right now, especially in the peacekeeping missions in Africa. So I do think, very, very important that we start to really hold these countries accountable and let them know, and that is why I think them putting money, more money towards peacekeeping will have skin in the game. And when they have skin in the game, they'll care more about how their money is spent.

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

BARRASSO:

And I want to get back to Resolution 2334. And I think that's just part of an ongoing strategy to undermine our friends in Israel.

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

HALEY:

Right.

BARRASSO:

And it triggered a law that we have in the United States cutting off contributions to UNESCO. Can you talk a little bit about the United States in terms of opposing Palestinian efforts to obtain full membership at any U.N. agency or organization?

HALEY:

Absolutely, because we don't recognize the Palestinian Authority as a state. And I think that we will not, whether it's funding UNESCO and the fact that we stopped that, I think that was a good move to do that, or whether it's something they're trying to insert themselves to be a member, which they tried to do. And I think that now we have to make sure that we continue to hold that ground on that front.

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

BARRASSO:

Well, I appreciate your attention to that. Thank you very much, Governor.

HALEY:

Thank you very much.

BARRASSO:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CORKER:

Thank you. Just to understand the state of play, I had not planned to have a second round, but there was an email exchange with one of our staff members that indicated that was a possibility. And I think the minority has understood that to be, that there will be. Because I do want to conduct always our business with an air of trust, we will have, for some few members who wish to have a second round, a five-minute round.

I don't know of anything that is controversial that's occurred. I would just ask members to respect the fact that it wasn't something that I intended, but if you really have something that you want to ask, in order to maintain trust we'll have a second round for those few members who may have questions.

I want to ask our nominee, who's been here now for three hours, would you like to take a 10-minute break?

HALEY:

No, sir, I'm ready to continue.

CORKER:

OK. Well, Senator Coons will finish his first round of questioning. And if other members do in fact have questions for you, I would remind folks that we are going to have QFRs and those will be due as of the close of business tomorrow. But with that, we'll continue on and plow through this.

Senator Coons.

COONS:

Thank you, Chairman Corker.

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

Let's talk about U.N. Security Council and some of the challenges we've faced there and some of the interests that other countries bring to play there.

We talked yesterday about the Iran nuclear deal, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action, and why Russia and China worked with us on imposing and enforcing multilateral sanctions, negotiating to a finished deal and then to enforcing it. And another member asked you earlier about why the U.N. Security Council hasn't been able to make progress in challenging or confronting Assad's war crimes against his own people.

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

HALEY:

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

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

COONS:

And these were questions I told you yesterday I'd follow up on again today. Let me make sure I understand your answer. Is it clear to you that the reason the Security Council hasn't acted to confront human rights violations in Syria is because Russia blocks that action?

HALEY:

Yes, it is clear.

COONS:

Why does it raise a red flag for you that Russia and China supported the JCPOA, the Iran deal, if the United Kingdom and Germany and the EU and other vital American allies, France, did so as well? Are you questioning the value of our international partnerships with them?

And let me ask the follow-on question, if we walk away from it without giving it a chance to be fully implemented, will we be safer?

HALEY:

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

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

COONS:

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

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

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

HALEY:

No, I think that we need to make it very clear with Russia on where we stand on Crimea and Ukraine and Syria and be strong on that.

Having said that, it's very much like we talk about human rights violations. We may not agree with a country on human rights violations, but we need to work with them on other things. I think what the president-elect is trying to do is see, are there any opportunities to work with Russia? Because we can use Russia's help in trying to go against ISIS and we can use Russia's help on trying to help with other threats throughout the world.

COONS:

That's right.

HALEY:

And so I think that...

COONS:

We have vital allies in NATO, such as the Germans, the French, the Brits, who have gone alongside us and fought in Afghanistan, who have invoked Article Five NATO Charter and stood alongside us in the fight against terrorism.

I have real trouble with his idea that in any way we should view -- we should trust Vladimir Putin and his Russia at an equal level as Angela Merkel and Germany and all of our NATO allies, his ongoing, steady diminution of the value of NATO when NATO has been the strongest, most important, most enduring alliance we've built and been a part of.

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

HALEY:

I did not.

COONS:

I urge you to do so.

HALEY:

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

COONS:

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

HALEY:

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

COONS:

But he's not in front of me and you are, so forgive me.

(LAUGHTER)

HALEY:

And you're not getting any answers from me on that, so I'm just telling you in the importance of time.

COONS:

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

HALEY:

Well, as I've said, it is -- you can never win with slash-and-burn techniques. That doesn't work. What is important is that we do strategic types of cutting if we're going to cut anything at all. And so I don't agree with that. I don't think that that's the way that we can come out strong and show our strength in terms of what we believe in and what we're against. And I think it's better to do that with negotiations than I do think with just slash-and-burn.

COONS:

Well, let me commend to you -- I'll close and then come back for another round briefly, if I could -- let me commend to you that the new new secretary-general, Antonio Guterres, I think, will be a strong partner for you in engaging in thoughtful and systemic reform. And our vital ally, the United

Kingdom, does have a multilateral aid effectiveness review, a process that they go through to look at the return on investment, as you put it, or the effectiveness of their contributions. And they have assessed many of the U.S. voluntary funded programs as having a high impact. I'd recommend that to you for your reading. And I look forward to asking you some more questions in a few minutes.

HALEY:

Thank you very much.

CORKER:

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

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

Senator Cardin.

CARDIN:

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

And, Governor Haley, thank you for your strength to continue through without...

HALEY:

Well, there's a lot more strength that comes with that.

CARDIN:

Good. You're going to need it at the United Nations, so the best to you.

I want to take my time to go over a few issues that were covered in the first round. You've mentioned frequently that we want other countries to have skin in the game as it relates to peacekeepers and the importance of the peacekeeping missions. I just really want to point out that in 2016 alone 79 U.N. peacekeepers lost their life in service to humanity. So countries have skin in the game. We have used mostly resources, money, and there is the ability to pay issue among different states.

I don't disagree, and I concluded in my opening comments my concern about the sexual exploitation and abuse that cannot be tolerated. And we do need more countries participating. But I just wanted to point out that countries have given their people and some have lost their lives in support of our peacekeeping.

HALEY:

And I have great respect for that. My wording was about monetary.

CARDIN:

Well, some countries can't afford the monetary aid, and that's why they use their people and they subsidize through that way.

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

And in fact, you look at the refugee program, which you were complimentary of...

HALEY:

Yes.

CARDIN:

...between 1975 and 2015, over 3 million refugees have come to America. And it's my understanding there have been three specific episodes of terrorist involvement with those three that have led to convictions. That's three too many, don't get me wrong, and we just need zero. We've got to continue the strict vetting. But it's not the risk pool that maybe is popularly perceived by refugees coming to America. And I just really wanted to correct the record in that regard.

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

And when we're talking about never again, what's happening in South Sudan. Ethnic cleansing is taking place as we are here. Civilians are losing their life because of this ethnic conflict. The leadership has been unable or unwilling to deal with this.

In the United Nations, there's a couple of proposals that are pending. One an arms embargo that I would urge you to support. There's strong support in Congress for an arms embargo.

The other is to get a peace process actually working while protecting human life. We've got to be more aggressive because it is the next ethnic cleansing when we say never again.

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

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

HALEY:

Thank you very much.

CORKER:

Thank you.

Senator Menendez.

MENENDEZ:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

CORKER:

Without objection.

MENENDEZ:

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

I'd like to talk to you a little bit. You've answered the sanctions questions a couple of times here and I am left concerned because in your answers you said sanctions by the United States don't work if they are alone, they have to be multilateral. And of course we like to see multilateral sanctions.

But I would call to your attention that the sanctions regime that we've built on Iran that ultimately led them to come to the negotiating table -- I didn't care for the ultimate result and voted against it -- but that led them to the negotiating table was built largely by members of this committee working with the Congress and then getting the administration onboard and started off alone and then worked to build an international coalition.

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

HALEY:

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

And so it is always going to be that we lead and we lead strongly. It is my job to make sure we just aren't the only ones doing sanctions, that we have others with us.

MENENDEZ:

OK. I appreciate hearing that clarification. And I look forward to you making a lot of magic at the end of the day.

But sometimes we have to lead in order to achieve that. And sanctions don't always start off with a multilateral unity at the beginning. And because sanctions is a tool of peaceful diplomacy, and I don't think it should be used each and every time, I don't think it's the only tool of peaceful

diplomacy, but it is a major one, and if you neuter yourself of it then you've left yourself very little in the pursuit of peaceful diplomacy.

I want to go to Iran. U.N. Resolution 2231 specifically, quote, "calls upon Iran not to undertake any activity related to ballistic missiles designed to be capable of delivering nuclear weapons, including launches using such ballistic missile technology," close quote.

Since it was adopted at the Security Council, Iran has launched at least 10 ballistic missiles. Earlier this month, a report from the United Nations indicated Iran is likely in violation of these resolutions because of arms shipments to Hezbollah and possibly to rebels in Somalia and Yemen.

The U.N. Security Council arms embargo and ballistic missile sanctions require not just compliance of Iran, but also member states to enforce them. If Iran violates both the ballistic missile sanctions, as has been universally recognized, and violates the arms embargo, do you plan to use your position at the United Nations to try to create a coalition to hold Iran accountable?

HALEY:

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

MENENDEZ:

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

HALEY:

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

MENENDEZ:

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

HALEY:

Thank you.

CORKER:

There won't be a third round. If it's a brief question, because of your distinguished service here, then we'll let you do that so we can close this out.

(LAUGHTER)

Would you rather Coons go first and collect your thoughts?

MENENDEZ:

Yeah, that's easy.

CORKER:

I know that it's...

MENENDEZ:

In order to make it brief, Mr. Chairman, if I can collect my thoughts, you know.

CORKER:

OK. And before I go to Senator Coons, I would make this observation. I am all for the pursuit of Russia potentially being involved in war crimes in Syria, all for it. There's nobody on this committee that would be more for that. I will say that it's been interesting with our witnesses coming in for a new administration that's been a line of push, but there hasn't been much towards the sitting administration and the sitting U.N. ambassador relative to calling those out. So it would ring more fulsome to me if we were talking about that over the last month also. But I just would say...

CARDIN:

Mr. Chairman, I would take personal exception to that.

CORKER:

OK.

CARDIN:

Because I'll give you the volume of letters and phone calls and public questioning that I have done to not only the Obama administration, but the Bush administration.

CORKER:

Yeah, I...

CARDIN:

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

CORKER:

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

Senator Coons.

COONS:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

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

HALEY:

Well, Americans should always be concerned about fragile states and it's because usually when states are fragile they start to erupt in things that can cause threats down the road. And I think if you look at South Sudan, that's a perfect example, that while we have tried to bring peace to that area, you've now got a government that is not wanting that and we're starting to see other issues that are starting to happen in that area.

And so it's important for us to work towards peace everywhere. And I think it's important for us to get in front of the situation. We can see before it gets fragile. We can see conflict before it happens. And it's important that, I think, the U.N. not acknowledge it once it's too late, that we start to acknowledge it as we see it's happening, because I think we can get more effectiveness done that way than otherwise.

COONS:

Sort of the archetypal, fragile state in this area has been Afghanistan which was a refuge for a terrorist organization, al- Qaida, that attacked us largely because it really wasn't a coherent or effective state. I'd argue that the U.N. offers some of the strongest tools we have to address fragile states without deploying American troops. And whether it's UNICEF, which does a great work in terms of dealing with human suffering, or it's UNHCR, which deals with refugees or it's U.N. peacekeeping, talk to me about how you would imagine advocating for the U.N. being a more effective platform for addressing fragile states in the interest of our security and values.

HALEY:

I think it's important that we look for results. You know, it should not just be that we have a conversation about how a state is becoming more fragile, it's actually looking at results. And any time we're dealing with any situation that could start to pose a threat, we need to decide what we want to do as a plan and where we want to go and what we will consider success. And I think there need to be measurables along the way to make sure that we're complying with that.

And I think that those conversations need to be more detailed in nature as opposed to more high-reaching, saying that it is fragile or it may cause problems or it may be an issue. I think we need to get more involved.

COONS:

Let me ask you a closing question, if I might, that Mr. Tillerson and I went back and forth on and several others did as well. Some view our values, and I will just give three examples, things that we fight for in the world that, frankly, the Chinese and the Russians don't: press freedom and transparency, human rights and democracy. I see those as essential to our interests, not just distinct from our interests.

In one exchange, Mr. Tillerson suggested that at times -- at times -- our national security interests have to take a front seat and we maybe have to, with some of our allies and partners, have our advocacy for our values take a backseat. And I'd argue there are other settings where it is our failure to consistently advocate for democracy and human rights and good governance that leads to failed states, in some cases.

What's your view about the value of continuously advocating for democracy and human rights and a free press? Is it in conflict with our interests or does it complement our interests?

HALEY:

I think we always talk about the values of America. I think we always talk about why we're the greatest country in the world. And I think that we always express why we want to share those values with the rest of the world.

When it comes to other issues, and I understand we can have more pressing issues that we want to negotiate, I don't think we have to compromise our values to do that. I think these are conversations that can take place at the same time.

I think it's very important that countries around the world know what we value, but they also know where we stand. And I think that we can have negotiations, conversations on issues that are at hand without ever compromising us talking about our values. I think both can be done at the same time.

COONS:

I think we'll have a productive conversation about how we keep those in the right balance going forward and how we invest appropriately in advancing democracy and governance and human rights and a free press at the same time that we advance our commercial or security or other interests as well.

Thank you, Governor.

HALEY:

Thank you very much.

CORKER:

Thank you.

And Senator Menendez for his succinct questions.

MENENDEZ:

Mr. Chairman, because the questions are too important, I'm not going to synthesize them. I'll submit them for the record. They involve our participation with the U.N. Commission on Refugees in Central America. They involve where we're headed and what role the governor thinks we can pursue in Venezuela, which is a crisis right here in our own hemisphere. And also, I'd like to hear from the governor something that you're very passionate about, that we've worked together on, which is a greater role at the United Nations on human trafficking.

CORKER:

Right.

MENENDEZ:

And because I can't synthesize those and do them honor and worth, I will submit them to the record and look forward for what I hope will be very explicit responses to them.

I just want to take one more moment to say I appreciate the chairman's comments earlier, but speaking only for myself there has been no one who has more consistently challenged this administration as part of his own party on various issues, including the question of actions in Syria and war crimes. So it's not new to some of us.

CORKER:

Yeah. And I think that, especially coming from you, I will say a very accurate statement. And I appreciate the way we've been able to work on the Syrian issue. I know that we all have been very disappointed with the actions that have not been taken. And certainly working together on the Iran resolution, trying to oppose it, so I thank you for that.

And I would just -- it's an observation. There's a new zeal relative to it for lots of reasons. But I think that all of us certainly need to be pushing back against Russia and the violations in international norms that they have put forth. Certainly, what has happened in Aleppo is something that somebody needs to pay a price for. It upsets all of our sensibilities. And I appreciate everyone here on the committee expressing that.

CARDIN:

Mr. Chairman, I may be a little sensitive on this, but as one of those individuals who's been on a list for a long time not able to go to Russia because of my leadership on the Magnitsky law, this isn't just recent.

CORKER:

Yeah.

CARDIN:

Our concern about Russia has been building for a long time. And many of us have been very open about the danger Russia poses to the world order. So I don't think this is something that's new.

CORKER:

Yeah. Well, with that, do you have any other statements relative to our nominee?

CARDIN:

No, but just, again, it's been a pleasure hearing your responses. And as I said at the first time we met, thank you for being willing to serve your country.

HALEY:

And thank you for the opportunity. I appreciate it.

CORKER:

So for the state of play, we are going to leave the record open until the close of business tomorrow. I've just talked to the ranking member and we plan on having the markup on Mr. Tillerson on Monday, Monday afternoon, assuming his questions come in this week and are answered thoroughly.

In the event you're able, and it would be quite a feat, I think, I hope that people will keep the questions to questions that really need to be answered, but to the extent you're able to answer the questions by the end of the week also, we would attempt to have your markup at the same time we have Mr. Tillerson.

I think that, just an observation, again, I think people have very much respected your instincts here today. And I think the nuance of some of the foreign policy, having been the governor of South Carolina and all of a sudden coming to New York at the U.N. Security Council, there's going to be a lot of nuance that you're going to pick up over time and certainly knowledge relative to foreign relations issues that you just have not been dealing with.

But I think I can tell you as chairman, I feel very good about you going there with the instincts, the drive, the desire for reform that you've expressed here. I think you've impressed everybody.