

**House Report 106-720 - FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT
FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2001**

ADDITIONAL VIEWS

The allocation of resources for the Fiscal Year 2001 Foreign Operations bill of \$13.281 billion will not enable this President or the next to carry out an effective foreign policy that meets our national security requirements. The low level of funding will hinder our ability to respond to and confront ongoing development and security challenges around the world.

Unfortunately, again this year funding levels in the bill have been reduced well below the Administration's request, and this has resulted in a bill, which will be difficult to support. At one point this bill had an allocation of nearly \$13.6 billion, which is still well below the Administration's request, but would have been a good starting point. Because of floor action on other appropriations bills, however, the allocation was reduced to its current level of \$13.281 billion, which makes it \$1.539 billion or 10% below the Administration's request.

As the world continues rapidly changing we have an unprecedented opportunity and indeed a responsibility to provide global leadership through the spread of democracy and the promise of economic growth. The allocation of discretionary budget resources this year has once again failed to recognize this fundamental fact, and our foreign policy goals will be shortchanged.

In addition the overall priorities within the bill are skewed. While the overall request has been reduced by 10%, the amounts requested to address the problems of infectious disease, poverty alleviation, access to family planning, and debt relief in Africa, Latin America, and Asia have been cut in a disproportionate manner.

The bill contains only \$82 million of the \$472 million in pending requests for Debt relief. This amount will not even provide enough resources to enable two countries, Bolivia and Mozambique, who have met all necessary conditions to obtain relief, to actually get it. There are many other countries on the verge of qualifying for relief who simply will not receive it, if this funding level is not increased. The bill also contains a moratorium for countries, who receive debt relief from obtaining new loans from both the concessional and market loan windows of the international financial institutions. The lack of adequate funding for debt relief and the imposition of these undue restrictions on these poor countries clearly demonstrates fundamental opposition to the goals of this initiative. The Jubilee 2000 campaign for debt relief for the world's poorest countries enjoys a wide

measure of support throughout the United States and with a broad spectrum of religious leaders and organizations. It is time for us to make this funding a priority and to remove undue restrictions.

The bill contains only \$202 million of the \$244 million requested to combat HIV/AIDs. While we support the increases in the bill for the Child Survival and Disease account and the increases for fighting tuberculosis and providing more for basic education, it should not come at the expense of funding to combat HIV/AIDs. The staggering impact of this disease on the health and development of affected nations has made it imperative that prevention measures be augmented by strategies to build capacity to deliver care. The challenges presented to develop such a multidimensional approach in which effective care and prevention programs would be delivered in tandem requires resources. A consensus within the international community to provide more resources for combating HIV/AIDs has finally begun. The United States has the responsibility to be in the forefront of this effort, and we simply cannot fail to meet this challenge by shortchanging these programs.

The bill also reduces funding for lending to poor countries by drastically cutting funds for the International Development Association, the African Development Bank and Fund, and the Asian Development Fund by 32% below the requested levels. Overall cuts to all programs in the bill which benefit Africa and Latin America are 15%, which is unacceptable. While this bill does contain some funding to respond to the flood disasters in southern Africa, it is unclear whether that emergency funding will be finally approved by Congress.

Funds requested for family planning programs are cut to \$385 million, which is 29% below requested levels. In addition the bill contains objectionable language on the Mexico City policy, which seeks to impose restrictions on foreign organizations which are contrary to the principles of free speech and the laws of the United States.

The Global Environment Facility has been funded at a level of \$36 million against a request of \$176 million, which will endanger its ability to continue environmental lending. In addition the bill contains undue restrictions on programs to reduce harmful emissions and global warming.

There are many accounts and programs in the bill that are funded at levels which we support. Increases have been provided to the Child Survival and Diseases account and the Peace Corps for example. However, the bill is in serious need of correction. The last minute reduction in the allocation and the fact that these reductions were made in programs which most directly affect the poorest countries in the world, has forced us into a position of confrontation and division, which we regret.

Foreign aid should not be immune from budget cuts; however, it should not be the victim of skewed priorities. Robust and well-directed foreign assistance programs are essential for our national security and are supported by a majority of the American people. The process of building stability throughout the world by combating infectious disease and poverty, working for conflict resolution, enhancing democratization, and fostering the conditions for economic growth ultimately benefits all of us.

Nancy Pelosi.
Carolyn Kilpatrick.
Nita Lowey.
Jesse Jackson, Jr.