



FACT SHEET: Trump's Rescission Package Would Gut Bipartisan Foreign Policy Investments

Rescissions package that Senate Republicans are debating—and House Republicans passed—would decimate core foreign policy investments made on a bipartisan basis

Lifesaving programs like PEPFAR, GAVI, humanitarian assistance; U.S. treaty obligations; investments to advance U.S. interests all on the chopping block

Washington, D.C. – Ahead of a [hearing](#) on President Trump's [\\$9.4 billion rescissions request](#) with Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Director Russ Vought, U.S. Senator Patty Murray (D-WA), Vice Chair of the Senate Appropriations Committee, released a new fact sheet detailing how the rescission package would devastate core bipartisan foreign policy investments—and breaking down the Trump administration's misleading talking points on its request.

FICTION: This package would simply cut “woke” Biden-era initiatives—or a highly-selective short list of **past** examples of funded projects that the Trump administration finds objectionable.

FACT: President Trump *himself* signed most of these funds into law in March—and his administration has flexibility to determine how exactly to fulfill the objectives provided by Congress for the funding.

While Congress specifies particular objectives for the foreign assistance it has provided to advance U.S. interests, the Trump administration has discretion over how exactly to execute the funding in compliance with the law—just as any administration does.

The Trump administration has trotted out a highly-selective, tiny list of past initiatives funded by these broader pots of money allocated by Congress—but the plain fact is it now is in charge of executing these programs, and most of the funds in the rescission request were signed into law by Trump himself.

FICTION: The cuts are merely to “wasteful foreign assistance spending” that is “antithetical” to American interests.

FACT: Passing the rescission package would gut funding provided for all manner of important, bipartisan foreign policy objectives.

Passing this package would:

- Rip away \$900 million provided for global health programs that save millions of lives and protect Americans from public health threats. The package would cut \$400 million from PEPFAR and another \$500 million for other global health programs, which address maternal and child health, family planning, and diseases like malaria, TB, and Polio.
- Rescind \$4.9 billion for economic and development assistance—half of the total amount provided for fiscal year 2025. This funding pot is used to support cybersecurity, the Counter PRC Influence Fund, critical mineral supply chain diversification, support to partners in the Indo-Pacific, food security programs, support for U.S. businesses abroad, efforts to address irregular migration in our hemisphere, and many other bipartisan initiatives.
- Zero out \$1 billion to meet U.S. treaty obligations and contributions to international organizations. This includes funds to cover dues to the United Nations, support peacekeeping missions, support UNICEF, and more—ceding ground to countries like China to expand their influence and shape the rules of the road without the United States.
- Eliminate \$1.3 billion provided for humanitarian assistance, leading to needless suffering, promoting instability, and undermining U.S. interests. This includes emergency food needs, shelter, and other commodities that help stabilize conflict and disaster-stricken populations and stabilize partner governments.

FICTION: The Trump administration has transparently detailed what this package would mean for bipartisan foreign policy objectives long supported by Congress.

FACT: The Trump administration has refused to tell Congress or the public how it plans to effectuate the sweeping cuts it seeks, allowing Russ Vought and President Trump to decide what specific initiatives to slash well after Congress debates and passes the package.

The Trump administration’s proposed rescissions of a variety of foreign policy priorities only spell out cuts to high-level accounts—not the specific programs and initiatives funded from within those accounts that they will cut if this package passes.

We do not know which humanitarian responses that Congress intended to support will be reduced. We do not have details on which infectious disease programs or support for maternal and child health will be curtailed. We do not know which economic and development programs are going to be cut off, undermining congressional direction.

Will they cut funding to counter the Chinese government, support American farmers—both? We don't know.

FICTION: The \$400 million cut to PEPFAR funding is surgical, and the package will preserve all life-saving assistance.

FACT: The package does not protect lifesaving care, nor does it detail what specifically will be cut or how—the Trump administration retains that discretion and has so far refused to provide details on what it plans to cut. Cutting preventative assistance means cutting lifesaving assistance, too.

Without robust prevention efforts, more people will become infected with HIV—costing lives and many more dollars in treatment down the line. Every dollar invested in prevention saves \$20 in HIV treatment and care costs. The Trump administration's decision to curtail support for prevention efforts is already [seriously setting back](#) efforts to end the H.I.V. epidemic.

FICTION: Rescinding these funds will help “put the Nation's fiscal house back in order.”

FACT: The requested cuts spanning multiple fiscal years represent less than 0.12% of all federal spending in fiscal year 2025. Rescinding these investments will do nothing to meaningfully tackle our debt—but President Trump and Republicans' “Big Beautiful Bill” would explode it by \$4 trillion.

While some Republicans insist making these cuts is necessary in the interest of fiscal responsibility, the plain fact is President Trump and congressional Republicans' “One Big Beautiful Bill,” which Senate Republicans are laboring to pass this week, would add \$4 trillion to the national debt over just the next 10 years.

While rescinding these investments to advance U.S. interests abroad would do exceptionally little to address the deficit or our national debt, they would decimate core objectives Congress has long supported on a bipartisan basis.

###