



House Conservatives Target \$100 Million in Funding for Globalist Organization

Margaret Menge

July 21, 2017

Conservatives in the House of Representatives are calling for the elimination of all U.S. funding for the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, an international group headquartered in a château in Paris that produces economic reports and recommends “best practices,” but also frequently pushes for bigger government, higher taxes, and for the U.S. and Europe to throw open the door to immigrants.

“The OECD doesn’t get nearly as much attention as the U.N.,” says Dan Mitchell, a tax policy analyst at the Cato Institute, who has been keeping an eye on the organization for years. “There’s a lot more spending at the U.N., a lot more political controversies. But on a dollar-for-dollar basis, it’s probably the most egregious spending in the entire federal budget.”

The U.S. pays almost 21 percent of the OECD's total budget — about \$77 million — but the total cost for the U.S. to participate as a member in the organization is closer to \$100 million, says Mitchell, as the \$77 million is limited to official contributions to the organization and doesn't include the costs for the U.S. delegation of about 100 federal employees to fly back and forth to Paris for meetings twice a year.

In its budget released Thursday, the Republican Study Group — a group of conservative Republicans headed by Rep. Mark Walker (R-N.C.) — is proposing to eliminate all U.S. funding for the OECD.

The OECD has its genesis in the U.S. effort to help rebuild Europe after WWII through the Marshall Plan. It is generally focused on producing economic reports meant to encourage “best practices” among its 35 member countries, which include most countries in Europe, plus the United States, Australia, Canada, Chile, India, Japan, Mexico, and South Korea.

But in recent years, it's tilted left, with many reports focused on pushing a global warming narrative, complaining of income inequality, and arguing against countries that compete with others by offering lower tax rates.

“It's morphed into a typical left-wing bureaucracy,” says Mitchell.

And though the State Department refers to the OECD as a “neutral” organization, the OECD's two top officials were not neutral in the 2016 U.S. presidential campaign. In fact, it could be said

that they "interfered" in the U.S. presidential election by trying to tip the scales in favor of Hillary Clinton.

In an interview with Al Jazeera in June of 2016, Angel Gurría, the secretary-general of the OECD and a former foreign minister of Mexico, agreed with the host when asked whether Donald Trump could be considered a "racist" for saying Judge Gonzalo Curiel was biased against him in the Trump University lawsuit. He also called Trump's proposed border wall between the U.S. and Mexico a "crazy idea" that is "not gonna happen."

The No. 2 man at the OECD, meanwhile, an American named Doug Frantz, compared the Trump campaign to the rise of Hitler and Mussolini in a June 2016 interview and called the possibility that Trump might be elected president "a real threat."

Gurría, an economist by training, has taken an activist role in personally pushing for the United States and European countries to take on the risk of accepting all migrants, with the hope of future returns. In a World Economic Forum video in 2016, he called investment in migrants a "down payment," saying that when provided with skills, migrants will help a country's economic growth.

This exhortation for the industrialized nations of the world to accept and invest in migrants coming into their country, usually illegally, is reiterated on the organization's website.

"OECD calls on countries to step up integration efforts for migrants and refugees" is the headline on a press release on the OECD homepage with a link to a speech by Gurría.

According to a large study by the Federation for American Immigration Reform that uses only official government statistics that are uniform across states, it costs American taxpayers \$113 billion each year to provide support and services for the estimated 10 million to 20 million illegal immigrants in the country, more than half of whom have crossed into the country illegally from Gurría's home country of Mexico.

European countries, meanwhile, are grappling with a sharp increase in terrorism and a rash of sexual assaults of native women by Muslim migrants — most notably in Germany, where thousands of women were sexually assaulted and raped by immigrants on New Year's Eve 2016 in Cologne and other cities.

The libertarian Cato Institute's recent criticism of the OECD has focused on economics, in particular its report that is critical of plans for tax reform in the U.S. and that downgrades the outlook for economic growth in the U.S.

The report, Mitchell said on Fox Business in June, is "predicated on the notion that those bureaucrats in Paris should have the ability to harmonize taxes, which of course always means higher taxes."

The risk of staying in the organization, he says, is substantial, given that the OECD has a "multilateral convention" that President Barack Obama signed that, if the U.S. Senate were to ratify it in the future, would force the U.S. to share personal financial information with corrupt governments.

President Trump's first budget, called "A New Foundation for American Greatness," released this past spring, called for an almost 30 percent cut in funding for the State Department and international programs. It did not specify whether the OECD funding would be continued, but included the following statement that has caught the attention of everyone in Washington who works in the realm of foreign policy.

"The budget proposes to reduce or end direct funding for international programs and organizations whose missions do not substantially advance U.S. foreign policy interests."

The OECD is not specifically defunded in the House Appropriations bill either, though the bill does name four other international organizations for which Congress will not approve funding this year: the Green Climate Fund, UNESCO, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and the U.N. Population Fund. It will also specifically does not provide funding for international debt relief.

The Republican Study Committee budget goes further, proposing that all U.S. funding be cut for the OECD and for Global Green Energy and Climate Change. It seeks the cap on U.S. peacekeeping missions to be enforced. And it proposes for the following to be eliminated: the Emergency Refugee and Migration Assistance Fund, the Complex Crises Fund, the East-West Center, the U.S. Institute of Peace, the U.S. Trade and Development Agency (USTDA), the Inter-American Foundation, the Asia Foundation, and the United States African Development Foundation.

Only later in the budget process will it become apparent whether U.S. taxpayers will continue to fund the OECD to the tune of more than \$77 million a year.

"Simply stated, I can't imagine a more egregious way of wasting American tax dollars," Mitchell told LifeZette this week, saying the only way OECD funding will be stopped is if the White House or members of Congress intervene in the appropriations process to make that happen.