

importance of the work requires it. The impact of the decisions demand it, and the American people deserve no less. I urge Members to support H.R. 64.

Mr. BARCIA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 64, the Strengthening Science at the Environmental Protection Agency Act, legislation that will ensure that science plays a proper role at the Environmental Protection Agency. We must be sure that science will serve as the basis for sound regulations that do not unduly impede economic development.

I want to thank Congressman SHERWOOD BOEHLERT and VERNON EHLERS who worked closely with myself and Congressman RALPH HALL to craft a truly bipartisan piece of legislation. This legislation addresses recommendations made by the National Academy of Sciences and will do much to improve the quality of science at the Environmental Protection Agency.

This legislation emphasizes that research is integral to the mission of EPA to protect human health and the environment.

The creation of a Deputy Administrator for Science and Technology will ensure that science has an equal seat at the table when important decisions are made. Any regulation issued by the EPA must be based on the best scientific information available. I believe that the elevated status of this new position will ensure this is the case.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 64.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation sponsored by my good friend and colleague from Michigan, Mr. EHLERS.

This legislation, which establishes a Deputy Administrator for Science and Technology at the Environmental Protection Agency, fulfills a recommendation made in a report of the National Academy of Sciences. It is intended to give science a more visible role at EPA and to ensure a sound foundation for science at the agency.

As many in this body know, there is a widespread perception that politics more than science influences regulatory decisions at EPA. This bill addresses this problem, but it is only the beginning.

There needs to be a real change in the culture at EPA. Many have asked whether it is appropriate to have a regulatory body conducting and overseeing the science used to support its regulatory determinations. It seems to me that there is an inherent conflict of interest in such an arrangement. Even when EPA science is sound, there is an inescapable perception that the regulatory decision drove the science, not the other way around. This bill is a good start at raising the profile and centrality of science at EPA.

I want to thank the gentleman from Michigan for his leadership on this issue, and I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 64.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 64, the Strengthening Science at the Environmental Protection Agency Act.

In a report published in June of 2000, the National Academy of Sciences recommended the restructuring of the EPA's science programs to strengthen the role that science plays in the decision-making process. The National Academy's recommendations call for the establishment of a Deputy Administrator for Science and Technology and an appointment for the position of Assistant Administrator for Research and Development.

I am pleased that Mr. EHLERS introduced H.R. 64, which will make these recommendations a reality. Protection of our environment is dependent on science both to assess problems and to develop solutions. This bill enhances the mission of the Environmental Protection Agency to include conducting, sponsoring, and evaluating environmental science and technology research. The agency will then use the results of this research to carry out the EPA's agenda with regard to protecting the environment.

With this shift to a more science-based decision-making process at the Environmental Protection Agency, it only makes sense that the people who oversee science and technology at the EPA should be well-respected researchers who understand the scientific process. This bill directs the President to appoint a Deputy Administrator for Science and Technology and an Assistant Administrator for Research and Development (or Chief Scientist) who both have outstanding backgrounds, including research accomplishments, scientific reputation and leadership experience.

Although I support this effort, I wanted to sound one cautionary note. As we pass this bill, we will need to monitor its implementation carefully. We want to make sure that our direction that EPA has a Deputy Administrator for Science and Technology and an appointment for the position of Assistant Administrator for Research and Development not be distorted by anyone with a political agenda. We want to make sure the people who fill these new positions at EPA are truly scientists, not politicians intent on using junk science or biased science to fulfill a political agenda. That is equally true for pro-industry and pro-environmental positions.

All too often in the environmental arena we see decisionmaking being dictated by a reliance on studies created or funded by industry. In many instances, we don't have access to the raw data underlying these studies. As any scientist will tell you, this is a perversion of the peer review process that is the basis of all good science. We have also seen groups make wild claims that have no basis in scientific analysis.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 64 is a well-intentioned bill and a step forward to see that our decisions are guided by the best available data. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. BAIRD. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CULBERSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. EHLERS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 64, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENDING AUTHORITY OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK UNTIL MAY 31, 2002

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the Sen-

ate bill (S. 2248) to extend the authority of the Export-Import Bank until May 31, 2002.

The Clerk read as follows:

S. 2248

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF EXPORT-IMPORT BANK.

Notwithstanding the dates specified in section 7 of the Export-Import Bank Act of 1945 (12 U.S.C. 635f) and section 1(c) of Public Law 103-428, the Export-Import Bank of the United States shall continue to exercise its functions in connection with and in furtherance of its objects and purposes through May 31, 2002.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on S. 2248, and to insert extraneous material on the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this Member rises today in support of S. 2248, which is being considered today under suspension of the rules. This legislation simply extends the authorization for the Export-Import Bank until May 31, 2002, nothing more. Under current law, the most recent short-term reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank expires on April 30, 2002. If this subsequent short term authorization extension is not signed into law, the Export-Import Bank could not engage in new transactions and would have to wind down its current operations as of today, April 30.

Without the passage of this legislation the Export-Import Bank will not have the legal authority to issue new financing commitments in support of the export of U.S. made goods and U.S. origin services.

□ 1530

Each year, the bank supports more than 2,300 export transactions. Eighty-six percent of those transactions are for small and medium-sized businesses. The bank processes a daily flow of export cases and any expiration of the bank's charter will jeopardize pending sales and the jobs of U.S. workers tied to those transactions.

Even more important to small business, the Export-Import Bank has a Credit Committee which approves small business transactions. This Credit Committee meets often each week. If this extension is not passed, the Credit Committee will not be able to do their business, and small businesses in turn will be hurt the most.

Therefore, it is extraordinarily important that we approve this legislation today. I say that because tomorrow, in fact, we will be debating the Export-Import Bank Reauthorization Act of 2001 under a rule. That bill, introduced by this Member, of course, had careful attention in subcommittee and committee, and we are prepared to take it to the House floor tomorrow under a rule which is expected to be prepared this evening for consideration tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, for these reasons and many others, it is extraordinarily important that we approve this 1-month authorization extension for the Export-Import Bank today.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SANDERS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks, and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to my very good friend, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), I rise as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade in strong opposition to this 30-day extension to the Export-Import Bank. I think it is time to send this bank a message, and I think we should vote down this extension and this bill this afternoon.

This bill, I should say, is being opposed by 10 of my colleagues who have sent a letter to every Member of Congress urging a "no" vote on this legislation. These Representatives are the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS), the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL), the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY), the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. TOWNS).

This bill is also opposed by the Paper Allied Chemical and Energy Workers International, PACE, a union with over 300,000 members. It is opposed by the Independent Steel Workers Union. It is opposed by the U.S. Business and Industry Council and by the CATO Institute, a conservative think tank.

Mr. Speaker, this is an example of where progressives, such as myself, and conservatives, are coming together to protect the American taxpayer and the workers of this country in opposition to an outrageous example of corporate welfare.

While I do not often agree with the conservative columnist Robert Novak, I urge Members to read the article he wrote which appeared in yesterday's Washington Post which raises some very strong concerns about the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Speaker, many supporters of the Export-Import Bank argue that the

bank is necessary in order to create jobs. What I want to know, therefore, is if this bank is supposed to create jobs, how come the major beneficiaries of the Export-Import Bank, the corporations who have received the most assistance year after year, have substantially reduced their American workforce? In other words, instead of creating new jobs, these large corporations have taken money from the Export-Import Bank and, year after year, they have thrown tens and tens of thousands of American workers out on the street.

I think it is time to tell those folks who are at the trough for corporate welfare that if they want money from the taxpayers of this country, if they want help from the working people of this country, you do not lay off hundreds of thousands of American workers.

Mr. Speaker, some have talked about how 86 percent of the transactions from Ex-Im go to small business. That is correct. But that is a bit misleading, because 82 percent of the money, what is really important, goes to the Fortune 500 companies, while only 18 percent of the dollars and the subsidies go to small business.

Mr. Speaker, let me give a few examples of the work and the actions of some of the major beneficiaries of the Export-Import Bank. General Electric has received over \$2.5 billion in direct loans and loan guarantees from the Export-Import Bank. They are, I believe, the second largest major beneficiary. Not exactly a small business. In fact, they are one of the largest corporations in the world. So all the taxpayers in America who are struggling to keep their heads above water, GE thanks you very, very much for your assistance.

What is this company doing? What do they say. Jack Welch, as everybody knows, was the very successful CEO of GE for many years. Let me quote Mr. Welch: "Ideally, you have every plant you own on a barge."

That is his philosophy. I respect the guy. He is up front. He says that the way you make money is to move to China and Mexico, pay workers there sub-standard wages, and throw American workers out on the streets. That is his business. I do not have a problem with that, but I do have a serious problem that American taxpayers' money, American workers' money, goes to companies who say, "Hey, wouldn't it be ideal if we could have all of our jobs on a barge and move to any country in the world where wages are lower?"

GE has moved jobs from State to State and country to country in search of lower wages. The company's biggest export is, in fact, jobs. In 1975, GE had 667,000 American workers. In 1995, they employed 398,000, a decline of 269,000 jobs. Now, is that not something? What a success story for Ex-Im; the number 2 recipient lays off hundreds of thousands of jobs.

Now, I was a mayor of a city for 8 years and we provided help to the busi-

ness communities. But, you know what? We did not just give them a blank check. We said if you want taxpayer money, this is what we want from you in return. And I would suggest very strongly that what the taxpayers of this country want when they subsidize corporations is they want those corporations to reinvest in America, create jobs in America, and not run to China, Mexico and every country in the world where they can pay workers starvation wages.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Financial Service.

(Mr. OXLEY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OXLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support the 30-day extension of Ex-Im's reauthorization. Let me take a few minutes to outline for my colleagues why this extension is so critical.

Without this 30 day extension, the Ex-Im Bank will not be forced to close its doors, but it will be prevented from doing any new business transactions. What does that mean? It means many U.S. manufacturers will have to sit idle waiting for a full-term authorization, losing millions of dollars in business every day. It means that workers whose jobs depend on exports financed by the Ex-Im Bank will face an unclear future.

It means that the international export community will view the U.S. Congress as unsupportive of U.S. exporters and will seek to capitalize by convincing foreign markets that they cannot rely any longer on U.S. manufacturers. I have already received a copy of a letter that calls into question the ability of Ex-Im to transact future deals. That is the international perception. It is critical that we refute that view by passing this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow the House is scheduled to consider a 4-year reauthorization of Ex-Im that was approved by the Committee on Financial Services in October of last year. That legislation, H.R. 2871, received broad bipartisan support in the committee and was approved by a voice vote.

I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Monetary Policy and Trade, who, over the past several months, has worked closely with the administration to remedy some of its concerns related to the original legislation. Many of those concerns have been addressed and will be included in a manager's amendment to the legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the Ex-Im Bank is a vital tool for the American exporting community. The Ex-Im Bank provides loan guarantees, insurance and direct loans to U.S. manufacturers that seek

to reach overseas markets when there is no available commercial financing or direct competition from another export credit agency.

There are over 70 foreign export credit agencies supplying more than \$500 billion in financing for international exports. In order to remain competitive in the international arena, U.S. exporters need the Ex-Im Bank to compete on a level playing field. Without Ex-Im, our manufacturers would face an international market full of goods receiving government sponsored support, making it more difficult for them to offer their goods at a competitive price. Additionally, without Ex-Im, it will be more difficult for U.S. goods to reach emerging markets, effectively closing out the opportunity for U.S. businesses to build a customer base in those countries.

Let me reiterate, Mr. Speaker we will take up the full authorization for the Ex-Im Bank tomorrow, but today we must extend the charter of the bank for 30 days to ensure that Ex-Im can continue to create new business. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to approve this 30-day extension of the bank and let the world know that we support American manufacturers, we support American workers and we support the American economy.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE), the ranking member of the Committee on Financial Services.

(Mr. LAFALCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I find myself in agreement with much of what has been said by my friend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and my friend the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY), so I rise in strong support of this 30-day extension of the Ex-Im Bank.

I think it is imperative that we continue the existence of Ex-Im Bank until no other country has the means of subsidizing their exports. Otherwise, we would be engaging in unilateral disarmament. We cannot do that. I do not foresee the day in the near future when we are going to have a multilateral agreement that ends all subsidies of exports.

So, this is really a necessity for survival. If we did not extend Ex-Im Bank, basically you would have to shut down its operations. That is just untenable.

Having said that, let me also say I share some of the concerns of my good friend, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), both with respect to procedure and with respect to substance. About 30 days ago when we had another 30-day extension, I said that it would be difficult for me to support another extension unless we had come to the floor or would be coming to the floor with the authorization bill.

I wish we had done it in the past 30 days, but we are doing it tomorrow. So

that is good enough, we are doing it tomorrow. But also my assumption is, and I am supporting the 30-day extension on the assumption that the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) and others who have differences of opinion, who want to perfect the bill, will be given the opportunity to offer their amendments on the floor of the House so they can be voted up or down.

On the basis of that assumption, I can and do support the bill.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFALCE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to confirm the gentleman's understanding and expectation. This Member has specifically urged the Committee on Rules and our colleagues in the Committee on Financial Services to make in order, for example, the Sanders amendment and the amendment of the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and others that were offered in committee but which were not approved.

I expect and am very assured that we are going to have a structured but broadly open bill for discussion tomorrow and that the concerns of the distinguished gentleman (Mr. LAFALCE) will be addressed tomorrow in the debate.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAFALCE. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I find that a very persuasive reason for supporting today's bill. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS).

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I just heard this last colloquy with the gentleman from New York. If he still has faith in the Committee on Rules around here, that we are going to get a rule that will allow us to offer our amendments, I am going to pray tonight, I will burn a candle, I will do everything necessary, but let us see what happens about that tonight.

Now, the Export-Import Bank, I do not get this around here. \$673 million in loans and loan guarantees for projects related to the Enron Corporation. Has that corporation been lifted up into this debate? Does anybody want to defend that? I will yield to them right now. \$673 million in loans, leaving the taxpayers exposed to \$514 million in loans.

Then they approved a \$300 million loan for an Enron-related project in India, even though the World Bank, for whom I have not always praise, has refused to finance the very same project because it was not economically viable.

□ 1545

So what goes on here? This was created in the Depression to create jobs,

and now they are operating in a totally reverse strategy. Is this new information to the committee? And they are providing the money to the Fortune 500 corporations, which are nice people and I like them a lot, but they are the ones that are contracting the labor force into United States as we meet.

So I come to this debate a little bit confused.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONYERS. I yield to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman comes from Detroit where General Motors is. How many workers have been laid off by General Motors, a major recipient of the Export-Import Bank? Does the gentleman have any idea?

Mr. CONYERS. Yes, Mr. Speaker. Roughly 200,000.

Mr. SANDERS. Well, they must be doing a good job with the money that they are getting. They sure are.

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, from 559,000 to 314,000, and that is just one of the automobile corporations; they are all contracting. And most of the Fortune 500 companies are contracting their workforce. So how do we end up thinking that this is very important because this does not protect American workers? Why are we here?

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. MALONEY), a member of the Committee on Financial Services.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I rise in bipartisan support of the 30-day extension reauthorization of the Export-Import Bank. One month ago Congress successfully passed a 30-day reauthorization by voice vote, and I urge my colleagues to once again support keeping the bank in business as we finish the reauthorization tomorrow.

Since 1934, the Ex-Im Bank has helped finance the sale of U.S. products around the world by providing loan guarantees, loans, and export credit insurance for U.S. businesses. While some opponents of the bank argue that it has outlived its use, I believe its mission is increasingly relevant in today's competitive global economy, especially as new opportunities for U.S. exports increase in emerging markets.

In politically developing regions like Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union, projects often require the support of an export credit agency, and without Ex-Im Bank, they would be more likely to fall to foreign competitors.

Exports are increasingly important to the U.S. economy. The U.S. is far more dependent on exports today, which form a larger share of the GNP, than in the 1930s. In fiscal year 2000, the bank supported over \$15.5 billion in U.S. exports, on a subsidy of \$759 million.

The important point to remember about the bank is that it is a lender of last resort. It offers guarantees for loans that otherwise would not be made. Mr. Speaker, \$15.5 billion may not be a large number in relation to the entire U.S. economy, but this \$15.5 billion represents economic activity and U.S. jobs that, without Ex-Im Bank, support would not be available to American workers.

Across the country, Ex-Im Bank support goes to businesses, both large and small. I am frequently visited by constituents who use the Ex-Im Bank. In my district in New York, the bank has worked with financial institutions, import-exporters and manufacturers, totaling over \$1 billion in exports since 1995. During this period, the bank has supported 72 different businesses in my district alone, including 19 small businesses.

While today's vote will keep the bank in business for 30 days, the House will consider the bank's reauthorization through 2005 tomorrow.

With the leadership of the ranking member, the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAFALCE) and the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY) and the subcommittee chairman, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), this reauthorization builds on the bank's past successes. It has strong bipartisan support, and it also includes an amendment I offered in the subcommittee giving the bank explicit authority to turn down an application for Ex-Im support when a company has engaged in fraudulent business practices.

Mr. Speaker, this is an important institution, and I urge its continued support, both today and tomorrow.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Last summer, I worked with my very good friend, the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) on issues relating to the Export-Import Bank. In fact, we introduced a bill, H.R. 2517, that would have gone a very long way in protecting the taxpayers of this country from corporate welfare and in protecting American workers, and I want to thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his support of that effort. A markup was scheduled to take place on that bill but, out of nowhere, the markup was canceled, and my suspicion is that the moneyed interests who like the Export-Import Bank as it is right now sent down the word from on top that that markup never take place. What we have in front of us is an outrageous example of corporate welfare.

Mr. Speaker, my feeling is that the American people who, in many instances, are working longer hours for lower wages than was the case 20 or 30 years ago, many of whom have no health insurance, our seniors do not have prescription drugs, we face a housing crisis, a child care crisis; in the midst of all of this, people are say-

ing, why are the taxpayers of this country providing huge subsidies and loans to the largest multinational corporations in the world who pay their CEOs huge salaries, give them huge benefits, and companies that take this money from the taxpayers say, thank you very much and, oh, by the way, we are laying you off because we are going to China and hiring somebody at 20 cents an hour.

I think the American people want us to protect their dollars. I think they want us to protect American workers.

What is so bad about saying to a corporation, if you want taxpayers' money, then you have to protect American jobs? What a radical idea. But it is an idea that has not yet come to the Export-Import Bank.

There are a number of reasons why we should vote "no" and send a message to the Export-Import Bank.

Number 1, major corporations take the money, lay off American workers, and run abroad.

Number 2, the Export-Import Bank, as the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) indicated, has provided \$673 million in financing to questionable Enron-related projects, projects, in some instances, that the taxpayers of this country may have to pick up the tab for.

Number 3, the Export-Import Bank is hurting steel workers. The Export-Import Bank has provided an \$18 million loan to help a Chinese steel mill purchase equipment to modernize their plant. This Chinese company has been accused of illegally dumping steel into the U.S. According to the United Steel Workers of America, "It is disgraceful that the U.S. Government is bankrolling Chinese steel production when U.S. steel companies are declaring bankruptcy and American workers are being laid off."

Number 4, the Export-Import Bank is helping the Chinese military. The Export-Import Bank is subsidizing Boeing aircraft sales to the Chinese military. According to the President of Machinist Local 751, "Boeing used to make tail sections for the 747s in Wichita, but they moved the work to a military factory in Xian, China. Is this Boeing's definition of free trade, to have American workers compete with Chinese labor making \$50 a month under military discipline?"

Number 5, the Export-Import Bank is helping General Electric ship jobs to Mexico.

Number 6, the Export-Import Bank is helping AT&T ship jobs to China. And on and on and on it goes.

Mr. Speaker, in my view, if we keep the Export-Import Bank, we should have firm guarantees from the companies that receive the money that they are going to grow American jobs, they are going to hire more and more workers, not lay them off. In my view, a much larger percentage of money from the Export-Import Bank should go to the small business community, the people who are creating jobs in Amer-

ica, not to the big corporations who are sending our jobs abroad.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time is now to send a message to the Export-Import Bank who have, for so long, ignored the needs of the American taxpayer and have ignored the needs of American workers. Let us shut them down. Let them think. Give them some time to think. This is going to be a very good reflective time, contemplative time. They could take the time off, go home, meditate, and try to understand how they can represent American workers and American taxpayers, rather than just the multinational corporations.

So I urge a "no" vote. I will insert into the RECORD at this time a statement from the United States Business and Industry Council, which opposes the extension; a statement from the Cato Institute that opposes the extension; and a statement on behalf of the Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers representing 320,000 American workers who want to keep their jobs in this country.

The statements are as follows:

UNITED STATES BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY COUNCIL,

April 29, 2002.

OPPOSE THE 30-DAY EXTENSION OF THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK—REQUIRE THAT IT SUPPORT JOBS AND INDUSTRY IN AMERICA, NOT OVERSEAS

On Tuesday, April 30, 2002, a 30-day extension of the Export-Import Bank will be on the House Suspension Calendar. On behalf of our domestic American member companies, we urge that you vote against S. 2248.

The Export-Import Bank was created in 1934 to increase U.S. jobs through exports. Today, the Export-Import Bank has strayed from this mission. It is now providing billions of dollars to multinational companies that are laying-off hundreds of thousands of American workers and shipping their jobs overseas.

By opposing the 30-day extension, you will be sending a message to the Export-Import Bank that it should only support companies and projects that increase jobs in the United States.

EXPORT-IMPORT BANK'S TOP CLIENTS CUT THEIR WORKFORCE

Time Magazine reports the top 5 recipients of Ex-Im subsidies over the past decade have reduced their workforce by 38%—more than a third of a million jobs lost. These five companies, which include giants Boeing and General Electric, have received more than 60% of all Ex-Im subsidies.

THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK HAS HELPED CHINESE STEELMAKERS

The Export-Import Bank has provided an \$18 million loan to help a Chinese steel mill purchase equipment to modernize their plant. This Chinese company has been accused of illegally dumping steel into the American market. The U.S. government should not bankroll Chinese steel production when U.S. steel companies are being forced into bankruptcy by imports.

THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK IS HELPING THE CHINESE MILITARY

The Export-Import Bank is subsidizing Boeing aircraft sales to China. Yet, Boeing has been increasing the amount of aircraft production it does in China. It used to make tail sections for the 737 in Wichita, but then moved the work to a military factory in

Xian, China. Besides being questionable on commercial grounds, such deals amount to the Ex-Im Bank subsidizing Beijing's defense industry at a time when China's military buildup threatens the stability of Asia.

These practices must end. Oppose the 30-day extension of the Export-Import Bank.

THE CATO INSTITUTE,
April 30, 2002.

TIME TO RETIRE THE EXPORT-IMPORT BANK,
CATO STUDY CONCLUDES

WASHINGTON.—The House of Representatives faces a vote this week on whether to reauthorize the Export-Import Bank of the United States. A recent study published by the Cato Institute, "Rethinking the Export-Import Bank," finds that, "the Ex-Im Bank is a Great Depression-era agency that has little relevance in a time of increasingly open and sophisticated global markets."

According to the study:

Generous export subsidies don't equal better export performance. The United States exported roughly twice as much in 2000 as it did in 1990. By comparison, Germany's exports increased by 34%, Japan's by 66%, the U.K.'s by 51%, and France's by 36%. Yet according to a 1997 GAO analysis of official export support, the United States subsidized a much smaller share of its exports than any of these other nations. In addition, most (more than 80%) beneficiaries of Ex-Im financing do not face subsidized competition.

Export subsidies don't increase net employment or "improve" the trade balance. By overriding the market, the Bank directs credit to less efficient uses, creating distortions in the national economy, and imposing opportunity costs that are higher than the added value of the Bank's intervention.

It is neither fair nor constitutional that taxpayer dollars are being used to support particular businesses, including Enron, GE, and numerous other multibillion-dollar beneficiaries. Indeed, in FY2000, the top 10 recipients of the Bank's loans and long-term guarantees were large corporations that got 86% of those services. Private credit markets are far deeper and are more accessible than during the Great Depression when the Bank was founded, and large corporations should have no trouble financing creditworthy projects.

"Rethinking the Export-Import Bank" can be found at <http://www.freetrade.org/pubs/briefs/tbp-015es.html>. Daniel Griswold, associate director of Cato's Center for Trade Policy Studies, is available to provide comments and background. He can be reached at (202) 789-5260, or dgriswold@cato.org.

PACE,
April 29, 2002.

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Paper, Allied-Industrial, Chemical and Energy Workers International Union (PACE) and our 320,000 members I would like to express our opposition of the bill to provide for a 30-day extension of the Export-Import Bank. The bill will be on the Suspension Calendar for Tuesday, April 30, 2002. We urge that you vote against this legislation.

The Export-Import Bank was created in 1934, in the midst of the Great Depression, to increase U.S. jobs through exports. Unfortunately, the Export-Import Bank has reversed this strategy and is now providing billions of dollars in corporate welfare to large, multinational companies. In many instances, the companies that receive Export-Import Bank support are precisely the ones that are laying-off hundreds of thousands of American workers and shipping those jobs overseas to China and Mexico.

By opposing the 30-day extension, we will be sending a message to the Export-Import Bank and its supporters: start protecting American workers, stop financing Enron-related projects, support our struggling steel industry, and only support companies that are working hard to increase jobs in the United States—not the ones that are exporting jobs. If we are successful, the Export-Import Bank may have to close its doors for one day. Hopefully, this 24-hour period will enable the bank to consider changing its policies to help American workers—not the multi-national companies that are shipping jobs overseas.

Here are the top five reasons to oppose this bill:

1. The Export-Import Bank Provides Corporate Welfare To Companies That Ship jobs Overseas.

On August 8, 1996, the director of the AFL-CIO task force on trade said that: "Ex-Im financing is corporate welfare with a fig leave of U.S. jobs."

According to Time Magazine, the top 5 recipients of Ex-Im subsidies over the past decade which include Boeing and General Electric have reduced their workforce by 38%—more than a third of a million jobs down the drain. These same 5 companies have received more than 60 percent of all Export-Import subsidies.

2. The Export-Import Bank Has Provided \$673 million in Financing to Questionable Enron-related projects.

Since 1994, the Export-Import Bank has provided \$673 million in loans and loan guarantees for projects related to the Enron Corporation leaving taxpayers exposed to \$514 million. The Ex-Im Bank approved a \$300 million loan for an Enron-related project in India even though the World Bank repeatedly refused to finance this project because it was "not economically viable."

According to Human Rights Watch, Amnesty International, Friends of the Earth and the Indian media, "Enron subsidiaries paid local law enforcement to suppress opposition to its power plant in which they arbitrarily beat and arrested dozens of villagers."

3. The Export-Import Bank Is Hurting Steelworkers.

The Export-Import Bank has provided an \$18 million loan to help a Chinese steel mill purchase equipment to modernize their plant. This Chinese company has been accused of illegally dumping steel into the U.S. According to the United Steelworkers of America, "It's disgraceful that the U.S. government is bankrolling Chinese steel production when U.S. steel companies are declaring bankruptcy and American workers are being laid-off."

4. The Export-Import Bank Is Helping Boeing Ship Jobs to China.

The Export-Import Bank is subsidizing Boeing aircraft sales to China. According to the President of Machinists' Local 751: "Boeing used to make tail sections for the 737 in Wichita, but they moved the work to a military factory in Xian, China. Is this Boeing's definition of free trade, to have American workers compete with Chinese labor making \$50 a month under military discipline?"

5. The Export-Import Bank Is Helping General Electric Ship Jobs to Mexico.

The Ex-Im Bank insured a \$3-million loan to aid General Electric build a factory where Mexican workers will make parts for appliances to export back to the United States. This project is responsible for the loss of 1,500 American jobs in Bloomington, Indiana. Their jobs will now be performed by Mexican workers who are making \$2 per hour.

These practices must end. Oppose the 30-day extension of the Export-Import Bank bill.

Sincerely,

LOWELL "PETE" STRADER.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, the legislation that we will take up tomorrow will be requiring an increase of Ex-Im Bank funds for small business—a requirement of not less than 20%. Already, 86 percent of the transactions of the Export-Import Bank do involve small business.

This is not a question about sending a message to the Export-Import Bank by failing to approve this 1-month extension today. This is a very serious matter for it would not be just a 24-hour hiatus. This, in fact, will disturb the Ex-Im transactions now under review. It will be particularly damaging to the small business community, as I pointed out in my earlier remarks.

A "Dear Colleague" has been sent around to Members of the House. It states that, in fact, this is only a small message, a 24-hour period. As I said, this is not accurate. If the House does not vote in favor of Ex-Im's 30-day reauthorization, the bank will not be able to transact any new business until there is agreement between the House and the Senate on the terms of Ex-Im's reauthorization. In fact, the unfortunate message that would be sent is a real one to American exporters that we have no confidence in the Export-Import Bank.

I would like to address 4 specific points that were made in the "Dear Colleague" letter. First of all, the Export-Import Bank is not corporate welfare. As I mentioned, 86 percent of Ex-Im's transactions are with small businesses. Ex-Im charges interest on its direct loans and premiums for its guarantees and insurance, costs that the U.S. exporters usually pass through to the overseas customers. Those charges usually range from 5 percent to 17 percent of the financing obtained, depending upon the risk.

Number 2, the Export-Import Bank, like other institutions was, in fact, a victim of Enron. The entire U.S. economy was caught off guard when Enron folded, including the Ex-Im Bank.

□ 1600

But Ex-Im is receiving installment payments from Enron for all Enron-related transactions. Ex-Im is participating fully in the Justice Department investigation to determine if Enron made any false statements to the government with respect to export-import transactions.

Number three, the Export-Import Bank Extension Act does fight for steelworkers. The full reauthorization bill, which will come to the floor tomorrow, has a very important provision added at the suggestion or at the amendment of our colleague from the committee, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. TOOMEY).

That legislation addresses the \$18 billion guarantee approved by the Export-Import Bank in December of 2000 to

support the sale of computer software by American exporters to Benxi Iron and Steel Company in China. The Benxi Company was subject to a final determination of steel dumping by the International Trade Commission subsequent to that transaction approval.

The bill conforms Ex-Im lending to current U.S. trade laws now, because of the Toomey amendment, by barring any Ex-Im loan or guarantee for production of substantially the same product that is the subject of a countervailing duty or anti-dumping order or a section 201 determination by the International Trade Commission.

The legislation now also requires the Export-Import Bank to develop procedures for loans and loan guarantees to a business, which is subject to a preliminary countervailing trade duty or an anti-dumping determination of material injury. So we have taken very specific action in the committee on the Toomey amendment to address the concerns that came out of the Benxi steel case.

Fourth, I would say the Export-Import Bank is critical in maintaining U.S. jobs. It creates thousands of jobs every year.

I would like to give a quote from John J. Sweeney, the President of AFL-CIO. He says, "As far as we're concerned, corporations which receive subsidies from the Export-Import Bank are merely vehicles through which jobs and income for American workers are created."

I might also mention, this legislation is supported by the International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers. They strongly support passage of the legislation.

Now is not the time to take an action that is not responsible. We need to approve the 1-month extension today to keep the disruption from the Export-Import Bank's customers, the American exporters, from taking place.

We will have a full debate tomorrow. I am confident that the bill will give the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), for example, and other key members of the committee, as well as certain other Members of the House who have important amendments, an opportunity to present such amendments to be fully debated, and if necessary, a vote in the House.

Mr. Speaker, it is important we approve this legislation today under suspension. I urge my colleagues to support the passage of S. 2248.

Mr. LAFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this 30-day extension of authorization for the Export-Import Bank. Absent this extension, the Bank's authorization will expire, forcing Ex-Im to begin liquidation of its existing contracts and prohibiting any new transactions.

It is very important to understand that this 30-day extension is independent of consideration of H.R. 2871, the 4-year reauthorization of the Ex-Im Bank. H.R. 2871 will be considered tomorrow under a rule, which will give Members an opportunity to offer and debate amendments to the bill. That is the appropriate

venue for consideration of more substantive issues related to the Bank's authorization. Today's 30-day extension is necessary to avert a major disruption of Ex-Im operations during the time it takes to consider H.R. 2871 and conference it with the Senate.

Failure to pass the 30-day extension will not only harm the reputation of the Ex-Im Bank. It will also cause serious economic harm to American businesses, including the thousands of small business exporters that account for 90 percent of the Bank's transactions. It will be a setback for U.S. credibility in the global economy, potentially triggering lack of confidence in the U.S. government as a creditor and guarantor in international financial transactions. And it will send the wrong message on the foreign policy front at a time when we are working hard to engage with other countries in the war on terrorism.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WALDEN of Oregon). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the Senate bill, S. 2248.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds of those present have voted in the affirmative.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. HARMAN. Mr. Speaker, on roll call vote 114 last Thursday, April 24, I am not listed as having voted, although I am quite certain I placed my voting card into the voting machine.

Let the record show I intended to vote no on roll call vote 114, the Issa amendment to the Immigration Reform and Accountability Act.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 347) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the National Peace Officers' Memorial Service.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 347

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR NATIONAL PEACE OFFICERS' MEMORIAL SERVICE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The National Fraternal Order of Police and its auxiliary (in this resolution referred to as the "sponsor") shall be permitted to sponsor a public event, the 21st annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service (in this resolution jointly referred to

as the "event"), on the Capitol Grounds, in order to honor the law enforcement officers who died in the line of duty during 2001.

(b) DATE OF EVENT.—The event shall be held on May 15, 2002, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Rules and Administration of the Senate jointly designate.

SEC. 2. TERMS AND CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board, the event shall be—

(1) free of admission charge and open to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress.

(b) EXPENSES AND LIABILITIES.—The sponsor shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. EVENT PREPARATIONS.

Subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, the sponsor is authorized to erect upon the Capitol Grounds such stage, sound amplification devices, and other related structures and equipment, as may be required for the event.

SEC. 4. ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS.

The Capitol Police Board shall provide for enforcement of the restrictions contained in section 4 of the Act of July 31, 1946 (40 U.S.C. 193d; 60 Stat. 718), concerning sales, advertisements, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds, as well as other restrictions applicable to the Capitol Grounds, in connection with the event.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO) and the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from West Virginia (Mrs. CAPITO).

Mrs. CAPITO. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 347 authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds for the 21st Annual National Peace Officers' Memorial Service to be held on May 15, 2002.

In 2001, over 230 Federal, State, and local law enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty protecting and serving our Nation. The officers remembered in this service represent the risk involved in civilian protection, as well as the selflessness necessary to perform their duties. This memorial service will honor the courage and commitment of these men and women.

The memorial service will be one part of the annual Police Week, which is sponsored by the National Law Enforcement Officers Memorial Fund. This week of special events always occurs during the calendar week in which the National Peace Officers Memorial Day falls.

The week features such events as the Eighth Annual Blue Mass at St. Patrick's Catholic Church, the National Police Challenge 50K relay, the 7th Annual Motorcycle Dice Ride, the Seventh Annual Law Ride, the 14th Annual Candlelight Vigil at the National Law Enforcement Officers' Memorial, the Fraternal Order of Police and Auxiliary Wreath-laying Ceremony, and the