

turn around and seek U.S. taxpayer assistance through the U.S. Export-Import Bank, forcing middle-class families to pick up the tab. Companies that dodge U.S. taxes should not be rewarded with taxpayer subsidies through the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Chairman, we are talking about substantial dollars here. Let me give my colleagues some examples of what I am talking about.

Tyco International, everybody will remember Tyco International, one of the poster children for corporate greed, saved \$400 million in U.S. taxes by reincorporating in Bermuda in 1997. What was the response of the Export-Import Bank to this deliberate attempt to avoid paying their fair share of taxes? What did they do when Tyco moved to Bermuda? Well, they gave Tyco \$115 million in assistance since 1998. That is absurd.

In 2002, Ingersoll-Rand saved up to \$60 million in U.S. taxes by reincorporating in Bermuda. Since 2002, this tax-dodging company received over \$370 million in subsidized loans, loan guarantees and other financial assistance from the Export-Import Bank.

In 2002, Nabors Industry saved \$10 million in taxes by reincorporating in Bermuda. Since that year, it has received over \$300 million in taxpayer-backed financial assistance through the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. Chairman, the time is now to say enough is enough. If corporations want to move to Bermuda and disown the United States, that is their right, but they do not have a right to then come back to the taxpayers of this country and ask the United States Congress and the Export-Import Bank to give them substantial sums of money.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Chairman, since I believe I will be the only one speaking here, I reserve my time.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRBACHER).

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Let me note that many of the companies that leave, and this is where I have a disagreement with the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS), many of the companies that do leave our country leave because of high taxes, which I consider to be levels of taxation that are too high and levels of regulation that are too high in the United States of America.

We may have a fundamental disagreement on how high taxes should be and regulations should be on business, but where I do agree with the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) is that businessmen have to make a decision. They are a part of the American family, and we have got to make a decision if we are going to stay part of the American family based on the rules and regulations that we are judged by and have to live by because we are part of the process.

If an American company does decide that taxes and regulation are too high and decide to change their status so they are no longer being treated and taxed or regulated as a domestic company, they should not expect then to receive the benefits of a company that is an American company. This makes all the common sense in the world.

I think it is a travesty, as the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. SANDERS) has pointed out, there are some companies that have decided to leave this country and, thus, officially, in order not to pay the same tax load, then expect to receive and have received the benefit of such subsidies we are talking about tonight. This makes all the common sense in the world.

I would hope, however, that we would, number one, pass the Sanders amendment to make sure that companies that leave do not receive this subsidy, but, at the same time, I would hope that we pay close attention to our taxation and regulation policies that make it profitable or make the businessmen who are making these decisions feel it is profitable for them to leave this country.

We should want businesses to come here and do business because it is profitable, our taxes and regulations make it profitable for them to be here, create jobs, et cetera. In the meantime, let us not do the travesty of giving people subsidies who are not paying into the system and have gone overseas and changed their status in order to escape their tax obligation.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON) assumed the Chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Williams, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### FOREIGN OPERATIONS, EXPORT FINANCING, AND RELATED PROGRAMS APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2005

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL).

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Chairman, the author of the amendment, and I am a coauthor of it, mentioned that it has a broad spectrum of individuals supporting it. He mentioned progressives and liberals and conservatives and moderates, but he forgot the libertarians.

Libertarians support this as well and for a precise reason. A free market libertarian does not believe in welfare for anybody, let alone the rich, and it is particularly gnawing to see the subsidies go to the very wealthy.

I am in strong support of this amendment, but, like the gentleman from California, I do not support this for the purpose of collecting more taxes, but I do think it is a message to us here that if we do not revise our tax system and our regulatory system we will prompt more and more business to leave this country.

So there are two issues here, but corporate welfare and subsidies should have no part in this. There is no room for it. It is wrong.

Also, the beneficiaries outside the corporations we should not forget either, because the biggest country that benefits from this is China. Why do we subsidize China? People who receive the goods get a benefit as well as the people who get to sell the goods get a benefit? China is on the books right now currently with \$5.9 billion in outstanding loans. They receive more than anybody else. So there is something wrong with a system like that.

There are two economic points that I want to make on this. When we do this and we allow tax credit and special deals for some corporations, we assume, and we will hear this in the defense of the Ex-Im Bank, and say look at the good that we do. But what they fail to ask is, where did it come from, who was denied the credit? The fact that we do not finance it does not mean it would not happen. It would happen.

What it does is it distorts the market and causes people to do the wrong thing, and some individuals do not get the credit is obviously the case, but what we need to do is to have a much more oriented free market. When we direct it this way, even those companies may do more than they ordinarily would, and that participates in the economic bubble that occurs, of course, for other reasons as well. Then there has to be corrections. But if one is in a powerful position in a place where they can qualify, and 80 percent of this goes to the very, very large companies, although there are a lot of companies that receive the big bucks, and big countries like China.

This is corporate welfare. It should be defeated; and, ultimately, if we believe in liberty and freedom, we ought to get rid of the Export-Import Bank.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), who has actually been one of the leaders on this issue in the Congress.

□ 1930

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to join with this diverse group of Members who may not always agree on many things, but we do agree that taxpayer dollars should never be used to subsidize companies who have incorporated on paper overseas in order to avoid living up to their responsibilities to the United States of America.

Corporate expatriates cost our country \$5 billion in lost tax revenue. Any reasonable person might assume that