got the capability. And it is one of the best things we have going for us in the war against terror.

So I hope that begins to give the gentleman a little bit of a response about our responsibility in providing things that our military needs and our national defense needs. And I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman. The question here is, why aren't we competitively bidding these projects? We have had hearing after hearing after hearing in this Congress, more so than we had in the last Congress. To our great shame, I think as Republicans we didn't have enough oversight hearings. And we bring up Halliburton constantly, with no bid contracts.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. 8110. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for Concurrent Technologies Corporation.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike all funding in the bill for Concurrent Technologies Corporation.

As you may recall, I offered an amendment last month during consideration of the Energy and Water appropriations bill to cut funding for something called the Center for Instrumental Critical Infrastructure in Pennsylvania. We did not know whether the center existed. I had a colloquy with the chairman of the subcommittee in that time. But we learned that the money is actually going to Concurrent Technologies Corporation based in Johnstown, Pennsylvania. Concurrent Technologies has been a leading earmark recipient in multiple appropriations bills over the years.

In the Energy and Water bill, Concurrent received $1 million in earmarked funds. In this bill, Concurrent is due to receive $11 million in the form of four earmarks.

Concurrent Technologies was the focus of an October 2, 2006, story in the New York Times titled, ''Trading Boats for Pork Across the House Aisle.'' According to the article, Concurrent Technologies Corporation was created by an earmark in 1988. Back then, the corporation was called the Center for Excellence in Metalworking.

The New York Times stated that the military and other Federal agencies have paid Concurrent nearly $1 billion in grants and contracts since 1999. That is $1 billion in taxpayer funds to an entity created with an earmark. That does not include the $12 million Concurrent is receiving in earmarks this year alone.

Concurrent Technologies Corporation is an earmark incubator. It was created by an earmark to get more earmarks. Without earmarks, this corporation, I think it is safe to say, would not exist.

The president of the corporation, Mr. DeVos, was quoted in the local paper saying that the sponsor has ''impressed upon the area's defense industries leaders the need to wean themselves from this aid.''

Mr. DeVos and the sponsor of the earmark have a funny way of weaning Concurrent off of Federal earmarks. The sponsor has secured $11 million more for Concurrent in this bill alone. In addition, The Washington Post reported that Mr. DeVos and his company have spent $820,000 in fees to a lobby firm seeking more Federal aid.

I would ask the sponsor of this earmark to confirm what has been reported. With regard to the defense industry's needing to wean themselves off this aid, when is that weaning going to occur? Can we assure Members of this body that there will be no more earmarks to Concurrent Technologies? Can Concurrent Technologies survive without Federal Member-sponsored earmarks?

I look forward to receiving answers to these questions.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURTHA. I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURTHA. The Department of Defense, the intelligence and security communities, other Federal agencies, and industrial clients in the recent past, CTC was awarded the operations contract through full and open competition for both the National Defense Center for Environmental Excellence and the Navy Metalworking Center. The value of the two contracts, $250 million and $150 million respectively. The core funding for each is included in the President's budget.

Last year, CTC won over 50 competitive Federal awards, culminating in a $65 million contract from the Air Force Advanced Power Technology Office. I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. The gentleman correctly stated that Concurrent has been given some Federal contracts. Then, why in the world did they need this earmark? If they are getting Federal contracts through some kind of bidding process, then why do they need continued earmarks? Which, as I mentioned, are by their very definition sole-source contracts, no-bid contracts, where we are specifying an individual firm, a business in this case, that hires a lobbyist, $820,000 paid to a lobbyist to get more Federal funds.

Where does it end? Is this any kind of process or system that we can be proud of, with these earmark incubators that survive just by getting more earmarks? I mean, how can we do that? If every district in this country had those kinds of earmark incubators, every account in the U.S. Federal Government would be earmarked, I would venture to say.

So I would say we simply have to stop this somewhere. I urge support for the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used for the Doyle Center for Manufacturing Technology.

(b) CORRESPONDING REDUCTION IN FUNDS.—The amount otherwise provided by this Act for ''RESEARCH, DEVELOPMENT, TEST AND EVALUATION—Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Air Force'' is hereby reduced by $1,500,000.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the order of the House of today, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would strike $1.5 million in funding in the bill for the Doyle Center for Manufacturing Technology. The Doyle Center, which is a monument to its sponsor, is an earmark incubator, much like Concurrent Technologies, a center created out of earmarks for the sole objective for obtaining more Federal contracts or earmarks.

The center is a sister organization to a number of earmarks incubators like Concurrent Technologies, which is an entity, as mentioned before, receiving $11 million in earmark funds in the bill.

How do we know that there is a symbiotic relationship between Concurrent Technologies and the Doyle Center? For one thing, the chairman of the board of the Doyle Center is the senior vice president and chief financial officer of Concurrent Technologies. We also know that the Doyle Center and Concurrent Technologies work closely together on projects funded through earmarks. It is no surprise that they share the same leadership.

According to a recent article in The Hill, the creation of the Doyle Center is adding another layer to three nonprofit organizations devoted to a similar mission of helping spur economic development in the area, the Pennsylvania Technology Council, Pittsburgh