

Mr. Chairman, the Heritage Foundation calls the EDA the No. 1 Federal boondoggle which could be eliminated tomorrow without hurting anyone at all, and they are right. The EDA duplicates the activities of 62 other community development programs and 340 Federal economic development-related programs administered by 13 separate agencies. We simply do not need it, first of all; and second, it does not work.

Now, when we have a problem around here and we do not want to make a decision, what do we do? We say, well, let us get the GAO to do a study of it to get the facts so we will know what to do. Well, the GAO has done a study of the EDA, and it says that it has had a very small effect on income growth rates during the period that the aid was received and no significant effects in the 3 years after the aid ceased. This does not compute to the good-paying, long-term jobs the EDA is said to create.

Mr. Chairman, the value of this program that will be argued here tonight is fiction. The Senate received testimony to this effect in June of this year, and consequently had decided to appropriate only \$250 million, I say only, but it is a lot of money, more than I would want, but it said, they have said \$250 million to the EDA. We have gone far above that. I urge my colleagues to approve this amendment and bring the EDA's funding in line with the Senate bill.

This has been a target of Presidents, this has been a target of almost every think tank that has looked at it and tried to evaluate it. It has been a target of the GAO. Instead of getting rid of it, let us at least bring it down to the Senate level.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, here we go again. This is an amendment to drastically cut the Economic Development Administration, and I strongly urge a "no" vote.

We debated the issue of EDA on this bill last year and the year before and the year before, and on and on. Last year 328 Members of this body, a majority of Republicans and Democrats, voted resoundingly to support the work of the EDA and to reject this cut. I urge the House again to defeat the Hefley amendment.

If we do not vote this amendment down, we will be depriving hard-hit communities in every State in this country of the vital assistance these programs provide. EDA gives our poorest urban and rural areas the tools to raise themselves up by their own bootstraps, to create new jobs, expand their local tax base, and leverage private investment. It gives them a hand, not a handout.

If one's town is hard hit by sudden and severe job losses when a plant shuts down, EDA is the place to go. If one's community has been devastated by a natural disaster, like the recent floods this year in the Midwest, EDA is

the place one can turn to. If one's district has suffered from cutbacks in the defense industry, EDA is the only Federal program dedicated to helping your community retool its economy. If my colleagues do not believe me, ask California.

Critics of the program fail to recognize that the EDA has been reformed, reduced, and streamlined over the last 3 years. This bill cuts EDA funding by 15 percent below the current level. Due to the congressional oversight by both the authorizing committee of this body and the Committee on Appropriations, EDA's grants are truly targeted to the most distressed areas. The development and selection of projects has been moved out of Washington and back toward the local and State levels, and EDA's bureaucracy has been cut by over one-third in the last 2 years.

In addition, since the vote last year, the House has continued to demonstrate its support for EDA programs. Our colleagues in the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure will soon approve an EDA reauthorization bill that reforms the programs and responds to the past criticisms of this program.

Mr. Chairman, clearly, there are communities that do not need help. They have infrastructure, they have industry, they have access to education, and all the requirements for a healthy regional economy. Other areas, that must rely on us and EDA to help them cope with job loss and defense cuts and other economic disasters, need us. They are the ones that need our help. They are the ones who are turning to us for our vote.

So I urge Members to do as they did last year and the year before and the year before by an overwhelming margin. Vote down this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. LATOURETTE] assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Lundregan, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 2266) "An Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 871) "An Act to establish the Oklahoma City National Memorial as a unit of the National Park System; to designate the Oklahoma City Memorial Trust, and for other purposes."

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

DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

The Committee resumed its sitting.

PRIVILEGED MOTION OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I offer a privileged motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BECERRA moves that the Committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the privileged motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. BECERRA].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 103, noes 281, not voting 49, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

AYES—103

Abercrombie	Ford	Miller (CA)
Ackerman	Frank (MA)	Mink
Allen	Furse	Moakley
Andrews	Gejdenson	Nadler
Barrett (WI)	Gephardt	Neal
Becerra	Gutierrez	Oberstar
Berry	Harman	Obey
Bishop	Hefner	Olver
Bonior	Hilliard	Owens
Borski	Hinchev	Pallone
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Peterson (MN)
Carson	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Chenoweth	(TX)	Rangel
Clay	Jefferson	Roybal-Allard
Clayton	Johnson (WI)	Sanchez
Clyburn	Kaptur	Sawyer
Conyers	Kennedy (RI)	Serrano
Coyne	Kennelly	Skelton
Davis (FL)	Kilpatrick	Slaughter
DeFazio	LaFalce	Snyder
DeGette	Lantos	Stark
Delahunt	Levin	Strickland
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Stupak
Dellums	Lowey	Tauscher
Deutsch	Maloney (NY)	Taylor (MS)
Doggett	Markey	Thompson
Doolittle	Martinez	Thurman
Edwards	McCarthy (MO)	Tierney
Engel	McDermott	Torres
Eshoo	McGovern	Towns
Evans	McKinney	Velazquez
Farr	McNulty	Vento
Fattah	Meehan	Waters
Fazio	Millender-	Waxman
Filner	McDonald	Woolsey

NOES—281

Aderholt	Brady	Costello
Bachus	Brown (CA)	Cox
Baesler	Brown (FL)	Cramer
Baker	Bryant	Crane
Baldacci	Bunning	Crapo
Barcia	Burr	Cunningham
Barr	Burton	Danner
Barrett (NE)	Buyer	Davis (IL)
Bartlett	Callahan	Deal
Barton	Calvert	DeLay
Bass	Camp	Dickey
Bateman	Campbell	Dicks
Bentsen	Canady	Dingell
Bereuter	Cannon	Dixon
Berman	Capps	Dreier
Bilbray	Cardin	Duncan
Bilirakis	Castle	Dunn
Blagojevich	Chabot	Ehlers
Blumenauer	Chambliss	Ehrlich
Blunt	Christensen	Emerson
Boehlert	Clement	English
Boehner	Coble	Ensign
Bono	Combest	Etheridge
Boswell	Condit	Everett
Boucher	Cook	Fawell
Boyd	Cooksey	Foley

Forbes	Leach	Roemer
Fowler	Lewis (CA)	Rogers
Fox	Lewis (KY)	Rohrabacher
Franks (NJ)	Lipinski	Ros-Lehtinen
Frelinghuysen	Livingston	Rothman
Frost	LoBiondo	Roukema
Gallegly	Lofgren	Royce
Ganske	Lucas	Rush
Gekas	Luther	Ryun
Gilchrest	Maloney (CT)	Sabo
Gilman	Manton	Sandlin
Goode	Mascara	Sanford
Goodlatte	Matsui	Saxton
Goodling	McCarthy (NY)	Schaefer, Dan
Gordon	McCollum	Schaffer, Bob
Goss	McCrery	Schumer
Graham	McHale	Scott
Granger	McHugh	Sensenbrenner
Green	McInnis	Sessions
Greenwood	McIntosh	Shadegg
Gutknecht	McIntyre	Shaw
Hall (OH)	McKeon	Shays
Hall (TX)	Meek	Sherman
Hamilton	Menendez	Shimkus
Hastert	Metcalfe	Shuster
Hastings (WA)	Mica	Sisisky
Hayworth	Miller (FL)	Skaggs
Hefley	Minge	Skeen
Henger	Mollohan	Smith (MI)
Hill	Moran (KS)	Smith (NJ)
Hinojosa	Murtha	Smith (TX)
Hobson	Myrick	Smith, Adam
Hoekstra	Nethercutt	Smith, Linda
Holden	Neumann	Snowbarger
Hooley	Ney	Solomon
Horn	Northup	Souder
Hostettler	Norwood	Spence
Houghton	Nussle	Spratt
Hulshof	Ortiz	Stabenow
Hunter	Packard	Stearns
Hutchinson	Pappas	Stenholm
Hyde	Pascrell	Stokes
Inglis	Pastor	Stump
Istook	Paul	Sununu
Jackson (IL)	Paxon	Talent
Jenkins	Payne	Tanner
John	Pease	Tauzin
Johnson (CT)	Peterson (PA)	Thomas
Johnson, E. B.	Petri	Thune
Jones	Pickering	Tiahrt
Kanjorski	Pickett	Trafficant
Kasich	Pitts	Turner
Kelly	Pombo	Upton
Kennedy (MA)	Porter	Visclosky
Kildee	Portman	Walsh
Kim	Poshard	Watkins
Kind (WI)	Price (NC)	Watt (NC)
King (NY)	Pryce (OH)	Watts (OK)
Kingston	Quinn	Weldon (FL)
Klink	Radanovich	Weldon (PA)
Klug	Ramstad	Weller
Knollenberg	Redmond	Wexler
Kolbe	Regula	Weygand
Kucinich	Reyes	White
LaHood	Riggs	Whitfield
Lampson	Riley	Wise
Latham	Rivers	Wynn
LaTourette	Rodriguez	

NOT VOTING—49

Archer	Gillmor	Rahall
Arney	Gonzalez	Rogan
Ballenger	Hansen	Salmon
Bliley	Hastings (FL)	Sanders
Bonilla	Hilleary	Scarborough
Coburn	Johnson, Sam	Schiff
Collins	Klecicka	Smith (OR)
Cubin	Largent	Taylor (NC)
Cummings	Lazio	Thornberry
Davis (VA)	Linder	Wamp
Diaz-Balart	Manzullo	Wicker
Dooley	McDade	Wolf
Doyle	Moran (VA)	Yates
Ewing	Morella	Young (AK)
Flake	Oxley	Young (FL)
Foglietta	Parker	
Gibbons	Pelosi	

□ 1945

Mr. GUTKNECHT changed his vote from "aye" to "no".

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts changed his vote from "no" to "aye".

So the motion was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Hefley amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I join the chairman of the committee in rising in strong opposition to the Hefley amendment to cut \$90 million from the funding provided for the Economic Development Administration.

I know of no other agency, no other program in the Federal Government more critical to the economic development needs of communities around this Nation than EDA. EDA programs target funds to areas in need of assistance and respond to special needs of each individual town and city. EDA has programs which benefit communities in almost every stage of the development process.

For communities experiencing structural economic changes, EDA provides flexibility assistance to help them design and implement their own local recovery strategies. For communities facing prolonged economic distress, EDA provides the funding necessary to repair decaying infrastructure and to develop new infrastructures needed for business growth.

For communities faced with massive job loss associated with defense downsizing, EDA provides the funding to develop projects at the local level that support community revitalization priorities. EDA's grant and technical assistance programs really work. Any of my colleagues can look around their districts and point to economic success stories catalyzed by EDA funding.

EDA's grant programs represent an investment in our Nation's future, the future of our cities, our towns, and neighborhoods. Over the last 30 years, EDA has invested \$15.6 billion in our Nation's distressed communities, creating more than 2.8 million jobs and leveraging almost \$2 billion in private sector capital.

EDA has a proven success record, with over 39,000 economic development projects completed under its programs. EDA makes good fiscal sense. More than \$3 million in outside investment has been leveraged for every Federal dollar invested in EDA programs.

In closing, Mr. Chairman, economic development is a local process with a specific appropriated Federal role. EDA, in direct partnership with the stressed communities, provides seed funding that promotes long-term investments that respond to locally defined economic priorities.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. It is easy if one is from an affluent area of America to say we do not need to invest in the poorer parts of our country. But the fact is that the Economic Development Administration is absolutely crucial to the investment needed in the poorest of our geographical areas of this country.

We are talking about investment that not only is going to create jobs, but we are also talking about invest-

ment that is going to make these poor areas of America better places to live and work. We are talking about environmental improvement, as well. We are talking about improving the lives of the people who live in this area and the families and the kids.

In the last Congress, we had a vote on this issue; and in that last Congress, over 300 Members voted overwhelmingly to reject this amendment. Indeed, a majority of Republicans voted against this amendment. A majority of Democrats voted against this amendment. And for good reason: Because we need to have EDA investment in those areas of America which need to bootstrap themselves up.

Indeed, Rutgers University recently released a study which shows that for every dollar of EDA money invested in a region, \$10 of private money is invested. We cannot hardly get a better investment than that in America.

So let us support EDA. Let us invest in America. Let us build infrastructure in the poorest of our geographical regions. Vote down this amendment. Support EDA. It is good for America.

Mr. OLVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Hefley amendment, which would eliminate about a quarter of the funding for the Economic Development Administration. The author of the amendment has said that there are some 62 agencies that overlap or duplicate the economic development efforts of this agency. Yet, this is the one that we all know as an effective agency. This is the one that my colleague chooses to try to eliminate.

We all know that the Economic Development Administration supports communities that are in economic distress. We all know that modest economic development money can breathe new life into the communities that are facing financial hardship.

In the years, only a little more than six, that I have served in this Congress, EDA has funded regional economic planning for small communities to maximize their job creation and development potentials, EDA has provided capital for small businesses, EDA has helped turn former military bases into centers for new business, and EDA has funded utilities and road construction to create industrial parks in some of the poorest communities in my district, communities like Gardner and Fitchburg and Pittsfield, MA.

But EDA also provides emergency funds for communities in crisis situations. The town of Colrain, MA, was headed for an economic disaster here recently when its largest employer decided to close down, that it was going to simply close, thereby causing a ripple effect on the town's second largest employer, which was located on the same industrial site.

The two companies shared electric power, waste water, and fire safety infrastructures. Faced with the need to

make huge capital investments to remain alone on site, the second company was about to move its manufacturing elsewhere as well.

With my support, Colrain turned to EDA for emergency funding. And together with private, State, and local funding, and in this case no one of these could have done it alone, but they did it, they turned to the EDA for the emergency funds to finance the infrastructure improvement needed to retain a critical business and allow that business to grow. EDA answered Colrain's call for help. Colrain's application is moving through its final phases, and the serious job loss has been averted in my district.

Let me stress again that in the Colrain, MA, case EDA funding is only part of a larger package of State and local and private funding. No one of those entities would have been able to go it alone. But EDA's, in this case, modest Federal half-a-million-dollar commitment had a major impact in securing and leveraging, as other people have already said, the other funding sources and the private monies that have to go into such economic development.

□ 2000

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to preserve the EDA funding and to reject the Hefley amendment.

Mr. GOSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY]. I think it is a responsible amendment and long overdue. I refer to this as the Stop the Creep amendment. That is not an ad hominem remark. That refers to the fact that in 1995, this body voted to do away with this organization, and at that time the level of support was at about \$350 million. I would point out to my colleagues, particularly those on my right, that we are now talking about an appropriation of \$453 million, an increase of 29.4 percent that most of the fiscal conservatives in this body voted to do something about just 3 short years ago.

Mr. Chairman, 2 years ago a new majority was elected with a mandate to change the way Washington works. Instead of running up the tab on our kids, we pledged to make tough choices and prioritize our limited resources, and everybody cheered. This ambitious agenda was articulated in the House budget resolution which returned power to the taxpayer and eliminated wasteful departments. One of those that was pegged for elimination under the programs and agencies that were considered was the Great Society relic called the Economic Development Administration.

So what has happened? While the EDA has failed very badly in its core mission of providing aid to distressed communities, its success in bringing home the bacon is unmatched, and we all know it. Of grants made in 1994, for

example, the 17 States represented by the members of the relevant Senate and House subcommittees received \$1.10 per capita compared to 68 cents for the rest of the Nation. Rational observers, I am told, are concluding that grants are being made based on political considerations, not true need.

EDA proponents will serve up any number of creative defenses for this program, and I admit there have been some spots of success in it, but they are very few. But the supporters also ignore the fact, and here is a fact, the GAO was unable to find any study, any study, that established a causal linkage between EDA assistance and a positive economic effect in a community, the reason we have this program. It is not working.

Fact: Nearly 90 percent of the Nation has been found eligible for EDA grants in the past, despite the fact the money is supposed to go to certifiably distressed communities. Is everything in America a distressed community?

Fact: Proponents will argue that the EDA has been reformed, yet the agency has not been reauthorized since 1980. Translation: There has been no real reform. Despite years of promises that there would be some real house cleaning, it has not happened.

Mr. Chairman, the Hefley amendment does not end the EDA. It does not end the EDA, however deserved that might be. It simply makes a responsible cut down to the Senate level. I want to repeat, this amendment does not end the EDA. It reduces it to the Senate level. It ends the cost creep.

Last year the House-passed bill contained \$348 million for EDA, yet somehow it emerged from conference almost \$100 million heavier; \$426 million, to be exact, of taxpayers' money. A glance at the numbers reveals that we have increased EDA funding by 29 percent since 1995, the year that we pledged to end it altogether. What happened? Mr. Chairman, the present House bill not only exceeds the Senate level, but it is even higher than the President's budget request.

I urge my colleagues to support this sensible reduction in the funds for the EDA back to the Senate level of \$250 million, a quarter of a billion dollars, which is a \$90 million savings for the taxpayer for a program that we do not think is working very well, and our agency, the GAO, has not been able to find a positive benefit from it. I think it is a reasonable amendment. I ask Members to consider it sincerely.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSS. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, one of our speakers earlier talked about all of that matching money that came back. In September of 1994, a nonprofit corporation in Alabama was awarded a \$750,000 grant to create a revolving loan fund, and the community matching funds were to be \$1 million, and the \$1 million never showed up. The Inspec-

tor General investigated the nonprofit and found that they had not been meeting the matching fund requirement since 1986. So when we hear of all these matching funds, in theory that works, but in practice I could give my colleagues example after example after example where it simply has not worked.

The theory behind EDA, which is what most of the speakers are talking about, is good. The practice is, it does not work.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment. I do want to congratulate and commend the chairman of the subcommittee for the splendid job that he has done. The gentleman from Kentucky has led this subcommittee very ably, and has made the case, I think, very persuasively, and has worked with our authorizing committee, as the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] indicated earlier, to sort out some of the problems, narrow the focus, target this program more effectively and more efficiently, reduce its staffing level, and I take issue with some of the numbers cited just a moment ago.

The fiscal 1997 funding level for EDA, for this year, is \$427 million. The subcommittee has cut \$65 million out of that level. That is not a cut in the growth. That is a cut from this year's level. That is a cut in the real program down to \$361 million. The vote that my good friend from Florida referenced about eliminating EDA was not a vote on eliminating EDA. That was a vote on eliminating the Department of Commerce. It was part of the Republican reconciliation bill. EDA is included in the Department of Commerce. It is a stretch to say that we voted on eliminating EDA.

Those who would say that, oh, 90 percent of the country is eligible for EDA funds, that is not true. Ninety-three percent of EDA funds go to the eligible areas, only those areas that qualify with a 1 percentage point level of unemployment above the national average.

EDA has been an extraordinarily effective program for the small communities of America and even for larger cities. I have been watching this for 25 years. The opponents of EDA come up here representing comfortable areas of this country and tell the poor areas of America, "You do not need this help. You do not need this lift up." Well, every dollar of EDA leverages \$10 of private investment money. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. SHUSTER] cited the study that showed that there is a minimal cost of \$3,000 of EDA investment per job.

You want success stories? We have got them. During the time that I was privileged to chair the economic development subcommittee, we held hearings, we brought in all those who were

critics, we brought in those who benefited from the program. A Georgia development district received \$3.1 million in EDA funds, matched by \$3.1 million in non-Federal local private funds. That generated \$142 million in private investment, creating 2,238 private sector jobs. EDA cost per job, \$1,000.

Fort Holabird Industrial Park. Fort Holabird was shut down by the military. Baltimore was in distress. EDA granted a title 9 emergency grant to help rehabilitate that community, \$11.3 million. The city matched it with \$11 million. There was private investment of \$42 million, 1,000 new jobs. GM came in, made an investment in the community. They put in \$258 million with the funds that EDA provided to stimulate water, sewer, road access to this park facility. 4,000 jobs were protected and retained.

There is story after story of success. I do not want to belabor the body. I just want to quote from one of the witnesses when our committee went into Kentucky, southern Virginia, and West Virginia, a wise witness stood up and said, "We are proud, conservative mountain people. We don't ask for anything that we don't give of ourselves. But you can't turn around 50 and 100 years of decay and decline in 1 or 2 years of water and sewer grants. Give us a hand. Give us the opportunity. We have the energy. We have the youth that wants a future. We are proud mountain people. Give us the opportunity." EDA gives them that opportunity. I ask my colleagues, defeat this amendment. Give rural America an opportunity.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise tonight to vehemently oppose this amendment. I come from rural Pennsylvania, a rural part of Pennsylvania that has been struggling economically. We look at EDA as the doctor who can give us a transfusion to help us maintain economic life.

It has been interesting to listen to those who talk about this as pork, as waste. Let me tell my colleagues what happens in a small town in America when you lose the only factory, when you lose the only major employer. And I wish some of those that are proposing this amendment looked into the eyes of the people in the glass plant in Marienville when they knew their job of the last 50 years was gone forever and there were no other job opportunities within 40 miles. I will never forget the look on those people's faces, and I sure do not want to tell them that there is not an Economic Development Administration to help them.

In State government, we had a lot of economic development plans. I was often critical that a lot of that money went to very affluent areas, went to areas that were fighting growth, who were growing faster than they wanted to. But EDA targets its resources. It targets it to our communities that are

the most in need, communities that have lost their major employers.

Tell the community in Jefferson County that their industrial park, the 70 new jobs, was not worthwhile. Tell the people in Centre County who purchased a rail line that would have taken rail service away from employers and has since created 1,000 jobs. Tell the community in Tioga County in Pennsylvania that repurchased a Conrail line that was going to remove 450 jobs from their community because they could not function without rail service.

I am here today to tell Members that this is a program that if we do away with in these small rural towns, where are those people going to go? The unemployment lines, the welfare rolls. It is going to cost us a whole lot more money than this measly \$340 million that helps distressed communities all across this country.

Tell this to a community that lost a USX plant, a Quaker State headquarters, a Worthington Pump plant, a Van Huffer Tube plant, a Foster Forbes Glass plant, a Graham Packaging plant that we do not care. Tell them that, that we are not going to help them pull themselves up by their bootstraps.

If we want to look for economic development funds, why do we not look at the International Development Association that does economic development around the world? If we give them a 26 percent cut, we could save \$160 million. The USAID, Agency for International Development, if we gave them a 26 percent cut, we could save \$130 million. Aid to the former Soviet Union for economic development, if we give them a 26 percent cut, we could save \$160 million.

Mr. Chairman, this is a small program that targets its resources well to the poorest communities in America. I urge Members tonight to defeat this amendment and put it to bed forever, and let us work with a program that helps the poorest communities pull up their bootstraps.

□ 2015

Mr. WISE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment to cut 25 percent out of the Economic Development Administration budget. Some have spoken about projects that they question. Well, let me give my colleagues some success stories, and I think that is very, very important.

Let me talk to my colleagues about in the eastern panhandle of West Virginia, just an hour and 15 minutes drive from here, where a \$2 million EDA grant is helping to generate hundreds of jobs at the new Sino-Swearingen Aircraft facility. I calculated that for every Federal dollar going in between the EDA and ARC, which incidentally got \$4.5 million leverage, \$133 million, that it would be repaid to the Federal taxpayer in workers paying income taxes in about 3

years. One real estate developer said, "That's one of the best investments you can get."

So whether we are talking about the Sino-Swearingen plant in eastern West Virginia, whether we are looking at the jobs that are being generated at the Wood Technology Center at Elkins, WV, because of a EDA grant and the opportunities in the wood industry that it is making there, or whether we are talking about Jackson County, WV, where an EDA grant is helping create an estimated 350 jobs for the Jackson County Maritime and Industrial Center by constructing necessary water and sewer systems, EDA gets a return for the taxpayer.

Also, those of us who have been from flood-torn areas know the importance of EDA as it has come to our rescue in rebuilding communities and providing flood assistance grants throughout much of West Virginia, but, yes, throughout much of our country.

Let me just note that an independent study recently at Rutgers University evaluated EDA's public works program and found that EDA completed its projects on time, on budget, created and retained jobs at the minimum cost of a little over \$3,000 of EDA investment per job, and leveraged \$10 of private investment for every \$1 invested, and every EDA dollar results in \$10 returned to communities through an increased local tax base. That is a good return on the taxpayers' dollar; that is a solid reason to reject this amendment to cut the Economic Development Administration.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WISE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. BROWN of Florida. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I have a question as former chairman of EDA. I come from Florida, a community that has 2 bases to close, and I want to be clear what is EDA's responsibility as far as these base closures because, as we think about Florida, I want to be clear that my area of Florida supports the EDA grants and the mayor, the city council, the county commission, the State of Florida is working in partnership for these grants. Could the gentleman explain?

Mr. WISE. The gentlewoman makes a good point that the Economic Development Administration is a linchpin in the base closing legislation that this Congress is passed and is often the lead agency, the one that communities contact first to assist as they plan how to deal with this economic loss and how to gain from it. And so that is why this Congress has put additional funds into the EDA from time to time, to assist in base closing legislation such as what the gentlewoman is experiencing in Florida.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge the House strongly to reject this amendment; to recognize that the EDA has a vital function to perform for all our country and is performing it well.

Mr. HOSTETLER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY] to decrease funding, decrease funding for the Economic Development Administration. The Economic Development Administration, known as EDA, which is part of the Department of Commerce, was created in 1965 to assist in the development of depressed areas and encourage increased employment through loans and grants to State and local communities. While this objective may appear to be quite exemplary, in reality the EDA has at times funded many projects that have nothing to do with jobs or economic development for depressed areas.

As we struggle to balance the budget it is critical to target programs that waste millions of precious Federal dollars every year. We simply cannot afford to continue funding this program at such high levels. Therefore, I am supporting this amendment to fund the EDA at the Senate level, which is approximately \$90 million less than the House Committee on Appropriations passed level.

There are any number of examples of Federal spending for reasonable projects within EDA. We have all heard the stories of taxpayer dollars being wasted on the \$800,000 spent on a golf course that washed away, or the \$5 million that was awarded in 1976 to an economic development district that built a cash reserve of almost \$2 million and wasted and misused over a million dollars. Must I remind us of the \$850,000 that was awarded in 1987 to help fund a \$1 million, 3-year industrial park expansion? Eight years later that project was barely started but \$670,000 of the money, of the taxpayers' money, had been spent.

I do want to take a moment to elaborate on the concerns I have over a statistic that was sent to my office in a fax that was urging opposition to this amendment. According to a May 1997 Rutgers University study of the EDA public works program, EDA programs are successful at creating jobs at a cost to taxpayers of only \$3,058. I say "only" only because the information I received used the word "only." I am deeply concerned about any Federal program whose supporters would claim success over the fact that taxpayers are only paying over \$3,000 for the creation of one job. I am even more deeply concerned that we in Congress would view a government program as successful if it creates jobs and that these jobs only cost taxpayers \$3,000. Taxpayers in my district and around the country work very hard to make ends meet, and I am sure they too would be concerned if they were to find out about this so-called successful program.

Resources are very limited, and it is time we evaluate a little more critically the success of many Federal programs. I would contend that cutting

Federal spending and cutting taxes on all American taxpayers will prove to be much more successful at creating jobs, and not at a cost of over \$3,000. We are simply not in a financial position to fund many of these programs, and every effort we make to curb wasteful spending is a positive step toward balancing the Federal budget.

It is obvious the EDA has failed at its intended mission. Due to the budgetary constraints and the lack of a justifiable Federal role in these programs, it makes good sense to at least fund this program at the same level passed by the Senate earlier this year. The EDA has proven itself to be a failure at meeting its objective. This program has become a multimillion dollar drain on scarce and valuable Federal resources.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for my colleagues' votes to strike \$90 million of EDA funding in the fiscal 1998 Commerce-State-Justice appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately we are not as critical of this program as we would be of some of the others to see if it is really working well because it is too good for our reelection efforts. We live in a culture where we are judged by how much we are able to take back home.

The Department of Commerce Inspector General issued a semiannual report earlier this year and could not even express an opinion on the financial position of EDA because it has too many inadequacies in its internal control structure. The I.G. also identified many specific examples of grants that either should not have been made or that just did not work the way they were supposed to, just did not work.

So, yes, I do not have any illusions that this amendment is probably going to pass tonight; sometime it will, I think, but maybe not tonight because it is too good a bottomless pit for us to take money out of and take back home, whether it works or not.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I would just like the Congress to understand the scenario which they are seeing here. In Florida we call it a snooker, and that is what it is, a monumental snooker, Mr. Chairman. What you hear here should be added to the new nomenclature of the language of the Congress, snooker, and what it means is people are substituting things for the real facts because of the emotionalism which we see tied into this reduction.

Now first of all, this same group that we see here tonight, we have already cut EDA by 15 percent. So they are saying to my colleagues that the 15 percent which they have already cut EDA by is not enough. So use a little deductive reasoning, and what they are saying is let us cut out EDA. The same

people we see talking about EDA this year were up last year with this same amendment.

So now look, look back into the history. I always look at the names of people associated to an amendment; that is a good thing to do in this Congress. Then I begin to do what is called reciprocal innovation, and that means to be able to exchange some of the stuff that they are talking about and let them know that it is not true.

First of all, why cut it any more? There are no earmarks in this, none at all. EDA does not have any earmarks in this bill. But it selects these economic development projects that help the most distressed communities, the most distressed communities, not in anyone of our means but because people have to really apply to EDA for these improved at their distress, and it offers them some success in creating jobs.

Now another part of this snooker is this new welfare reform syndrome. My colleagues want to reform welfare. Well, I will tell them something. It is so simple: Got to create some jobs. It is so simple some of us do not understand it. My colleagues think it is going to happen overnight because they come to this floor and make some of these snookering statements. And the audacity of it, everybody should be able to see through it.

What they need to say to my colleagues is, You're going to cut out the source of building these communities, putting some economic development into these communities and developing jobs.

Now the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure has tried very hard, Mr. Chairman. They know about some of these abuses. They have worked it in such a way they are going to approve the EDA reauthorization, and it reforms these programs where they need reformation. But they are not going to bring in a snooker to try to get this Congress to cut \$90 million from these funds.

So then think about what would have happened to us in Miami if it were not for EDA. Eastern Airlines went out, 300 people without a job, more than that when we look at the long term effects of it. Opa-Locka went down, a small city there; the city of Miami is almost to go down if it were not for the economic development. This is a federalism which we need. There is federalism which we do not need, but we do need that. Homestead, a small farming community in my district, if it were not for EDA, what would have happened to Homestead?

We have heard a litany of snookers here tonight. That litany would have us think a city like Homestead in my district that was wiped out by the hurricane, if it were not for EDA coming into that city, trying to help build new businesses, trying to help build new infrastructure, trying to help us come back, those people are still deprived, they are have not come back yet. If it

were not for EDA, we could not have gotten the help we needed. St. Petersburg, FL; I could go on and on, Mr. Chairman.

But what I want to make clear to this Congress is that they just witnessed a monumental snooker, someone not in favor of the EDA trying very hard to cut it out. Let us stop them, let us oppose this amendment and kill it, Black Flag dead. Let us kill it.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentlewoman yield?

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Just very quickly to the gentlewoman from Florida: She is standing for Florida, I have heard people from the Midwest, I have heard the ranking member, I have heard the chairman of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. It is a terrible shame in this budget cutting, welfare slashing, that when we talk about real jobs like the jobs being created in Houston with the renewal of Hargus College, making that a small business incubator successfully with city and EDA funds, that we would want to cut and slash and burn and not create jobs for Americans. We want to create them everywhere else, but we do not want to create them for America. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me, and I appreciate what has happened in Florida, but it is happening all over America, and we should oppose vigorously this amendment.

Mrs. MEEK of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas very much, and I am glad she is helping to deflate that monumental snooker.

□ 2030

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, the author of this amendment has acknowledged that every year he comes to the floor and proposes a near identical amendment. When is he going to get the message?

Every year this House has increasing support for the Economic Development Administration. Every single year the opposition is on the decline. Why is that?

One of my colleagues, a previous speaker, said the American people send us here to make tough choices. Indeed they do. But they do not want us to make dumb choices.

I will tell you what the Economic Development Administration is all about. It is about my favorite four-letter word, and you can use it in polite company. That favorite four-letter word is "jobs," jobs that put Americans to work.

Now, if you want to tell me that EDA does not work, I will take you to community after community around this country that has been devastated by the loss of a military installation. We are told that is a peace dividend, that we do not need as many military bases, and I can understand that.

But what about those communities that one day face the loss of thousands of jobs? Where do they turn to? They look to Washington, and, fortunately, we have the Economic Development Administration to help these communities try to help themselves.

What about those communities all across the country that are victims of cruel tricks played by mother nature, devastated by natural disasters? They look to us, those of us in positions of responsibilities, and say help. Thank God we have the Economic Development Administration to help.

How about those factories closing? Where do those communities go? Someone earlier said, "You know, it is \$3,000 a job." Guess what? I will take you to community after community across this country that would gladly accept jobs if it only cost \$3,000. It costs so much more. As a matter of fact, the rule of thumb for EDA is about \$10,000 a job. And, guess what? The communities that desperately need them do not even have five cents, let alone \$10,000. They lost their tax base. They have lost their employment opportunities.

EDA is about hope. Now, I was here as a young staff member sitting in that gallery in August of 1965 when the Public Works and Economic Development Act was first passed. I remember that vividly, Republicans and Democrats joining to create an agency that offered some hope for distressed communities across this country, and through those years, those 32 years, the agency has had its ups and downs.

But life has changed for me. Now I serve on the committee that has jurisdiction over the authorization of this program, and I have sat there as witness after witness has come forward, some telling us of the changes needed, and those changes have been made; some telling us that they have ideas for improvement, and improvements have been made. But, one after another, from communities all across this country, we have had local government officials come and say, "Thank you for the Economic Development Administration. Please continue this important program, because where opportunity has been lost, hope has been provided."

This measure will pass overwhelmingly to continue the Economic Development Administration. It did the year before, and the year before that, and the year before that. This is a good agency. It is not perfect. I have never seen a perfect agency and unlikely never will.

But the fact of the matter is basically this: In an economy that is beginning to move in the right direction, in an economy where more and more we are telling people from all walks of life that you have expanded opportunity, greater hope, there are still areas of distress. Those areas need assistance. And when that assistance is possible in the form of a loan or a grant from the Economic Development Administration, and we are part of the organiza-

tion that makes that agency possible, I think it is a day's work well done.

I would say overwhelmingly, Mr. Chairman, reject this amendment. Support the continued funding of the Economic Development Administration for all the right reasons, but, most importantly, for jobs for America.

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I think there are a lot of people that are smoking on this. I am the ranking member of that subcommittee, and there are very few Members in the House I have more respect for than the gentleman who has brought this amendment.

I want to say this to the gentleman: There is much merit to what you are saying, and if there are not some basic reforms I will vote with you next year.

But there is a new administrator over there, Mr. Phillip Singerman, and he has done a fine job. I want the Congress to know this.

In addition to that, we are beginning to move EDA from a giveaway program to a leveraged program. I have offered legislation, part of which has been included, and I would like the gentleman from Colorado to recognize what that legislation does.

My legislation provides a fund of money that can only be used to buy down interest rates when a bank makes a loan. I think the problem we have had around here in economic development is we have thrown money at communities. Much of it has been easy money, and people with ideas come in without their own sweat and blood and have gotten money from Uncle Sam and ripped us off. I think our intentions were well meaning, but they were not successful.

My language says, look, we use some of the EDA money, but we will only give that money as an incentive once a bank qualifies a legitimate project. Then we will use it to buy down those interest rates.

We are making some basic reforms in the economic development program, and some of the shortcomings are being overcome. I took the floor to let the gentleman know that, because I believe that in the past the gentleman has been on target. This is an agency that has not lived up to the types of deeds and tasks it should have.

Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Singerman has done a good job and I think he deserves that chance, and I think we deserve the chance as the authorizing committee to refashion and to reform EDA, to make it more of a leveraging agency rather than a giveaway agency.

I want to let the gentleman know we are doing that. I know the gentleman is going to go on with his program, and I respect that. I believe the gentleman, through his amendments, has kept EDA's feet to the fire, and we are making the improvements because of his efforts.

I do not want to demean the gentleman's efforts. In fact, I appreciate his

efforts, and when we get a chance after this is all over, I would like to sit down with the gentleman and even like to incorporate some of the ideas and concerns he has.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I have listened intently to the discussion and the debate. I rise in opposition to this amendment, and I do so because I have lived in severely distressed neighborhoods for the last 40 years.

The community where I live in Chicago, the area where my office is located, is something called the North Lawndale community, which has been called the "permanent underclass" by sociologists and urbanologists. It has been called "the place where there is no hope." And yet, because of an EDA grant, that community does in fact have hope.

My community has lost more than 100,000 manufacturing jobs over a 30-year period, Allied Radio, GE, Hot Point, Motorola, International Harvester, Sunbeam, you name them, Western Electric. They were once there, but now they are all gone.

As a result of that grant, my neighbors and I have an opportunity to go to a bank that would not have been there had it not been for an EDA grant. We have an opportunity to go to stores that would not have been there had not it been for an EDA grant. There are small manufacturing concerns that have begun to come back that would not have been there had not it been for the EDA grant.

So I tell you, if we are talking about rebuilding, redeveloping, reconstituting urban America, then we are not talking about taking one dime, one scintilla, one ion from this agency. If anything, we are talking about trying to find additional ways to put the needed resources of this country where they should go, to rural America, to urban America, to places that have made this country what it is and is redeveloping.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge all of my colleagues, let us not cut; let us increase. Let us give hope to the hopeless. Let us bring help to the helpless. Let us make America the land that it has never been, but yet ought to be. Let us make America the America that it has the potential of being.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment to H.R. 2267, the Commerce, Justice, State fiscal year 1998 Appropriations bill that is being offered by our friend Mr. HEFLEY of Colorado—an amendment that would cut \$90 million from the Economic Development Administration—the EDA.

Mr. HEFLEY says he wants only to cut \$90 million from EDA—down to \$271 million—so that our bill will match the funding level in the Senate-passed bill.

There is no magic, and no common sense either, in the Senate numbers.

Last year, my colleagues, you joined 328 of your colleagues—Democrats and Republicans alike—for continued funding of the EDA.

I urge you to vote again to stop the push to gut the Economic Development Administration

and its program funds that assist so many States and localities nationwide, but particularly in those areas suffering the most economic stress.

H.R. 2267 already cuts the EDA by 15 percent below the fiscal year 1997 level. There are no earmarks—these economic development projects are selected by the EDA on the basis of sending help to the most distressed communities in our Nation—helping people by creating jobs.

I know that each of you are aware of the assistance EDA provides to your own district's distressed communities, whether they are urban or rural.

This is vital seed money for local governments—for every \$1 spent in EDA funds, local governments leverage another \$10 from other sources, to help pay for these vital economic development programs.

These local governments are hard pressed to respond to the needs of former welfare recipients as they are faced with finding ways in which to provide necessary jobs—gainful employment—for those families.

A vote against the Hefley amendment to cut \$90 million from the Economic Development Administration is a vote in favor of new jobs, for families in need, for communities suffering from the effects of natural disasters such as hurricanes, earthquakes and spring floods.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. HEFLEY].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 107, noes 305, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 455]

AYES—107

Archer	Fox	Nussle	Gejdenson	Moakley
Armey	Gekas	Oxley	Gephardt	Mollohan
Bachus	Goodlatte	Paul	Gilchrest	Moran (KS)
Barr	Goodling	Paxon	Gillmor	Moran (VA)
Barrett (NE)	Goss	Petri	Gilman	Morella
Bartlett	Granger	Pitts	Goode	Murtha
Barton	Greenwood	Porter	Gordon	Nadler
Bereuter	Gutknecht	Pryce (OH)	Graham	Neal
Bilbray	Hastert	Ramstad	Green	Ney
Bilirakis	Hastings (WA)	Riggs	Gutierrez	Northup
Bliley	Hayworth	Rohrabacher	Hall (OH)	Oberstar
Blunt	Hefley	Roukema	Hall (TX)	Obey
Boehner	Hobson	Royce	Hamilton	Olver
Bono	Hoekstra	Ryun	Harman	Ortiz
Brady	Hostettler	Sanford	Hefner	Owens
Burton	Hunter	Schaefer, Dan	Heger	Packard
Cannon	Hyde	Schaffer, Bob	Hill	Pallone
Chabot	Inglis	Sensenbrenner	Hilleary	Pappas
Christensen	Istook	Sessions	Hilliard	Parker
Coble	Johnson, Sam	Shadegg	Hinchee	Pascrell
Coburn	Kasich	Smith (MI)	Hinojosa	Pastor
Condit	Klug	Snowbarger	Holden	Payne
Cox	Kolbe	Souder	Hoolley	Pease
Crane	Largent	Stearns	Horn	Pelosi
Cunningham	Leach	Stump	Houghton	Peterson (MN)
Deal	Linder	Sununu	Hoyer	Peterson (PA)
DeLay	Manzullo	Talent	Hulshof	Pickering
Doolittle	McCollum	Thomas	Hutchinson	Pickett
Dreier	McInnis	Thornberry	Jackson (IL)	Pombo
Dunn	McIntosh	Thune	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Ehlers	Mica	Tiahrt	(TX)	Portman
Ehrlich	Miller (FL)	Watts (OK)	Jefferson	Poshard
Ensign	Myrick	Weldon (FL)	Jenkins	Price (NC)
Fawell	Nethercutt	Weldon (PA)	John	Rahall
Foley	Neumann	White	Johnson (CT)	Rangel
Fowler	Norwood		Johnson (WI)	Redmond
			Johnson, E. B.	Regula
			Jones	Reyes
			Kanjorski	Riley
			Kaptur	Rivers
			Kelly	Rodriguez
			Kennedy (MA)	Roemer
			Kennedy (RI)	Rogers
			Kennelly	Ros-Lehtinen
			Kildee	Rothman
			Kilpatrick	Roybal-Allard
			Kim	Rush
			Kind (WI)	Sabo
			King (NY)	Sanchez
			Kingston	Sanders
			Klecicka	Sandlin
			Klink	Sawyer
			Knollenberg	Saxton
			Kucinich	Schumer
			LaFalce	Scott
			LaHood	Serrano
			Lampson	Shaw
			Lantos	Shays
			Latham	Sherman
			LaTourette	Shimkus
			Levin	Shuster
			Lewis (CA)	Sisisky
			Lewis (GA)	Skaggs
			Lewis (KY)	Skeen
			DeLauro	Skelton
			Lipinski	Slaughter
			Dellums	Smith (NJ)
			Deutsch	Smith (OR)
			Diaz-Balart	Smith (TX)
			Dickey	Smith, Adam
			Dicks	Smith, Linda
			Dingell	Snyder
			Dixon	Spence
			Doggett	Spratt
			Dooley	Stabenow
			Doyle	Stark
			Duncan	Stenholm
			Edwards	Stokes
			Emerson	Strickland
			Engel	Stupak
			English	Tanner
			Eshoo	Tauscher
			Etheridge	Tauzin
			Evans	Taylor (MS)
			Everett	Thompson
			Ewing	Thurman
			Farr	Tierney
			Fattah	Torres
			Fazio	Towns
			Filner	Trafficant
			Forbes	Turner
			Ford	Upton
			Frank (MA)	Velazquez
			Franks (NJ)	Vento
			Frelinghuysen	Visclosky
			Frost	Walsh
			Furse	Wamp
			Galleghy	Waters
			Ganske	

Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weller
Wexler

Weygand
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf

Woolsey
Wynn
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—21

Ballenger
Bonilla
Collins
Flake
Foglietta
Gibbons
Gonzalez

Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Lazio
McCrery
Quinn
Radanovich
Rogan

Salmon
Scarborough
Schiff
Solomon
Taylor (NC)
Yates
Young (AK)

□ 2111

Mr. THOMPSON, Mrs. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. CUBIN, and Messrs. GUTIERREZ, COYNE, and CRAPO, Mrs. CHENOWETH, and Mr. SMITH of Texas changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. LINDER and Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(Mr. ROGERS asked and was given permission to speak out of order for 1 minute.)

LEGISLATIVE SCHEDULE

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, for the purpose of informing Members about the rest of the evening and the schedule that might take place, there have been numerous discussions taking place. We think we have an agreement worked out. It is being prepared now for us to peruse in due course of time. If the agreement is approved by both sides of the aisle, then there would be no further votes this evening in the body. The votes would be rolled until tomorrow.

□ 2115

However, it is still being pursued. I suggest that we proceed with one more amendment and ask Members to hang tight for a possible vote on that amendment while the agreement is being pursued, and we think that we will be successful.

With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER] be permitted to offer the amendment No. 12, notwithstanding that portion of the bill is not yet considered as read, with the understanding that during the process of that debate, the larger agreement will be pursued.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MR. HOSTETTLER

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

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 12 offered by Mr. HOSTETTLER:

Page 49, line 9, insert "(reduced by \$175,100,000)" after "\$185,100,000"

Page 49, line 10, insert "(reduced by \$74,100,000)" after "\$74,100,000"

Page 49, line 12, insert "(reduced by \$500,000)" after "\$500,000".

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and all amendments thereto close in 20 minutes and that the time be equally divided.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, in all this talk about a balanced budget agreement about how Democrats and Republicans, the President and Congress want to cut wasteful Government spending to reach a balanced budget, I would like to talk about one of those costly and troubled Government programs that was not protected in the budget agreement and should have been eliminated.

The Advanced Technology Program, ATP, gives direct subsidies to private corporations to support their research and development budgets. These cash handouts usually go to the Fortune 500 companies such as IBM, AT&T, GM and the like, which already have billion-dollar R&D budgets and billions in annual revenues.

Not only did the budget agreement reject the President's proposal to protect ATP funding, the Commerce Department recently issued a report chock full of planned structural changes. But the administration's plan falls far short of addressing the real problems with ATP, which are too fundamental to be fixed by minor adjustments.

The fundamental problem is what many Members of Congress and even ATP grantees already know, ATP does not have the ability to effectively promote its goals of advancing high-risk technology research and promoting U.S. competitiveness.

Technology development in most industries simply changes too quickly to depend on slow-moving congressional budgets. In short, ATP is corporate welfare. Given our budget constraints, we cannot afford it. And after watching the program for seven years, ATP does more harm than good.

If we dare venture to read the Constitution, we find that the program is unconstitutional. Mr. Chairman, we must eliminate funding for ATP.

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

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, last night we had a similar debate on the ATP program. During that debate, those who spoke in opposition to the ATP cuts amendment refuted most of the points made by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Hostettler], who is offering this amendment.

Let me simply say, and a lot of it is in repetition, that the ATP program is not a partisan program. It was initi-

ated under the Bush administration, and it has continued as a centerpiece of President Clinton's competitiveness program to this day.

One can have a philosophical difference and take the position that ATP, the Advanced Technology Program, is corporate welfare, whatever that means. In fact, it is the core of the country's competitiveness program as we move into an era of increasingly internationalization of our economy and in real competition with particularly the developed nations around the world.

These countries recognize the importance of collaborative relationships between their country, between the academic community, and between private industry in order to be strategic in developing not product but developing pre-commercial research and development discoveries that lead to advancements that allow industry to pick up and be on the cutting edge. We are into a high technology era, and these strategic relationships are recognized as being instrumental in making us competitive.

Such countries as Japan, England, Germany and Australia are investing heavily in these kind of initiatives, far more heavily than the United States. For example, Japan is spending about \$9 billion a year on pre-competitive technology development. And the European Community recognizes the importance of these kind of strategic relationships. It is funding their equivalent to the Advanced Technology Program to the tune of \$5.5 billion a year. ATP funds pre-competitive generic technology development. It does not fund product development.

Mr. Chairman, simply, we have a philosophical difference of how the country should relate to industry and what role is appropriate for the Government to play in commerce. I draw the line at the Government not helping getting product into the marketplace. No, that is the private sector's responsibility.

But when increasingly high technology is important to economic competitiveness, this pre-competitive, the Government incentivizing companies in these partner relationships to get involved in areas that have a future that we are in direct competition with is extremely important.

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

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. Royce].

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Chairman, the private sector and deregulation are the principal engine of this country's \$8 trillion economy. It is not Government handouts. Government cannot claim credit for the personal computer phenomenon, cannot claim credit for Internet, cannot claim credit for Microsoft or Bill Gates. The way a market system works, as opposed to a corporatist or socialist system, is that if there is a profit entrepreneurs will

risk investing in order to reap the profits.

For example, I share with my colleagues the pharmaceutical products that come to market. On average, it costs \$400 million, takes 8 to 10 years to bring them to market. And yet, if there is a profit to be made, entrepreneurs will act with or without government handouts, as they do in these cases, to bring these things to market.

Most of my colleagues here voted for this last year. We passed this out of this House, this very amendment to eliminate this program, and it was passed out of the Senate. It was subsequently curtailed because of other problems.

But, basically, between 1985 and 1986, the Department of Commerce, which oversees ATP and MEP issued \$1.23 billion in loans and loan guarantees through various programs. Not even half were paid back. The American taxpayers lost \$650 million, and those loans still carried on the books are of questionable value.

For example, the Economic Development Administration at Commerce, which lent \$471 million some 20 years ago, has recovered only \$60 million and sought congressional approval to sell off some of its bad loans for less than 10 cents on the dollar.

Let us take some examples from Europe and Japan. High-definition TV is one of the clearest failures of the Government's targeted handouts. The Japanese businesses, with subsidies that totaled \$1 billion in the late 1980's, sought to help HDTV using existing analog technology. The French did the same. One billion dollars in their government went to that.

Here in the United States, luckily our administration at the time took a pass on investing \$1.2 billion in subsidies to compete with these foreign rivals. As a result of being denied massive subsidies, American companies were forced to develop an alternative, and the alternative that AT&T and Zenith developed was a fully digital system that made analog Japanese and European systems obsolete. Before they were ever put into production, they lost \$2 billion overseas because they were pushing these subsidies.

We relied on the market, and again it showed that the market works. Many businessmen do not support this corporate welfare. I am going to quote one who appeared before committee, Dr. T.J. Rodgers, president and CEO of Cypress Semiconductor Corp., who told us before the committee that, "I am here to say that such subsidies will hurt my company and our industry because they represent tax-and-spend economics."

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan [Ms. STABENOW].

Ms. STABENOW. Mr. Chairman, first I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA], the chair of the Committee on Science Subcommittee on Technology, who has

worked so long and hard to put together an effective Advance Technology Program that we now have in this budget for continuation of funding for the next year.

I also would like to thank my colleagues who voted overwhelmingly earlier today against an amendment to cut \$74 million from the Advanced Technology Program. This is in fact an amendment that would be a larger cut than the one that was overwhelmingly voted against earlier today. Important misperceptions about this program continue to be repeated over and over again.

□ 2130

This is not a program that is about corporate welfare. This is about creating American jobs and creating technologies that will be on the cutting edge, that will allow us to compete with other countries. The majority of dollars in this program go to consortia and partnerships where universities frequently are the ones receiving the dollars to do research in partnership with our businesses, large and small.

Almost 50 percent of the businesses involved in these consortia are small businesses that on their own would not be able to be involved in higher-risk, long-term kinds of research. We are talking about those kinds of research opportunities that research systems in Michigan, we have a wonderful program that has been highly successful to look at how we create a more competitive auto industry, a system. The Big 3 do not normally sit down together and plan and problem-solve about quality issues. But with the leadership of the ATP program and the Federal Government, we have been able to bring them together.

I would urge my colleagues to reaffirm our earlier vote today and again vote no and allow us to continue this important program about jobs.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I rise today as an opponent of corporate welfare and in support of this amendment to eliminate funding for the Advanced Technology Program. Since I have been in Congress, I have worked diligently to eliminate Federal subsidies to corporations that do not need them. I took on, for example, the sugar daddy of corporate welfare, the sugar program, which because of the way the program operates, it cost the American consumer \$1.4 billion, but 42 percent of the benefits of this corporate welfare program go to only 1 percent of the sugar plantations. That is corporate welfare. And so is the Advanced Technology Program.

I have cosponsored several amendments this year to eliminate subsidies, and the ATP program is one of the most egregious examples of corporate welfare we have today. I am glad to be able to continue to support this effort. This program subsidizes big multi-

national companies. It gives hard-earned taxpayer dollars to companies such as AT&T, Shell Petroleum, DuPont and IBM for them to conduct research on risky ventures. If these companies want to engage in risky ventures, they should be required to find private funding.

Supporters of the ATP program claim that it is essential for research and development. Yet in 1993 the GAO estimated research and development spending nationwide to be approximately \$150 billion. The ATP program at \$185 million represents a mere, if not unnecessary, drop in the bucket.

Private funding for these ventures is available. The GAO report found that from 1990 to 1993, half the applicants who were denied ATP funding found alternative private-sector funding for their research. What is more disturbing is that 63 percent of the ATP applicants did not even bother to seek private funding. They just went straight to the government for funding. After all, why should these firms have to compete if they can just go to the public trough?

Americans should not be forced to spend their hard-earned tax dollars to fund high-risk research projects for some of America's largest corporations. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland [Mrs. MORELLA].

Mrs. MORELLA. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak against corporate welfare and against this amendment, because ATP, the Advanced Technology Program, is not corporate welfare. The ATP is a competitive, peer-reviewed, cost-shared program with industry. It is really what we are all about, public-private partnerships. And it is working. ATP is designed to develop high-risk, potentially high-payoff technologies that otherwise would not be pursued because of technical risks and other obstacles that discourage private investment.

The House-passed authorization for NIST reforms ATP to further emphasize this point. The authorization bill included language to reform the grant process by requiring that grants can only go to projects that cannot proceed in a timely manner without Federal assistance. This should ensure that all ATP funds go to high-risk projects that could not receive private backing. The bill also increases the match requirements for ATP grant recipients to 60 percent for joint ventures and nonsmall-business single applicants.

Further, terminating ATP would amount to the U.S. Government turning its back on its obligations to small business. The problem is that ATP funds long-term 5-year research grants, and the funding for the remaining years of those 5-year grants is termed a mortgage.

Quite frankly, if we terminate this program, it would amount to our turning our back on our obligations, because the 5-year research grants would mean that we have not fulfilled our obligation, which would be mortgages over \$100 million. The early termination would especially hurt small businesses which receive almost 40 percent of ATP grants. Small businesses, unlike their larger counterparts, cannot afford to have the Federal Government suddenly drop out of the technology development partnership.

The appropriations bill cuts ATP by \$40 million from last year's appropriated level, and the appropriation in this bill is identical to the authorization level passed by the House this spring. Let us remember what we did today. We refused to reduce the ATP program on a vote of 261-163. Surely we are not going to destroy this program that is working. So support a reasoned reform of ATP and reject this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would remind the Members that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER] has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOLLOHAN] has 1½ minutes remaining and the right to close.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. BASS].

Mr. BASS. I thank the gentleman from Indiana for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I think it is important that we understand what we are talking about here tonight. What we are talking about having is the taxpayers of this country financing research and development from some of the wealthiest and largest corporations in this country.

We have heard tonight that ATP develops technologies that private sector corporations and venture capital groups will not develop. First, this assertion contradicts the findings of the General Accounting Office study that addressed whether, in the absence of ATP funding, corporations or consortia would carry out the research anyway. According to the GAO survey, nearly half of the near winners continued their projects even though they were not awarded ATP funding. Of the entities granted ATP funds, 42 percent admitted that they would have continued their R&D project without Federal assistance, while 41 percent said they would not have.

We have also heard that without ATP funding, American businesses and start-up companies will not have sufficient capital to conduct R&D into cutting-edge technologies. Mr. Chairman, we have heard many times; in 1996 the venture capital industry in this country pumped more than \$10 billion into new ventures, and last year alone companies raised more than \$50 billion from initial stock offerings.

Let me also point out that the top four winners of ATP grants invested more than \$20 billion of their own cor-

porate resources into research and development. Remember, we are talking about \$185 million versus \$20 billion. That is twenty thousand million dollars that the private industry is putting in, and we are talking about \$185 million.

Mr. Chairman, when do we end this business of the Federal Government giving something to everybody in this country? Let us get our priorities straight. Let us support the pending amendment before us this evening.

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this discussion has given credence to the old axiom that says that nothing is so absurd that if said often enough, people will start believing it. Those people who say that ATP is not corporate welfare I think are wrong. When you give hundreds of millions of dollars a year to multibillion-dollar corporations who have multibillion-dollar research and development budgets, that is corporate welfare, Mr. Chairman. I would urge that this body follow the precedents of last year and defund the ATP.

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. HOOLEY].

Ms. HOOLEY of Oregon. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this amendment. This, frankly, is an attempt to kill a good program that is having a positive impact on the American technology industry and the economy as a whole.

There is a small company, not a billionaire company, in my home State, called Planar America that is working to establish a United States presence in the flat panel display industry. Partly as a result of the ATP program, Planar has developed a means of refining the color in a remarkable technology called active matrix electroluminescence, which could rapidly become the display of choice in commercial video and military applications. But they are competing directly with companies in Japan working to beat them to the technology. The ATP program has played a key role in speeding up the development of this technology in an industry where timing is critical to future profits. In addition, Planar has invested more than an equal share in this effort as required by the program.

Let me be clear. The ATP is not a corporate giveaway. The government has a role in giving our Nation a jump start on certain high-risk innovations, and we have a responsibility to employ foresight in making our decisions. Obviously our economy and our workers stand only to benefit from this very nominal investment. I urge my colleagues to support our Nation's research and development and vote no on this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this amendment. This, frankly, is an attempt to kill a good program that is having a positive impact on the American technological industry and the economy as a whole.

ATP is not, as some of my colleagues will tell you, a hand-out to big American corporations. It is an investment that otherwise may not be made without the good sense and forethought of Members of this body. This is not about subsidizing individual companies; this is about the broad effects of the program on the United States economy.

The purpose of the program is to benefit entire industrial sectors that, in turn, create good jobs for U.S. workers in the future. Furthermore, it's a program that largely provides grants to small U.S. businesses. In fact, 47 percent of the current recipients are small businesses, with 75 percent of those businesses employing under 100 people.

For those who are less familiar with this program, let me give an example of how this program is making a difference for a particular industry, largely involving small companies. The flat-panel display industry has become one of the principal battlefields of international competition in electronics. While our Nation has dominated technology development in the computing industry, most of the flat-panel display technologies have come from foreign countries, especially those relating to color displays.

Computer manufacturing has been one of the most valuable industries for our Nation's economic growth with booming exports of personal computers to international markets. Yet we're allowing one of the most important components of that growth to be performed outside of the United States. The market for flat-panel displays is expected to reach \$14 billion by the end of the decade. Our Nation can't afford to sell off this technology to foreign countries that are willing to adequately invest in its development.

One recipient of an ATP grant in my home State of Oregon, called Planar America, is working to establish a United States presence in that industry. Partly as a result of the ATP program, Planar has developed a means of refining the color in a remarkable technology called Active Matrix Electroluminescence, which could rapidly become the display of choice in commercial video and military applications.

But they are competing directly with companies in Japan working to beat them to the technology. The ATP program has played a key role in speeding up the development of this technology in an industry where timing is critical to future profits. In addition, Planar has invested more than an equal share in this effort, as required by the program.

Let me be clear. The ATP is not a corporate giveaway. The Government has a role in giving our Nation a jump start on certain high-risk innovations, and we have a responsibility to employ foresight in making our decisions. Obviously, our economy and our workers stand only to benefit from this nominal investment.

I urge my colleagues to support our Nation's research and development and vote no on this amendment.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which would eliminate funding for the Advanced Technology Program.

The ATP program facilitates the development of technology that would benefit the U.S. economy. This is done by using a combination of Federal funding and industry funding to support research on high-risk, promising technologies that have the potential to significantly

impact the Nation's economy. In today's highly competitive environment, the ATP program enables industry to pursue cutting edge technologies.

You might be interested to know that although U.S. software and computer companies lead the world in developing advanced, highly integrated systems for manufacturing; U.S. manufacturers as a whole trail their major foreign competitors in adopting these technologies. In my own State of Connecticut, United Technologies Corp. is working jointly with a number of other major industrial firms in an experiment on how our companies can adapt to new technology in a more efficient manner.

The ATP program lets modest Federal investments reap impressive rewards and keep America competitive in the global marketplace. Ending ATP would deny these companies the tools to expand our economy. And it would turn back the efforts of Democrats and Republicans who have helped the government help small business through these programs.

Everyone says they support a vibrant economy and an effective government. Let's show we match our rhetoric with action, and oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOSTETTLER].

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HOSTETTLER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 177, noes 235, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

AYES—177

Aderholt	Deal	Jenkins
Andrews	DeLay	Johnson, Sam
Archer	Dickey	Jones
Armey	Doolittle	Kasich
Bachus	Dreier	Kingston
Baker	Duncan	Klug
Ballenger	Dunn	Kolbe
Barr	Ehrlich	Largent
Barrett (NE)	Emerson	Latham
Barrett (WI)	Ensign	Lewis (KY)
Barton	Everett	Linder
Bass	Foley	Livingston
Bereuter	Forbes	LoBiondo
Berry	Fowler	Lucas
Bilirakis	Fox	Luther
Bliley	Franks (NJ)	Manzullo
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	McColum
Boehner	Ganske	McHugh
Bono	Gillmor	McInnis
Brady	Goodlatte	McIntosh
Bryant	Goodling	McIntyre
Bunning	Goss	McKeon
Burton	Graham	Metcalf
Buyer	Granger	Mica
Callahan	Greenwood	Miller (FL)
Campbell	Gutknecht	Minge
Canady	Hastert	Moran (KS)
Cannon	Hastings (WA)	Myrick
Chabot	Hayworth	Nethercutt
Chambliss	Hefley	Neumann
Chenoweth	Hergert	Ney
Christensen	Hill	Northup
Coble	Hilleary	Norwood
Coburn	Hobson	Nussle
Combest	Hoekstra	Pappas
Condit	Horn	Parker
Cooksey	Hostettler	Paul
Cox	Hulshof	Paxon
Crane	Hunter	Pease
Crapo	Hutchinson	Peterson (MN)
Cubin	Inglis	Peterson (PA)
Cunningham	Istook	Pickering

Pitts	Shaffer, Bob
Pombo	Sessions
Portman	Shadegg
Pryce (OH)	Shaw
Radanovich	Shays
Ramstad	Shimkus
Redmond	Shuster
Riggs	Smith (MI)
Riley	Smith (NJ)
Rohrabacher	Smith (TX)
Roukema	Smith, Linda
Royce	Snowbarger
Ryun	Solomon
Salmon	Souder
Sanford	Spence
Scarborough	Stark
Schaefer, Dan	Stearns

NOES—235

Abercrombie	Gilchrist
Ackerman	Gilman
Allen	Goode
Baessler	Gordon
Baldacci	Green
Barcia	Gutierrez
Bartlett	Hall (TX)
Bateman	Hamilton
Becerra	Harman
Bentsen	Hefner
Berman	Hilliard
Bilbray	Hinche
Bishop	Hinojosa
Blagojevich	Holden
Blumenauer	Hooley
Boehlert	Houghton
Bonior	Hoyer
Borski	Hyde
Boswell	Jackson (IL)
Boucher	Jackson-Lee
Boyd	(TX)
Brown (CA)	Jefferson
Brown (FL)	John
Brown (OH)	Johnson (CT)
Burr	Johnson (WI)
Calvert	Johnson, E. B.
Camp	Kanjorski
Capps	Kaptur
Cardin	Kelly
Carson	Kennedy (MA)
Castle	Kennedy (RI)
Clay	Kennedy
Clayton	Kildee
Clement	Kilpatrick
Clyburn	Kim
Conyers	Kind (WI)
Cook	King (NY)
Costello	Kleczka
Coyne	Klink
Cramer	Knollenberg
Cummings	Kucinich
Danner	LaFalce
Davis (FL)	LaHood
Davis (IL)	Lampson
Davis (VA)	Lantos
DeFazio	LaTourette
DeGette	Leach
Delahunt	Levin
DeLauro	Lewis (CA)
Dellums	Lewis (GA)
Deutsch	Lipinski
Diaz-Balart	Lofgren
Dicks	Lowe
Dingell	Maloney (CT)
Dixon	Maloney (NY)
Doggett	Manton
Dooley	Markey
Doyle	Martinez
Edwards	Mascara
Ehlers	Matsui
Engel	McCarthy (MO)
English	McCarthy (NY)
Eshoo	McDermott
Etheridge	McGovern
Evans	McHale
Ewing	McKinney
Farr	McNulty
Fattah	Meehan
Fawell	Meek
Fazio	Menendez
Filner	Millender
Ford	McDonald
Frank (MA)	Miller (CA)
Frost	Mink
Furse	Moakley
Galleghy	Mollohan
Gejdenson	Moran (VA)
Gekas	Morella
Gephardt	Murtha

Stump
Sununu
Talent
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Tiahrt
Upton
Wamp
Watkins
Watts (OK)
Weldon (FL)
Weller
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wolf

NOT VOTING—21

Bonilla	Hansen	Rogan
Collins	Hastings (FL)	Schiff
Flake	Lazio	Schumer
Foglietta	McCrery	Smith (OR)
Gibbons	McDade	Taylor (NC)
Gonzalez	Oxley	Yates
Hall (OH)	Quinn	Young (AK)

□ 2233

Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mrs. NORTHUP, and Mr. BRADY changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE) having assumed the chair, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2267) making appropriations for the Departments of Commerce, Justice, and State, the Judiciary, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1998, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution there.

LIMITING AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2267, DEPARTMENTS OF COMMERCE, JUSTICE, AND STATE, THE JUDICIARY, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1998

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that during further consideration of H.R. 2267 pursuant to House Resolution 239:

(1) No further amendment shall be in order except: amendments printed before September 25, 1997, in the portion of the congressional Record designated for that purpose in clause 6 of rule XXIII; amendments numbered 2 and 3 in part 2 of House Report 105-264; one amendment offered by Representative Rogers of Kentucky after consultation with Representative Mollohan of West Virginia; one amendment to the amendment printed in the Congressional Record and numbered 4; and pro forma amendments offered by the chairman or ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their designees;

(2) each amendment shall be considered as read and (other than the amendments numbered 2 and 3 in part 2 of House Report 105-264 and the amendment numbered 4 and any amendment thereto) shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent;

(3) the amendment numbered 4 shall be debatable for 60 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, except that if an amendment thereto is offered before that debate begins, then the amendment and the amendment thereto shall