

make it more difficult for the FEC to electronically scan the information. It will also save thousands of dollars in the Clerk's office.

This bill may have prompted some confusion, as has been alleged earlier, on how the FEC would implement the bill, but I am pleased that the FEC now has clarified their earlier request and that they are not pushing for more employees to accomplish this single point of entry.

I want to reiterate that I support using a portion of the \$1.5 million fenced in fiscal year 1996 for the computer modernization on electronic filing initiatives such as those authorized in H.R. 2527. I am confident that single point of entry can be achieved for less than the CBO cost estimate of a half a million dollars, and the FEC's estimate of between \$400,000 to \$500,000 makes sense.

This bill will speed disclosure, reduce duplication and move the FEC toward computer modernization. I encourage my colleagues to give it their full support.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. EHLERS], a valued member of the Committee on House Oversight.

Mr. EHLERS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to rise in strong support of H.R. 2527. Just 2 years ago I ran for Congress for the first time. I was very surprised when the time came to file the first campaign finance report and discovered that I had to file a copy with the secretary of state in the State of Michigan and a copy with the Clerk of the House. I just assumed that the report would go to the FEC. I did not realize it would take a few days for them to get it.

What amazed me even more is that when the news media wanted to find out what we had expended on the campaign, they did not go to the secretary of state of Michigan, they did not go to the Clerk of the House, and of course they could not get it from the FEC; they came to our campaign office and we had to run off multiple copies for the media.

□ 1445

This bill will cure those problems. The report will be filed with the agency that is responsible of reviewing it, the FEC. That is where it appropriately belongs. Even more importantly, we can file by electronic means. I certainly will take advantage of that. It will save a lot of work, it will save a lot of postage, and it will certainly speed up the time that the press will have to spend scanning these particular reports.

Once again Mr. Speaker, I believe it is an excellent bill and I rise in strong support of this bill. I encourage its passage.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

In closing, we are pleased to support this, but I would reiterate my personal concern, and I believe the concern of our side of the aisle, that as we save, as the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] has pointed out, \$500,000, or thereabouts, from the Clerk's office, and we transfer the responsibility of unified point of entry and first entry into the FEC, it is, I think, agreed on both sides that there will be an additional cost to the FEC.

We have provided, by correspondence more than legislation, that of the \$1.5 million for computerization, a portion of that can be used for the purposes of carrying out this additional responsibility that we transfer from the Clerk's office to the FEC.

We have no opposition to that, but I would like to observe that we must carefully review the capacity of the FEC to do those things which the public expects it to do. This will be a step in the right direction. But it will only be a step in the right direction if they have the capacity to do the job from an administrative standpoint, enter the data properly, have it accessible easily, and be able to respond to the public's questions.

I will be looking as a member of both the authorizing and the appropriating subcommittees that have responsibility to oversee FEC at the impact that this additional responsibility has on them with a view next year to make sure that they have sufficient funds to carry out what the American public believe to be an absolutely essential task of knowing where money comes from, where it goes, and what relationship, if any, it has to policy.

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

Mr. Speaker, I know the gentleman from Maryland did not mean to misspeak in his concluding comments, but this is not an additional responsibility for the FEC. The FEC now has the responsibility to receive and record all campaign reports.

This is a timing question. Because, notwithstanding current procedure, where the campaign reports are filed with the clerk of the House first, they are nevertheless still eventually transferred to the FEC. So this is not, I repeat, not an additional responsibility for the FEC. It is merely a question of timing.

The FEC enjoyed, as we say, the float. The fact that the clerk was the one who received at the appropriate deadline the reports, enabled the FEC to buy some time to do other work that was required under the law by the deadline and then begin to receive, 1 to 3 days after the deadline, the materials from the clerk.

This procedure could have been changed in any previous Congress. But it was convenient for folk. It was useful to have a system for holding reports in an area where that report could be retrieved by candidates, to be changed, to be reviewed, and then submitted to the FEC.

It seems to me the fundamental responsibility is the deadline and the public's right to know. The practice that H.R. 2527 eliminates is that float time. It does away with the convenience that the FEC had for a number of years of not having to deal with its responsibilities at the given deadline.

So when we talk about costs to the FEC, quite frankly this is something that should have been corrected a long time ago.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2527, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2527, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

#### DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS OF 1995

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2204) to extend and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2204

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

##### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Defense Production Act Amendments of 1995".

##### SEC. 2. EXTENSION OF PROGRAMS.

Section 717(a) of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2166(a)) is amended in the first sentence by striking "Title I (except section 104), title III, and title VII (except sections 708, 714, 719, and 721) of this Act, and all authority conferred thereunder shall terminate at the close of September 30, 1995" and inserting "Title I (except section 104), title III, and title VII (except sections 708 and 721), and all authority conferred thereunder, shall terminate at the close of September 30, 1998".

##### SEC. 3. AUTHORIZING APPROPRIATIONS FOR TITLE III PROJECTS.

Section 711 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 (50 U.S.C. App. 2161) is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "(a) AUTHORIZATION.—" and all that follows through "subsection (c).," and inserting "(a) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in subsection (b),"; and

(2) by striking subsections (b), (c), and (d) and inserting after subsection (a) the following new subsection:

“(b) TITLE II AUTHORIZATION.—There are authorized to be appropriated for each of the fiscal years 1996, 1997, and 1998, such sums as may be necessary to carry out title III.”.

#### SEC. 4. REPORTS TO THE CONGRESS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President shall prepare and transmit to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs of the Senate an interim report and a final report on proposed legislative modernization of the authorities contained in the Defense Production Act of 1950.

(b) TIMING.—The President shall so transmit—

(1) the interim report required by subsection (a), not later than January 31, 1997; and

(2) the final report required by subsection (a), not later than September 30, 1997.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New York [Mr. FLAKE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE].

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bill before us today, H.R. 2204, a basically noncontroversial measure to extend and reauthorize the Defense Production Act of 1950. In this, I am grateful to enjoy the support of Representative JAMES A. LEACH, chairman of the Committee on Banking and Financial Services. In true bipartisan spirit, our distinguished former chairman, Representative GONZALEZ and Representative FLAKE, the ranking member of the subcommittee have also provided their strong support for this legislation and I am very appreciative of their efforts. I would be remiss if I did not also acknowledge the valued input provided by Representative METCALF, Representative BARR, Representative CHRYSLER, and Representative WATT of the subcommittee. Their counsel has served to improve the future exercise of Defense Production Act authorities.

Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy of the House Banking and Financial Services Committee has primary jurisdiction over the Defense Production Act, which is the primary statute used for the mobilization of civilian efforts during national disasters in peacetime and in support of the national defense during periods of national emergency. The authorization for the DPA expired on September 30, 1995. This legislation would extend and reauthorize the DPA until September 30, 1998.

Title I of the DPA is designed to ensure that the Armed Forces of the United States can obtain the critical goods and services required to carry out their duties during wartime national emergencies and peacetime national disasters. It provides the President with the authority to establish an order of precedence among contracts and to require that those contracts or orders for essential goods, necessary to

the national defense, take precedence over other contracts or orders. In addition, title I authorizes the President to manage the allocation of materials, equipment, and services necessary to promote the national defense.

The fiscal year 1995 Defense Authorization Act redefined “national defense” and amended the DPA to extend the application of the authorities under title I to be used in the event of a national disaster. This is a sensible adaptation to permit these capabilities and authorities to be employed to help victims of natural disasters—floods, fires, hurricanes, and earthquakes.

These authorities have been employed to support the U.S. military in every conflict since 1950. Operation Desert Storm was a recent example of a conflict situation that arose with special needs that could not be completely anticipated and supplied through the ordinary operations of the market. Currently the Bosnian situation places actual and potential emergency equipment and logistical demands for the support of our forces.

Title III authorizes the President to use incentives to establish, expand, and maintain domestic production capacity for critical components, critical items of technology, and essential industrial resources required for the execution of the national security strategy of the United States.

No appropriations for DPA have been requested by this administration for fiscal year 1996 and none are forecast for fiscal year 1997. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that H.R. 2204 would result in additional outlays of \$80 to \$85 million over the 5-year period between 1996–2000. All of these costs would be subject to discretionary appropriations. The bill is not subject to pay as you go procedures because it would not affect direct spending or receipts. Enactment of this bill will have no effect on the budgets of State and local governments.

Mr. Speaker, the administration and the minority support this extension of the DPA through September 30, 1998. The other body has already passed substantially identical legislation by unanimous consent. This bill is a provident and careful provision for the unpredictable conflict or national emergency. I urge its immediate adoption.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, as well as the many members on both sides of the committee and in the House who realize the importance of the Defense Production Act to our national security.

Mr. Speaker, preparedness has long been a staple of our Nation's military strength. It is an unrefuted fact that our Nation's defense is grounded upon a policy of a strong industrial and technology base capable of meeting na-

tional defense requirements, and is further predicated upon our maintaining technological superiority on the battlefield. The synergy of these two themes is affirmed in the Defense Production Act.

More importantly, however, the authorities contained in the act make our policy a reality. The DPA's authorities are unique in that they provide the Defense Department the ability to maintain a strong domestic base which will be responsive to threats to the national security of the United States. Moreover, I am pleased to say these same authorities may apply in times of natural disasters here at home.

Mr. Speaker, a brief history of the DPA is in order, so that the American public can understand the efficacy of its provisions. Established in 1950, the original intent was to mobilize the Nation's production capacity in response to material shortages experienced during World War II and the outbreak of the Korean war. Only three out of seven titles remain in operation today, and these authorities expired on September 30, 1995.

Title I is a powerful tool that ensures that our Armed Forces and those of our allies can obtain the materials they need to meet any contingency that threatens the national security. These priorities and allocations authorities have been used extensively and have proven invaluable. During Desert Storm, title I ensured that industry provided priority production and shipment of essential items urgently needed by the coalition forces. Close to 600 cases were handled during the conflict which included delivery of: Global positioning system receivers; activated charcoal for gas masks; and search/rescue radios.

Mr. Speaker, title III provisions also contain vital authorities. This “expansion of productive capacity and supply” authority allows the President to use incentives to establish, expand, or maintain domestic productive capacity for critical components, critical technology items, and industrial resources essential for the execution of the national security policy of the United States.

Title III provides a unique vehicle by which the Defense Department can provide financial incentives to industry to support defense needs. These incentives allow domestic industries to support and supply key advanced materials and technology items, and facilities the use of these materials in our Nation's defense systems. Most often these systems involve high technology systems including lasers, radar, and communication systems.

Mr. Speaker, the last operative authority, title VII, contains some general measures. I will close, however, by extending my support to the new language inserted requiring a report for possible changes to the active sections of the DPA. Members from both parties expressed concerns about the age of this law, and whether these authorities

are obsolete. Some also felt that the President has too much power under the DPA. I believe the changes will assuage these concerns, and I look forward to working with Mr. CASTLE and the Defense Department on those changes.

Therefore, as the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Domestic and International Monetary Policy, I support the bill.

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, for 45 years the Defense Production Act has provided the executive branch with essential authorities to ensure that our Armed Forces will have the materials and supportive services necessary to promote the national defense.

Ever since the Defense Production Act was enacted in 1950, the Banking Committee has carefully reviewed and amended the act so that it is as necessary today as the day it was enacted.

The bill before us today continues, until September 30, 1998, the President's authority to set procurement priorities on contracts for goods and services that are absolutely necessary for strategic military purposes. Additionally, the bill extends the President's authority to establish financial incentives to permit the domestic defense industry to produce goods and services which are critical elements of weapon systems.

While we recognize that we live in a global industrial environment, it simply makes no sense to depend on foreign sources of critical parts for U.S. weapon systems; no matter how strongly we believe another country shares our national interests. This legislation takes important steps to prevent an unreasonable reliance on the defense industries of other countries. The Defense Production Act produces jobs in American industries and promotes the development of new technologies for our firms.

I commend the chairman of the Banking Committee, Chairman LEACH, the subcommittee chairman and ranking member, Chairman CASTLE and Congressman FLOYD FLAKE respectively, for their work in bringing the bill to the floor.

I strongly recommend bipartisan support of the Defense Production Act Amendments of 1995.

□ 1500

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Delaware [Mr. CASTLE] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2204, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2204, the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Delaware?

There was no objection.

#### PROHIBITION OF CERTAIN TRANSFERS OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 924) to prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from transferring any national forest system lands in the Angeles National Forest in California out of Federal ownership for use as a solid waste landfill.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 924

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

#### SECTION 1. PROHIBITION ON CERTAIN TRANSFERS OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS.

After the date of the enactment of this Act the Secretary of Agriculture shall not transfer (by exchange or otherwise) any lands owned by the United States and managed by the Secretary as part of the Angeles National Forest to any person unless the instrument of conveyance contains a restriction, enforceable by the Secretary, on the future use of such land prohibiting the use of any portion of such land as a solid waste landfill. Such restriction shall be promptly enforced by the Secretary when and if a violation of the restriction occurs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN].

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

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 924 was introduced by Representative BUCK MCKEON and would prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from transferring lands within the Angeles National Forest out of Federal ownership for use as a solid waste landfill. H.R. 924 addresses a concern raised by residents of southern California over efforts to construct a 190 million ton solid waste landfill in an area of the Angeles National Forest known as Elsmere Canyon. A private company is currently seeking to obtain 1,643 acres of land within the Angeles National Forest to facilitate construction of what would be the largest landfill in the United States. The Forest Service previously issued a recommendation against this exchange in a January 1995 draft environmental impact statement and also rejected a similar request made by the same company in 1986.

The Angeles National Forest is within a 2-hour drive of more than 20 million Californians and ranks second in the Nation in recreation use with 32 million visits annually. An enormous solid waste landfill, which the Forest

Service has rejected on two occasions, is clearly not compatible with public use of the Angeles National Forest, which compromises 72 percent of the open space within Los Angeles County.

To sacrifice a prime area of the Angeles National Forest for a questionable landfill project is clearly not within the public's interest. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 924 and commend Mr. MCKEON for his success with this legislation.

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

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] and the author of this bill, the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON] have it about right. We agree with the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I am a cosponsor of H.R. 924 Representative MCKEON asked myself and others to cosponsor this bill because of his deep concern that the placement of the proposed Elsmere Canyon solid waste landfill could negatively his constituents and the local communities. It is obvious from the Resources Committee hearing that this proposed landfill is very controversial. The proposed landfill would be developed on land that is now part of the Angeles National Forest, land that would be acquired through a land exchange between the landfill operator and the Forest Service. While it appears highly likely that the proposed landfill will be rejected under the existing administrative procedures of the Forest Service, House passage of this legislation which will legislatively end any chance of this project going forward.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 924 and recommend its adoption by the House.

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

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON], the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 924. This legislation would prohibit the Secretary of Agriculture from transferring land within the Angeles National Forest out of Federal ownership for use as a solid waste landfill. I introduced this bill in response to concerns raised by residents of southern California over efforts to construct a 190-million-ton solid waste landfill in the section of the Angeles National Forest known as Elsmere Canyon. I am also pleased that most of the Members from the California delegation have joined me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, on at least two previous occasions the Forest Service has rejected proposals to construct a landfill within the Angeles National Forest. A similar proposal is currently under consideration where a private company would acquire through exchange 1,643 acres of land within the Angeles National Forest to facilitate construction