of what would be the largest landfill in the country. The Forest Service has already issued a draft environmental impact statement that has recommended against accepting this exchange, and is in the process of completing a final report on this issue.

There are several reasons to support passage of this legislation today. As many southern Californians know, the Angeles National Forest is our version of Central Park, occupying 72 percent of the open land in Los Angeles County. In addition, the forest is within a 2-hour drive for more than 20 million Californians and ranks second in the Nation in recreation use with more than 32 million annual visits—which is approximately equal to one visit per year for every person in California. Moreover, although the tract proposed for the landfill is on the western edge of the Angeles National Forest, it is an integral part of the forest's ecosystem and provides unique and spectacular educational and recreational opportunities for visitors to the forest. Finally, several tracts of land that the Forest Service is slated to acquire in an eventual exchange have already been obtained by the trust for public land through receipts act funding, which will reduce the value of an exchange to the Federal Government.

Mr. Speaker, I am not involved in the issue to express arguments against landfills, since there are already several in my district. However, it is important to realize that the State of California is making great strides in promoting safer and more practical landfill alternatives. New developments in solid waste disposal technology already exist that will soon diminish the need for expensive and potentially unsafe new landfills. These technologies include combustion alternatives that do not adversely affect air quality as well as various recycling endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, all of us in this Chamber have a responsibility to protect public land which belongs to our citizens. To sacrifice a prime area of National Forest land for a questionable landfill project is clearly not in the public's interest. The legislation before us will carry out our intent to further prevent forever the construction of a landfill within the Angeles National Forest, and I urge its adoption.

Before concluding, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleagues who have supported this effort, especially my good friend, Mr. HANSEN, the chairman of the National Parks, Forests, and Lands Subcommittee as well as another friend, Mr. RICHARDSON, the ranking member of the subcommittee who is an original cosponsor of the legislation. I also want to express my appreciation to my colleague from California, Mr. MILLER the ranking member of the full committee and my friend from Alaska, Mr. YOUNG chairman of the full committee, for their efforts, along with the counsel of the National Parks Subcommittee, Allen Freemyer, and the subcommittee staff for their guidance and assistance throughout this process.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to thank my colleague and mentor, the gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD]. He was the first Congressman I met in my life, and he has been a great example to me of what we should be in this House of the people. He represents the area covered in this bill and has been a great partner in getting to this point.

I express my appreciation also for the efforts of the residents of the city of Santa Clarita, CA, who have worked tirelessly to bring this issue to have the public's attention.

I urge support of this measure this day, H.R. 924.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California [Mr. MOORHEAD].

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

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, this is a very important piece of legislation for the people of southern California. It is one that we have fought for a long period of time as we have fought against a trash dump that would destroy one of the most beautiful areas of southern California.

I do not think many people know it, but we have got the finest waterfall that I know of in southern California within Elsmere Canyon. It is a lovely area. It is an area that is adjacent to large population areas.

Our biggest problem in the national forest has been fires and the floods that followed. We have tried to provide recreational facilities for the people of southern California in those woods and forests that are a part of them. If a trash dump was built on this site, it would be a danger for fires. It would endanger the water supply of the people of Santa Clarita. It would endanger the quality of air that we have in that part of the county. It would not be a good place for a trash dump.

I am very, very grateful to the gentleman from California [Mr. MCKEON] for bringing this legislation to this Congress. It is an area that I cherish and I want to keep pure, and I think that this legislation is the only thing that is going to do it.

I ask all Members to vote for this bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah [Mr. HANSEN] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 924.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 924, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## EXTENDING FEDERAL POWER ACT DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF THREE ARKANSAS HYDROELECTRIC PROJECTS

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 657) to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of three hydroelectric projects in the State of Arkansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 657

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

**SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF DEADLINES.**

Notwithstanding the time limitations of section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, upon the request of the licensee for FERC Project No. 4204, 4660, and 4659 (and after reasonable notice), is authorized, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of such section 13 and the Commission's procedures under such section, to extend the time required for commencement of construction for the project for up to a maximum of 3 consecutive 2-year periods. This section shall take effect for the project upon the expiration of the extension (issued by the Commission under such section 13) of the period required for commencement of construction of such project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

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

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

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, this bill would extend the deadline for commencement of construction for three projects constituting the 21-megawatt White River Project in Arkansas for up to 6 years. The licensees for these projects, the city of Batesville and Independence County, have invested more than $4 million in development. The licensees seek an extension because they have not been able to obtain a power sales contract. Construction of these projects will create new jobs for local residents and produce about $300,000 in annual revenues for local governments. During construction, the licensees plan to spend more than $12 million on wages and salaries, and nearly $38 million on materials, providing further employment and income to

local communities. The bill was introduced by our colleague, Representative LINCOLN of Arkansas. There is a need for congressional action, since the construction deadline for one of the projects ran out last week.

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

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

This is the first of eight bills that we will consider this afternoon that deal with hydroelectric projects, and as the gentleman from Colorado mentioned, there has not been any objection to any of these bills.

The Federal Power Action allows the licensee 2 years to begin construction of a hydroelectric project once the license is issued and can extend that deadline but may do so only once and only for 2 years. However, there are many obstacles that make it difficult for projects to commence construction during either the initial license time frame or the extension time frame.

Perhaps the most frequent reason for delay is the lack of a power purchase agreement, for without such an agreement it is unlikely a project could get financed. Because of the limitations set in the Federal Power Act, the House has had a long bipartisan tradition of moving noncontroversial license extensions, and I am pleased we are continuing that tradition today with the gentleman from Colorado and myself and our subcommittee by taking up these bills that were reported, as I said, without dissent by the Committee on Commerce, and so I would ask that the first bill, H.R. 657, be considered.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 657.

The question was taken.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHAEFER. 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. 657, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

## EXTENDING THE TIME FOR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN FERC LICENSED HYDRO PROJECTS

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 680) to extend the time for construction of certain FERC licensed hydro projects.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 680

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

**SECTION 1. EXTENSION.**

Notwithstanding the limitations of section 13 of the Federal Power Act, the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, upon the request of the licensee or licensees for FERC projects numbered 4244 and 10648 (and after reasonable notice), is authorized in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of such section 13 and the Commission's procedures under such section, to extend the time required for commencement of construction for each of such projects for up to a maximum of 3 consecutive 2-year periods. This section shall take effect for the projects upon the expiration of the extension (issued by the Commission under such section 13) of the period required for commencement of construction of each such project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

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

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

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, this bill would extend deadlines for construction of two projects in New York with a capacity of 9.7 and 10.2 megawatts for up to 6 years, which would extend the deadline to up to 10 years after the date the licenses were issued. Adirondack Hydro Development Corp. is licensee for one of the projects, and general partner of the other. To date, the company has invested $2 million in development of the projects. The licensee has not been able to begin construction because it has not been able to obtain a power sales contract needed to secure financing. Construction and operation of the projects offers substantial benefits to the community, including an estimated 180 jobs, a payroll expenditure of $18 million, and a further $20 million spent on local purchases of materials. This legislation was introduced by our colleague, Representative SOLOMON of New York. The construction deadline for one of these projects is January 16, 1996, so time is running short.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Colorado has explained the substance of the bill. It was reported out of our Subcommittee on Power and Energy and the full Committee on Commerce without objection. It is based on construction not having commenced for lack of a power-purchase agreement. I support the legislation.

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

Mr. SCHAEFER. 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 Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 680.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SCHAEFER. 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. 680, the bill just passed.

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

There was no objection.

## EXTENDING FEDERAL POWER ACT DEADLINE FOR CONSTRUCTION OF AN OHIO HYDROELECTRIC PROJECT

Mr. SCHAEFER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1011) to extend the deadline under the Federal Power Act applicable to the construction of a hydroelectric project in the State of Ohio.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 1011

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

**SECTION 1. EXTENSION OF DEADLINE.**

Notwithstanding the time limitations of section 13 of the Federal Power Act (16 U.S.C. 806) the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, upon the request of the licensee for FERC Project No. 9423 (and after reasonable notice), is authorized, in accordance with the good faith, due diligence, and public interest requirements of such section 13 and the Commission's procedures under such section, to extend the time required for commencement of construction for the project for up to a maximum of 3 consecutive 2-year periods. This section shall take effect for the project upon the expiration of the extension (issued by the Commission under section 13) of the period required for commencement of construction of such project.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PALLONE] will be recognized for 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SCHAEFER].

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

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