

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 hit 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

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 HYDRO-ELECTRIC 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