

# EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## INTERSTATE TRANSPORTATION OF MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 30, 1996

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in reluctant support of House Resolution 349, the Flow Control Act of 1996. I am reluctant because of the circumvention of the normal committee process and because there are provisions in this bill that are so narrowly drafted as to affect only one town in my district. In fact, to my knowledge, it's the only town in the country so affected.

The bill generally grandfathers all communities in New York and other States which have actually designated waste management facilities pursuant to duly enacted State and local legislation. The single exception to this situation is the section entitled "Facilities Not Qualified for Flow Control" incorporated into the bill.

This section provides that flow control may not be exercised with regard to any facility if the following conditions are met:

The ordinance was determined to be unconstitutional by a State or Federal court prior to May 16, 1994, and before the date of enactment of the legislation;

The facility is located over a sole source aquifer and within 1 mile of a coastal zone; and  
The facility is not fully permitted and operating in compliance with Federal, State, and local regulations.

As I understand it, the bill was further modified in this extraordinary process to ensure that it applied only to facilities within 5 miles of a public beach and 25 miles of a city with a population of 5 million or more. Clearly a reference to New York City.

By its terms, the provision applies to only a single town in the State of New York: North Hempstead. It would not apply to neighboring towns such as Hempstead, Babylon, or Islip, although waste disposal conditions are virtually identical in these towns and the need to manage solid waste is similar. Only North Hempstead would be denied authority to utilize its flow control ordinance in support of a waste management plan.

On its face the bill is unfair. North Hempstead meets the conditions set out in the bill for other towns to take advantage of flow control yet the amendment would deny North Hempstead this authority for no legitimate reason.

The bill will shift from waste companies to residential taxpayers much of the approximately \$10 million annual cost of furnishing waste management services. By denying flow control authority to North Hempstead, the bill will threaten the fiscal solvency of the town because the tipping fees currently generated by the town's flow control ordinance are utilized for the following: \$6 million per year for

debt service on property purchased by the town's solid waste management authority for an incinerator project which was not constructed; \$60 million over several years for remediation of landfills in Port Washington, NY, one of which is a Superfund site and the other which requires closure under Federal environmental regulations; and \$6 million in construction cost for a new solid waste transfer station.

The loss of flow control authority for North Hempstead is particularly egregious in view of the fact that the villages which would benefit utilized the town landfill for 40 years, and should thus bear some of the remediation costs which are now being paid for with flow control tipping fees.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of provisions such as this that the bill should have been considered by committee and should not have come to the floor under suspension of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, flow control authority is crucial to cities and towns across the country. So I hope that as we go to conference with the Senate, this onerous provision will be dropped, providing flow control to all the municipalities that need it.

## U.S. FOREIGN MILITARY SALES DURING FISCAL YEAR 1995

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 1996

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to my colleagues' attention information submitted pursuant to the Arms Export Control Act with respect to U.S. foreign military sales during fiscal year 1995.

The first table details worldwide government-to-government foreign military sales during fiscal year 1995 for defense articles and services and for construction sales. Total FMS sales for fiscal year 1995 were \$9.029 billion, a decline from \$12.865 billion in fiscal year 1994.

The second table details licenses/approval for the export of commercially sold defense articles and services for fiscal year 1995.

The tables follow:

*Total value of defense articles and services sold to each country/purchaser as of September 30, 1995 under foreign military sales (see part II for construction sales)*

[In thousands of dollars]<sup>1</sup> Accepted—  
fiscal year 1995

Countries	Accepted— fiscal year 1995
<b>Part I—Foreign Military Sales:</b>	
Antigua and Barbuda .....	162
Argentina .....	15,909
Australia .....	164,756
Austria .....	10,462
Bahrain .....	57,266
Bangladesh .....	7,542
Barbados .....	88
Belgium .....	24,213
Belize .....	298
Bolivia—Intl. Narc .....	13,631
Botswana .....	75
Brazil .....	58,259

Countries	fiscal year 1995
Brunei .....	20
Cambodia .....	1,688
Canada .....	197,661
Cape Verde .....	2
Chad .....	343
Chile .....	4,084
Colombia .....	20,732
Colombia—Intl. Narc .....	10,235
Costa Rica .....	2,009
Denmark .....	47,222
Djibouti .....	50
Dominica .....	73
Dominican Republic .....	610
Ecuador .....	134
Ecuador—Intl. Narc .....	129
Egypt .....	1,080,975
El Salvador .....	7,214
Eritrea .....	204
Estonia .....	168
Ethiopia .....	544
Fiji .....	15
Finland .....	218,175
France .....	767,735
Germany .....	266,461
Ghana .....	85
Greece .....	216,194
Grenada .....	95
Guyana .....	67
Haiti .....	918
Honduras .....	3,952
India .....	15
Indonesia .....	11,293
Ireland .....	45
Israel .....	661,282
Italy .....	31,012
Jamaica .....	1,169
Japan .....	715,389
Jordan .....	15,316
Kenya .....	2,754
Korea (Seoul) .....	494,320
Kuwait .....	83,694
Latvia .....	234
Lebanon .....	66,044
Lithuania .....	341
Luxembourg .....	68
Malaysia .....	25,697
Malta .....	12
Mexico .....	1,608
Morocco .....	4,482
Mozambique .....	368
Nacisa .....	397
Namibia .....	60
Namma .....	1,371
Namsa—F104 .....	350
Namsa—General+Nike .....	20,011
Namsa—Hawk .....	928
Namsa—Weapons .....	7,384
Napmo .....	2,734
NATO .....	1,670
NATO AEW+C (0+S) .....	26,750
NATO Headquarters .....	221
Netherlands .....	947,526
New Zealand .....	9,390
NHPLO .....	1,630
Niger .....	589
Norway .....	12,131
Oas Hq .....	33
Oman .....	8,108
Org. of African Unity .....	763
Pakistan .....	78
Panama .....	55
Paraguay .....	13
Portugal .....	13,519
Rep. of Philippines .....	23,025
Romania .....	12,431
Saclant .....	6,507
Saudi Arabia .....	485,613
Senegal .....	451

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.