

move the air pollution...or the pollution from the ground and the water into the air through incineration. We must be very cautious when we do this. An example...a good example of this would be the federal government moved to curb the use of CFCs. They put a...encouraged the large corporations to reduce their use of CFCs, and these corporations complied with that. But in doing so they started using two other chemicals as propellants and other...and for other uses that are just as bad, if not worse, for the ozone than the CFCs. So thus we jumped out of the frying pan and into the fire. We lowered our use of CFCs and raised our use of the other chemicals that are just as bad for the ozone layer. So we didn't actually do any good. So I think we must move cautiously on this and make sure that we aren't forcing ourselves into a corner by changing our policy and taking a position that will be just as harmful for the environment as the position we have, basically, now of doing nothing is. On page 4, line 7, is where the change really comes about, in my opinion, on this bill. I basically change the focus of the bill. Page 2, lines 18 through 20, mentions that we should support recycling and waste reduction through existing and future waste management systems. I think we must do that. But I think the future systems are the ones that we should address right now. The communities across the state need the help to set up their plans. That is where I attempt to prioritize this bill and the thrust of this bill. My attempt is to prioritize first planning, planning on the state level and planning on the local level. As I mentioned, we must proceed in a very methodical manner on this issue to avoid the many pitfalls that are out there in front of us. The state must encourage some sort of consistency across the area, but yet we must remain flexible enough so the answers to the local communities' problems can be solved locally. So we must...I feel we must emphasize the importance, first, of a state plan; second, local plans that are consistent and compatible with that state plan. And I would take the thrust of this bill and move it in that direction. Senator Johnson's initiatives in the bill would still be there, only they would be basically moved on down the line. And I think the priorities of our state plan, and they are listed in my amendments, should be, first, volume reduction at the source; second, recycling, reuse and vegetative waste composting; third, incineration and energy resource recovery; fourth, incineration for volume reduction; and, fifth, and finally, landfilling, land disposal, if you will. We really need to look at volume reduction as the first step in our solid waste problem. Just think of going to the grocery store and