the House Committee on Commerce. The legislation does not modify, supplement, or otherwise affect the authority of any other Federal law or the standards applicable under any other Federal law, including the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. The language which was included in the House bill, but inadvertently deleted by the Senate amendments, was intended to make clear that the bill does not amend any statute other than the Solid Waste Disposal Act.

Thank you again for your clarification.

Sincerely,

THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.,
Chairman.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, DC, March 5, 1996.

Hon. THOMAS J. BLILEY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BLILEY: It has come to my attention that in amending H.R. 2036, the Land Disposal Program Flexibility Act of 1996, the Senate did not incorporate a House provision that was inserted during your Committee's consideration of this legislation. The provision stated that ''[n]othing in this paragraph shall be construed to modify, supplement, or otherwise affect the application or authority of any other Federal law or the standards applicable under any other Federal law.''

The exclusion of this language from the Senate passed bill should not be viewed as implying a contrary policy on this issue. The legislation passed by the Senate does not modify, supplement, or otherwise affect the application or authority of any other Federal law or the standards applicable under any other Federal law, including the Federal Water Pollution Control Act. I understand this clarification is important to both you and the Chairman of the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

H.R. 2036 and its Senate companion, S. 1497, provide a model for moving targeted, commonsense legislation that maintains protection of human health and the environment while removing duplicative or overlapping layers of regulation. It has been a pleasure to work with you and your colleagues in the House to move this legislation expeditiously.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. CHAFEE.

Mrs. LINCOLN. Madam Speaker, further reserving the right to object, and I will not object, I want to thank the gentleman for his explanation and certainly commend him for his bipartisan fashion in which this bill has been handled.

The chairman and the subcommittee chairman here, the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. OXLEY], are certainly to be congratulated for shepherding the bill through the process it has gone through. I, too, believe this bill represents a great bipartisan solution to problems identified under RCRA's existing land disposal restrictions.

As we all know, under the current regulatory regime, industries will be required to put in place over $800 million a year to install new equipment without corresponding benefits to the environmental health. This is something neither the industrial community nor the Environmental Protection Agency wants. H.R. 2036 resolves this needless investment by incorporating commonsense solutions.

Industries will avoid duplicative regulations under this bill. If their surface impoundments are in compliance with the Clean Water Act or their underground injection wells are in compliance with the Safe Drinking Water Act, industries will not need further treatment technologies to comply with RCRA.

I believe it is an excellent bill. Again I applaud Chairman OXLEY for his hard work. It is a bill that should serve as an example for future environmental legislation as we work together.

It has Republican support, Democratic support, administration support, and the industry support. We have all worked wholeheartedly together.

Again I thank Chairman BLILEY, Chairman OXLEY, and the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. DINGELL, for working with me on this very important issue.

Madam Speaker, I see no other speakers on this side, and the bill has been cleared from our side.

Madam Speaker, I rise to address provisions in H.R. 2036, the Land Disposal Program Flexibility Act.

This is important legislation that will eliminate a mandate that the Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] promulgate under the Solid Waste Disposal Act stringent and costly treatment standards for low-risk wastes that are already being treated to meet standards applicable under the Clean Water Act, simply because the Clean Water Act treatment system uses surface impoundments. In 1990, EPA issued regulations that took the approach adopted by this bill and exempted such wastes from Solid Waste Disposal Act land disposal restrictions and treatment standards. In 1992, however, the U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit overturned EPA's regulations. In compliance with the court's order, EPA has issued new regulations that would impose these unnecessary and costly requirements. These regulations will go into effect shortly so it is important for Congress to act expeditiously on this legislation.

Recognizing this urgency, I did not seek a formal referral of H.R. 2036 when it moved through the House. Instead, I worked cooperatively with Chairman BLILEY of the Commerce Committee on any potential Clean Water Act issues raised by the bill. To address my concerns, Chairman BLILEY added language to the bill that specifically states that H.R., 2036 provides no grant of authority to address the wastes managed in surface impoundments that are part of the Clean Water Act treatment systems, beyond the authorities provided under existing law.

Unfortunately, through inadvertent oversight, this language was not included in the Senate amendment to H.R. 2036. However, Senator CHAFEE, chairman of the Senate Committee on Environment and Public Works has assured me in a letter dated March 5, 1996, that the legislation passed by the Senate also does not modify, supplement, or otherwise affect the application or authority of any other Federal law, or the standards applicable under any other Federal law, including the Clean Water Act.

Because of the urgency of this issue, I will not offer an amendment to H.R. 2036 today to expressly state this intent. Instead, I ask unanimous consent that Senator CHAFEE'S March 5, 1996, letter to me be printed in the RECORD.

U.S. SENATE, COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC WORKS,
Washington, DC, March 5, 1996.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN SHUSTER: It has come to my attention that in amending H.R. 2036, the Land Disposal Program Flexibility Act of 1996, the Senate did not incorporate a House provision that was inserted during the Commerce Committee's consideration of this legislation at your request. The provision stated that ''[n]othing in this paragraph shall be construed to modify, supplement, or otherwise affect the application or authority of any other Federal law or the standards applicable under any other Federal law.''

The elusion of this language from the Senate passed bill should not be viewed as implying a contrary policy in this issue. The legislation passed by the Senate does not modify, supplement, or otherwise affect the application of authority of any other federal law or the standards applicable under any other Federal law, including the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

H.R. 2036 and its Senate companion, S. 1497, provide a model for moving targeted, commonsense legislation that maintains protection of human health and the environment while removing duplicative or overlapping layers of regulation. It has been a pleasure to work with you and your colleagues in the House to move this legislation expeditiously.

Sincerely,

JOHN H. CHAFEE.

Madam Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

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

There was no objection.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OXLEY. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to insert extraneous material on H.R. 2036, the bill just considered.

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

There was no objection.

REPORT ON NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY OF THE UNITED STATES—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on National Security:

To the Congress of the United States:

As required by section 603 of the Goldwater-Nichols Department of Defense Reorganization Act of 1986, I am transmitting a report on the National Security Strategy of the United States.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *March 7, 1996.*

The message also announced that the President did on the following days approve and sign bills of the House of the following titles:

January 4, 1966:

H.R. 2808. An act to extend authorities under the Middle East Peace Facilitation Act of 1994 until March 31, 1996, and for other purposes.

January 6, 1966:

H.R. 1655. An act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 1996 for intelligence and intelligence-related activities of the United States Government, the Community Management Account, and the Central Intelligence Agency Retirement and Disability System, and for other purposes.

January 10, 1966:

H.R. 394. An act to amend title 4 of the United States Code to limit State taxation of certain pension income.

H.R. 2627. An act to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the sesquicentennial of the founding of the Smithsonian Institution.

January 11, 1966:

H.R. 2203. An act to reauthorize the tied aid credit program of the Export-Import Bank of the United States, and to allow the Export-Import Bank to conduct a demonstration project.

January 11, 1966:

H.R. 1295. An act to amend the Trademark Act of 1946 to make certain revisions relating to the protection of famous marks.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

EXPRESSING OUTRAGE AND CONDEMNATION OF MURDEROUS TERRORIST ATTACKS IN ISRAEL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Speaker, before we get to the substance of our special order, I want to express my outrage and condemnation for the wave of murderous terrorist attacks that have struck Israel in the last 2 weeks.

I extend my condolences to all the families of the victims, including the two American young people who had studied in New York City and were killed in Jerusalem.

CONFLICT OVER THE ISLAND OF IMIA

I want to thank my good friend from Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, for joining me in these special orders to bring attention to the recent conflict over the Island of Imia.

The gentleman from Florida has always been a good friend of Greece and Cyprus, and it has been my great honor and pleasure to work closely with him on many issues of concern to Greek- and Cypriot-Americans.

In fact, just this week, the gentleman and I announced the formation of the new Congressional Caucus on Hellenic Issues.

As such, I know that Mr. BILIRAKIS shares my outrage over the recent comments of Mr. Denktash, the Turkish-Cypriot leader, who has admitted that many of the 1,619 Americans and Greek Cypriots who are missing from the Turkish invasion of 1974 were in fact murdered by Turkish forces.

The fact that he waited 22 years to admit to these atrocities is itself a crime against humanity.

As the gentleman knows, the families of several of the missing live in my district in Astoria. Mr. Denktash's admission points to the need for an accurate accounting for each and every one of the Americans and Cypriots whose plights are still unknown.

Mr. Speaker, we could talk about this tragedy all evening, but we rise tonight to discuss a different outrage—the conflict in the Aegean.

For those Members who may not know, the island of Imia is one of the Dodecanese islands that were formally returned to Greece by Italy as part of the 1947 Paris Agreement.

It has been Greek for almost 4,000 years.

Last Christmas, a Turkish cargo boat ran aground near Imia.

Even though the accident occurred in Greek territorial waters, the captain of the cargo boat refused assistance from Greek authorities, claiming he was in Turkish waters.

The incident escalated swiftly.

The Greek mayor of the nearby island Kalolimnos rightfully put a Greek flag on Imia, which was then torn down and replaced by a Turkish flag by so-called Turkish journalists.

Troops and ships from both Greece and Turkey quickly came to the area and a major confrontation developed.

Only through the swift intervention of the United States was violence avoided.

President Clinton deserves enormous credit for working hard to diffuse this dispute.

However, Turkey's challenge of established international boundaries in an attempt to expand its Aegean borders is totally unacceptable.

This confrontation over Imia would never have happened if Turkey abided by international law.

The real issue here is not the status of a small, uninhabited islet in the Aegean.

Rather it is the much more fundamental one of a challenge to Greek sovereignty.

Greek sovereignty over Imia is well established and, until this incident, unchallenged by anyone, including Turkey.

In 1932 Italy and Turkey concluded an agreement clearly stating that the Greek island of Imia belonged to Italy.

At the conclusion of World War II, Italy ceded the Dodecanese islands—including Imia—back to Greece with the Paris Peace Treaty of 1947.

By international law, the successor state automatically assumes all rights and obligations established by international treaty.

But Turkey has challenged the international status quo in order to create a destabilizing situation in the Aegean.

Violations of international law are, unfortunately, nothing new for Turkey.

The list includes: massive human rights violations against the Kurds; the illegal 1974 invasion and occupation of Cyprus; the blockade of Armenia, which prevented United States humanitarian assistance from reaching that country; and religious restrictions for the Eastern Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarchate in Istanbul.

Clearly, Turkey is the main cause of instability in the eastern Mediterranean.

Last June, the United States House of Representatives sent a clear signal to Turkey that we find these actions unacceptable by voting to cut aid to Turkey by 25 percent.

Turkey must be made to pay a real price for defying the will of the international community.

If Turkey continues to ignore this message, our sanctions should only increase.

Turkey must understand that future actions of this kind will bring about an even greater reduction in United States aid.

Maybe Turkey will then realize that there are serious consequences for its behavior.

Once again, I thank the gentleman from Florida for joining me on the House floor this evening.

The SPEAKER (Mrs. WALDHOLTZ). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. BURTON addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

THE SOVEREIGNTY OF IMIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida [Mr. BILIRAKIS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Madam Speaker, we are Americans, and this is the United States of America. Let us say one of our protectorates, if you will, Samoa, Guam, the Virgin Islands, all of a sudden a claim was made upon them by country X. What would we do? Certainly I would like to think what we would not do is to decide to sit across the table with country X and negotiate the rights to those particular territories. It is ridiculous, because everyone knows, the entire world knows, the world community knows these territories are part of the United States of America, if you will.

On December 25, as the gentlewoman from New York [Mrs. MALONEY] certainly has already shared with us, and she does such a great job at this, and it is such an honor really to be tied in with her in these special orders, on December 25, 1995, a Turkish cargo ship ran aground on Imia. The ship's captain refused assistance from the Greek Coast Guard because the captain said the islet was Turkish. Tensions began to mount and by January 29, 1996, both Greece and Turkey had dispatched naval vessels to the area. On January