TITLE III—INSPECTION, APPREHENSION, DETENTION, ADJUDICATION, AND REMOVAL OF INADMISSIBLE AND DEPORTABLE ALIENS

Subtitle A—Revision of Procedures for Removal of Aliens
Subtitle B—Criminal Alien Provisions
Subtitle C—Revision of Grounds for Exclusion and Deportation
Subtitle D—Changes in Removal of Alien Terrorist Provisions
Subtitle E—Transportation of Aliens
Subtitle F—Additional Provisions

TITLE IV—ENFORCEMENT OF RESTRICTIONS AGAINST EMPLOYMENT

Subtitle A—Pilot Programs for Employment Eligibility Confirmation
Subtitle B—Other Provisions Relating to Employer Sanctions
Subtitle C—Unfair Immigration-Related Employment Practices

TITLE V—RESTRICTIONS ON BENEFITS FOR ALIENS

Subtitle A—Eligibility of Aliens for Public Assistance and Benefits
Subtitle B—Public Charge Exclusion
Subtitle C—Affidavits of Support
Subtitle D—Miscellaneous Provisions
Subtitle E—Housing Assistance
Subtitle F—General Provisions

TITLE VI—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Subtitle A—Refugees, Parole, and Asylum
Subtitle B—Miscellaneous Amendments to the Immigration and Nationality Act
Subtitle C—Provisions Relating to Visa Processing and Consular Efficiency
Subtitle D—Other Provisions
Subtitle E—Technical Corrections

DIVISION D—SMALL BUSINESS PROGRAMS IMPROVEMENT ACT

TITLE I—AMENDMENTS TO SMALL BUSINESS ACT
TITLE II—AMENDMENTS TO SMALL BUSINESS INVESTMENT ACT

DIVISION E—[CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT AND WATER SECURITY]

TITLE I—CALIFORNIA BAY-DELTA ENVIRONMENTAL ENHANCEMENT AND WATER SECURITY ACT

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, October 3, 1996.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 5 of rule III of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, I have the honor to transmit a sealed envelope received from the White House on October 2, 1996 at 6:00 p.m. and said to contain a message from the President whereby he returns without his approval, H.R. 2909, the ''Silvio O. Conte National Fish and Wildlife Refuge Eminent Domain Prevention Act.''

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.

SILVIO O. CONTE NATIONAL FISH AND WILDLIFE REFUGE EMINENT DOMAIN PREVENTION ACT—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 104–271)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 2909, the ''Silvio O. Conte National Fish and Wildlife Refuge Eminent Domain Prevention Act.''

This bill would prohibit the use of eminent domain authority for the protection of the public's fish and wildlife resources at portions of the Silvio O. Conte National Fish and Wildlife Refuge in the States of New Hampshire and Vermont. Because it is unnecessary and would undermine important governmental interests, I cannot support it.

First, the Conte Refuge poses no threat to property owners. Located along the Connecticut River in the States of Connecticut, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Vermont, it represents an entirely new kind of national wildlife refuge. Rather than relying on the traditional approach of acquiring large tracts of land, the comprehensive plan for the Conte Refuge provides that only small amounts will come into Federal ownership—a total of only 1,200 acres in New Hampshire and Vermont, along with conservation easements for an additional 760 acres. Instead of Federal land acquisition, the main emphasis for the Refuge will be on restoring the Connecticut River watershed through voluntary partnerships, cooperative agreements, and environmental education. The Fish and Wildlife Service has no intention of using its eminent domain authority.

Second, this bill would undermine a constitutionally bestowed authority of the Federal Government by prohibiting the use of eminent domain for fish and wildlife conservation. The truth is that the Fish and Wildlife Service almost never uses eminent domain for wildlife conservation purposes—on a nationwide basis, since 1989, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has only used its eminent domain power with the consent of the owner to settle price or title differences. Still, eminent domain remains an important tool of last resort, to protect the public's interest in fish and wildlife resources should unforeseen circumstances arise.

Private property is a fundamental American right and value. But this bill is unnecessary and would erode a constitutional authority that has served the public interest for over 200 years. As stated during debate on this bill in the House of Representatives, H.R. 2909 is a solution in search of a problem.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 2, 1996.*

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large upon the Journal, and the veto message and bill will be printed as a House document.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the veto message of the President, together with the accompanying bill, H.R. 2909, be referred to the Committee on Resources.

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

There was no objection.

CALENDAR YEAR REPORTS PREPARED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION—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 Transportation and Infrastructure and the Committee on Commerce:

To the Congress of the United States:

I transmit herewith the 1995 calendar year reports as prepared by the Department of Transportation on activities under the Highway Safety Act, the National Traffic and Motor Vehicle Safety Act of 1966, and the Motor Vehicle Information and Cost Savings Act of 1972, as amended.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *October 3, 1996.*

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.

CONCERN EXPRESSED OVER USE OF MILITARY PERSONNEL FOR POLITICAL PURPOSES

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

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I took this House floor and talked about my concern about military personnel staffing in the Speaker's office and how I felt it ran afoul of House rules. House rules are very clear about who can be allowed to be a fellow, who can be a detailee, or who can be a volunteer. Obviously my real fight is with the Defense Department. Today I will be firing off another letter to Secretary Perry who has been playing games with me for about 6 months claiming, ''Well, she's leaving town, so if we just wait long enough, this will go away.''

What I want to say to Secretary Perry is every way I read your very own staffing document, all gazillion pages of it, this is also in violation of here. They claim the people in the Speaker's office were assigned to the

Joint Chiefs of Staff legally under here. Fine, you can assign officers to the Joint Chiefs of Staff. But there is not anywhere in here that says then the Joint Chiefs can take them and do whatever they want, have them work in bakeries, filling stations, day care centers, or the Speaker's office. Absolutely not. And when you are talking about very high-priced military staff, that is indeed a concern.

So yesterday we talked about the House rules. Today I must say I do not accept DOD's explanation at all that this is valid. But let me go one step further and say what I think everyone in America should be concerned about other than the money is the fact that do we want military officers engaged in partisan political activities.

Let me read you something from George Will. George Will's column today was praising the 104th Congress, which I do not think I would do, I would disagree with some of those facts, but he goes on to say in his column that this record has been obscured by the fog of war rhetoric from its leader, the Speaker, and for whom politics of war has been carried on through his office.

He goes on to talk about the different tapes that have been obtained with the Speaker's conversations with Army officers in which they are filled with military jargon about ''politics is war'' and ''our budget fight is like the Duke of Wellington's peninsula campaign,'' and I could go on and on and on. But I think people are scared when they think we are up here playing war games with their lives, or war games with Medicare, Social Security, the budget or whatever we are doing. This should be a civil place and not a place where we are trying to incite civil war between two parties. I think it is very wrong to use military officers to come over and engage in that.

Today in Roll Call—and I will put in the RECORD the Roll Call editorial which is a newspaper editorial that I think is very valid—it talks about this issue and lays out many more facts about it. It goes on and says, it is a very serious matter for GINGRICH to systematically use Army personnel and facilities to train House Republican membership and leaders and top leadership staff in skills that they are to use to defeat the Democrats in partisan warfare.

I ask you, is that what we want our military officers doing? Do we have so many military officers we are now going to deploy them into the Republican and Democratic parties—although the Democrats did not get any—and fight it out here?

I say as I leave this institution that I care so much about, I think this is a huge cloud, and I hope we get it cleared up. I think the bottom line still lays with the Defense Department who clearly wanted to get on the new leadership's good side, and I suppose if they had asked them to clear out the Pentagon and let them use it for staffing or send cars over here or anything else, it looks like they would because they sent helicopters, officers, or anything they asked for. That is wrong. We have always kept our military separate and nonpartisan. These staffing rules are very clear that the military on active duty that are getting paid by the taxpayers are not supposed to be engaged in partisan activities.

As I say this, I chuckle because a couple of years ago I worked very hard in transferring my military base from military to civilian status, and in May before the election, I was not allowed on the military base because it was considered too partisan, the May before the November election, by DOD. So you could not go to help transfer something that you had spent probably 18 months working on because that was partisan and yet they can send military officers over here, helicopters, facilities, train people, and be in all this dialog? No. Something is terribly amiss here. I really am sorry to have to keep taking the floor and pounding away, but I think it is very important to let Secretary Perry know I am not going to let this go, I hope the press does not let this go, and I hope the American people do not let this go.

WAR AND POLITICS

From Sun-tzu to Clausewitz to Mao Zedong, there's been an intimate connection between war and politics. House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R–Ga) has every right to be fascinated by the connection, to the point of famously declaring that ''politics is war without bloodshed.'' As a legislative leader, he also has every right and responsibility to familiarize himself with the strategies the Army is developing to protect the country's national security. If some of what he learns about war is intellectually applicable to his political pursuits, he's clearly free to adopt it.

It's another matter entirely, however, for Gingrich top systematically use Army personnel and facilities to train House Republican Members and top leadership staff in skills they can use to defeat Democrats in partisan warfare. Yet this, according to a two-part series to articles by Roll Call's Damon Chappie, is what Gingrich did from 1993 through 1995, using the US Army Training and Doctrine Command at Fort Monroe, Va. TRADOC's contribution to the art of war: a new fighting doctrine emphasizing operations that are ''rapid, unpredictable, violent, and disorienting to the enemy.''

According to documents obtained by Roll Call under the Freedom of Information Act, Gingrich arranged for at least seven separate TRADOC sessions for 15 Republican leadership aides and six Members serving on a task force headed by Rep. Pete Hoekstra (R-Mich). Costs were paid for by the Army, although the purpose of the sessions seems to have been to help Republicans maintain their House majority—i.e. defeat the Democrats in ''bloodless'' war.

The documents indicate that Army officials became concerned—legitimately so—about being used for such a purpose, especially after Hoekstra mentioned to one Army colonel that the program was to be expanded to Senate Republicans. The colonel suggested that Gingrich should hire a retired Army officer to conduct the seminars or ''as a minimum, suggest to the Speaker that we have to, in some way, make this more bipartisan.

Exactly so. Gingrich could have used Republicans party finds had he chosen, but instead he used taxpayer resources—inappropriately, we believe. But there is an even more troubling aspect here. As of January 1995, Gingrich ceased being merely a Republican leader and became a constitutional officer. For a House Speaker to use the Army to make ''war'' on his political opposition is a misuse of the military and his own office.

FAREWELL TO REPRESENTATIVE SCHROEDER AND STICKING UP FOR THE MILITARY

(Mr. SOLOMON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman that just spoke is leaving this body and we are going to miss her. She has been a very valuable Member even though we have disagreed quite often. I happen to agree on this particular issue. I am just afraid that the way it was presented, that I know that she did not mean this intentionally but that it would criticize our military. The people that serve in our military, they usually start out when they are 18, 19 years old or after they have gone through college and ROTC, they become officers in any branch of the military, and they are some of the most respected people in all of America.

□ 1415

I think we always have to look at that, especially if they serve in the Pentagon, if they are the Joint Chiefs of Staff. They did not get there by having their integrity questioned.

I would just like to stick up for them and say they are, to my knowledge, some of the finest people I have ever known, not only this Joint Chiefs of Staff, but all of those that have preceded them. I just wanted to say that for the record, and wish the gentlewoman good-bye.

MILITARY BEING PUT IN DIFFICULT POSITION

(Mrs. SCHROEDER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New York for his nice comments. If I was doing anything to demean military personnel, please, let me apologize over and over again. You know and I know that DOD directive 1344.10 is absolutely opposed to partisan activities on active duty, and yet if they are sent there by the Joint chiefs and get used that way, what do they do?

It is because of whistleblowers in the military that we are very concerned about this and raised red flags. Yet, apparently, the Secretary of Defense said put them down, we are going to do this, and told them to do it anyway.

So I salute them for coming forward, and I thank the gentleman. The Sergeant Bilco thing of bilking the taxpayer, we do not want. I do think they