

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. ARMEY], the majority leader, for the purpose of inquiring of the schedule for when we are coming back and what the majority perceives to be the business as we come back.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, this marks the last vote for the day and the beginning of the April district work period. As the adjournment resolution indicated, we will be back on April 15, and we expect to have votes after 5 p.m. on Monday, April 15. We would at that time be taking up for consideration H.J. Res. 159, proposed constitutional amendment to require a two-thirds vote to raise taxes, the taxpayer bill of rights; and H.R. 842, to provide off-budget treatment for transportation trust funds, both subject to a rule. During the course of that week we would consider these items. Of course, conference reports, if they are available. We would expect to be out by 6 p.m. on Thursday, with no votes on Friday.

I should also mention we will have some suspensions which we will make available to both the minority and majority Members on the first day back.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the majority leader and wish he and his colleagues the very best and hope that as we come back, we will come back to a productive session, particularly as it relates to getting the business of the CR completed and moving on to the budget for the coming fiscal year.

Mr. ARMEY. If the gentleman would yield again.

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. ARMEY. It has been my privilege to work with and to observe the extraordinarily hard work that has been put out by Members from both sides of the aisle, from both parties, on the appropriations process these past couple of weeks. I think we can all, the entire body can be proud of all of these Members for their willingness to work on that, and the effort made by the staff as well. I have every confidence that we will be able to come back in 2 weeks and see some renewed effort that will be fruitful.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for his comments and wish him well.

PERMISSION FOR MEMBERS TO EXTEND THEIR REMARKS IN THE RECORD FOR TODAY

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that for today all Members be permitted to extend their remarks and to include extraneous material in that section of the RECORD entitled "Extension of Remarks."

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUTKNECHT). Is there objection to the request to the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING THE SPEAKER AND MINORITY LEADER TO ACCEPT RESIGNATIONS AND MAKE APPOINTMENTS, NOTWITHSTANDING ADJOURNMENT

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that notwithstanding any adjournment of the House until Monday, April 15, 1996, the Speaker and the minority leader be authorized to accept resignations and to make appointments authorized by law or by the House.

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

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY, APRIL 17, 1996

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday, April 17, 1996.

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

There was no objection.

DESIGNATION OF THE HONORABLE BILL EMERSON TO ACT AS SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE TO SIGN ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS THROUGH APRIL 15, 1996

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 29, 1996.

I hereby designate the Honorable BILL EMERSON to act as Speaker pro tempore to sign enrolled bills and joint resolutions through Monday, April 15, 1996.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objections, the designation is agreed to.

There was no objection.

COMMUNICATION OF THE HONORABLE KENNETH E. BENTSEN, JR., MEMBER OF CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable KENNETH E. BENTSEN, Jr., Member of Congress:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 26, 1996.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House that a member of my staff has been served with a subpoena issued by the United States District Court for the District of Columbia. This subpoena relates to her employment by a former Member of the House.

After consultation with the General Counsel, I have determined that compliance with the subpoena is consistent with the privileges and procedures of the House.

With kindest personal regards,

Sincerely,
KENNETH E. BENTSEN, Jr.,
Member of Congress.

UNITED STATES ON SLIPPERY SLOPE TOWARD EXTENDED DEPLOYMENT

(Mr. SKELTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material.)

Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Speaker, this is the fourth in a series of speeches I am giving on the status of the NATO peacekeeping mission in Bosnia.

Our troops continue to do an outstanding job. They are fully deployed. They are completing tasks according to schedule, although not always under optimum circumstances.

However, I have concerns about three conditions that may cause us to stay in Bosnia past our scheduled departure at the end of 1996. I outlined these three concerns in a letter I sent to the President this morning. I will place the letter into the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

First, the March 21 edition of the New York Times reported the United States and NATO are being urged to keep our forces in Bosnia after the end of the year. International civilian and military authorities are alleged to be pressing for continued NATO presence beyond our scheduled departure.

To keep American troops in Bosnia past the end of 1996 would be a major mistake. It flies in the face of a clear statement by Secretary of State Warren Christopher, who said:

This is not a permanent commitment. This is approximately a 1-year commitment. If it can't be done in a year, perhaps it can't be done in a longer period of time.

Staying in Bosnia breaks faith with our American troops who are presently stationed in Bosnia, who expect to return to their families in 9 months. It also contradicts what the American people were told about the duration of the mission.

American forces are facing a difficult and challenging assignment in the NATO peacekeeping mission. The 1-year deployment was intended to provide an opportunity for peace, not a guarantee of it. The people of Bosnia must assume the responsibility of ensuring their own peace.

Second, American and NATO peacekeepers are being diverted from their original mission to the task of rebuilding Bosnia. This assignment shifts the focus of our military forces from peacekeeping to assisting in civil projects.

Third, and finally, by several accounts, a cornerstone of the Dayton agreement—the continuance of the Muslim-Croat federation—appears severely weakened. The U.S. and NATO could well be in a quandary if that alliance should crumble.

The push to keep United States and NATO forces in Bosnia, the expansion

of mission assignments and the possible disintegration of the Muslim-Croat federation could compel us to extend our commitment in Bosnia. We are on a slippery slope toward a lengthy deployment of 5 or even 10 additional years.

Another issue that concerns me is the continued presence of Iranians in Bosnia who are training Bosnian Government soldiers. This is a clear violation of the Dayton peace agreement. Their presence also poses a threat to the safety of our troops, as some of these groups are opposed to our peace-keeping effort.

I commend Maj. Gen. William L. Nash, commander of the American sector of NATO forces in Bosnia, who stressed his determination to withdraw on schedule. He properly stated that the burden for peace is "on the shoulders of those folks that live here."

If the people of Bosnia truly want peace, 1 year is more than enough time to get it started.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the President to stick by the commitment and have our American troops home by Christmas.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to include a copy of my letter to the President in the RECORD at this point.

The letter referred to is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 28, 1996.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The March 21 edition of the New York Times reported the U.S. and NATO are being urged to keep our forces in Bosnia after the end of the year. International civilian and military authorities are alleged to be pressing for continued NATO presence beyond our scheduled departure.

To keep American troops in Bosnia past the announced date of departure at the end of 1996 would be a major mistake. First, it flies in the face of a clear statement by Secretary of State Warren Christopher: "This is not a permanent commitment. This is approximately a one-year commitment. . . . If it can't be done in a year, perhaps it can't be done in a longer period of time." Second, it breaks faith with our American troops who are presently stationed in Bosnia, who expect to return to their families in nine months. Third, it contradicts what the American people were told about the duration of the mission.

American forces are facing a difficult and challenging assignment in the NATO peace-keeping mission. The one-year deployment was intended to provide an opportunity for peace, not a guarantee of it. The people of Bosnia must assume the responsibility of ensuring their own peace.

Already, American and NATO peacekeepers are being diverted from their original mission to the task of rebuilding Bosnia. This assignment shifts the focus of our military forces from peacekeeping to assisting in civil projects.

Further, by several accounts, a cornerstone of the Dayton agreement—the continuance of the Muslim-Croat Federation—appears severely weakened. The U.S. and NATO could well be in a quandary if that alliance should crumble.

The push to keep U.S. and NATO forces in Bosnia, the expansion of mission assignments and the possible disintegration of the Muslim-Croat Federation could compel us to

extend our commitment in Bosnia. We are on a slippery slope toward a lengthy deployment of five or even ten additional years.

I commend Major General William L. Nash, Commander of the American sector of NATO forces in Bosnia, who stressed his determination to withdraw on schedule. He properly stated that the burden for peace is "on the shoulders of those folks that live here."

Mr. President, if the people of Bosnia truly want peace, one year is more than enough time to get it started.

Very truly yours,

IKE SKELTON,
Member of Congress.

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.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

[Mrs. SCHROEDER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mrs. CUBIN] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mrs. CUBIN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gen-

tleman from Georgia [Mr. NORWOOD] is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

THE CHILDREN'S TELEVISION ACT RULEMAKING

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

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, in 1990 we passed in this body the Children's Television Act. In that act we set as a requirement that the Federal Communications Commission had to go into a rulemaking on the question of what the responsibilities of local broadcasters would be to have served the educational and informational needs of the children who live within the broadcast area of every television station in the United States. During the Bush years there was no real activity on this rulemaking that had to be undertaken, and there was a delay of almost a year before Reed Hunt was in fact confirmed as the new Chairman of the FCC in 1993.

The FCC is in a rulemaking right now on this issue, and it is I think about as important a debate as we can have in this country because, while the V-chip which we passed on the floor and is now law, as signed by President Clinton, gives to the parents of the country the ability to block out excessively violent, sexually material on their screen, and that will be a technology available to parents within the next couple of years, it still does not in any way ensure that there will be quality positive children's television that will enhance the educational and informational needs of children across the country. That is what the Children's Television Act rulemaking at the Federal Communications Commission is all about.

It is my belief that the Commission has to take a very strong stand on this issue. We know that children watch, on average, 4 to 7 hours of television every day. Now, would that it was not so, but we have moved from the 1950's in the era of "Leave It To Beaver" to the 1990's in the era of "Beavis and Butthead."

Increasingly, the broadcast stations in our country have reduced dramatically the amount of children's television of educational content that they put on the air, and instead, substituted the Flintstones or the Jetsons, and argued that in fact those are programs of educational quality because the Flintstones teach children about the archaeological age and the Jetsons will teach children about the future. But parents know that they really do not serve any educationally nutritious role in the development of young people's minds.

So this debate at the FCC is quite important. I am of the opinion that the FCC has to put on the books a requirement that a minimum of 3 hours per