

The second law of peacekeeping is that were there is no peace, sending peacekeepers is a disaster. When the parties remained unreconciled—as in Beirut and Somalia, for example—peacekeepers simply become targets.

The third law of peacekeeping is that Americans make the best targets. If you are unhappy with the imposed peace, there is nothing like blowing up 241 Marines or killing 18 U.S. Army Rangers to make your point. Killing Americans is a faster way to victory than killing your traditional enemy.

From which follows one of the rare absolutes in foreign policy: Never send peacekeepers—and certainly never send American peacekeepers—to police a continuing, unsettled war. Yet President Clinton long ago committed the United States to sending 25,000 peacekeeping troops to police a Bosnian peace.

He made this offer in his usual foreign policy way: unreflective offhandedness in the service of expediency. And now, as a Bosnian agreement of sorts approaches, his bluff is about to be called. Must the country go along with his folly?

If in the coming peace talks at an Air Force base in Dayton, Ohio, Richard Holbrooke can manage to get the Serbs, the Croats and the Bosnians to agree to a real peace—one they will be satisfied with and truly respect—that would be wonderful. But why would we need Americans to police such a peace? Such a peace could be policed by Fijians or Pakistanis or Canadians wearing U.N. blue helmets or some other multinational attire.

Why are the Bosnians demanding American ground troops instead? Because none of the three vengeful, irredentist parties expects anything resembling a real peace. They are not even pretending. Croatia, for example, announced just Tuesday that if it does not get Eastern Slavonia it will go to war with Serbia at the end of November to get it.

At Dayton, the parties may grudgingly sign on to a "peace" that all know will amount to a limited, temporary cessation of hostilities—a hiatus long enough to allow the quick interposition of heavily armed NATO and American ground troops. And then what?

And the, insanely, we have made ourselves parties to the conflict. There will be no avoiding it.

Whom are we going to fight? Congress asked administration spokesmen at hearings last week. The administration answer: just rogue elements of the different militias who might violate the agreements their political leaders had signed. But if any of the three parties sent regular troops against us, we would presumably just give up and get out.

As if giving up and getting out can be accomplished without needless casualties, self-inflicted humiliation and grave tensions with allies who might be left behind. And as if the job of housebreaking overambitious "rogue" militias is the job of the U.S. Army and not of the Balkan parties' own political and military leadership.

And what kind of neutrality—the one indispensable for any peacekeepers—are we bringing to the conflict? Our sympathies for the Bosnian government side are pretty obvious, particularly to the Serbs who have been on the receiving end of NATO air strikes and U.S. Navy cruise missiles. Even more absurd, the administration intends to simultaneously "peace-keep" and arm and train the Muslims.

Let's be clear: U.S. troops will be in Bosnia not to peacekeep but to protect the Bosnian government side. Our job will be to serve as human tripwires for the Bosnians. If Serbs or Croats move against the Bosnians, they will henceforth have to roll over the bodies of

Americans first—and risk involving the United States even more heavily on the side of the Sarajevo government.

Bosnia is about to see the transformation of an impotent UNPROFOR (U.N. Protection Force) into a heavily armed USPROFOR (U.S. protection force). And the administration knows it. Secretary of Defense William Perry boasts that our force in Bosnia will be "the meanest dog in town." But real peacekeepers are not supposed to be mean dogs. Real peacekeepers, like the ones in Sinai or Cyprus, are warm puppies. Their job is to carry binoculars and smile and reassure everyone. You send heavily armed infantry when you are going to protect and enforce.

It is hard to think of a greater folly than trying to enforce a peace among unreconciled Balkan enemies. It is a folly that Clinton's fitful meanderings on Bosnia have backed us into, a folly that must be firmly rejected now before it is too late.

PARTIAL-BIRTH ABORTION BAN ACT A BAD IDEA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentlewoman from Colorado [Mrs. SCHROEDER] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mrs. SCHROEDER. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sorrow that I take the floor today to talk about this issue of partial-birth abortions. There really is no such medical term, and I think it is terribly unfortunate this House is going to be dealing with a bill on that this week.

I think one of the reasons it is coming up is because Members do not understand childbearing and birth. We all got here the same way, but it is absolutely amazing how little we understand about the birth process.

Let me say, first of all, in 1920, 800 women in this country died for every 100,000 live births. There were all sorts of risks in having children. In 1990, that came down from 800 to 8. That is something we are very proud of, the great strides we made in safe motherhood.

But this Congress, because of playing politics with this issue and trying to think of 30-second ads and all sorts of distortions we can run against people on this issue, is about to start turning back the clock on safe motherhood.

Let me talk a little bit about late abortions and what a nightmare they are. When we look at the number nationwide, there are fewer than 600 abortions a year in this country done in the final term, fewer than 600 in this huge country. So just a handful of people are affected. Maybe that is why it is so easy to politically target them. But as I have been talking to my colleagues about this bill, I find there are all sorts of things that they do not really understand. So let me talk a bit about what doctors say the reason for these abortions are.

First, we can find that sometimes a woman's health deteriorates very rapidly, and this is the only thing that can be done to save the life of the mother. There are things like severe heart disease or kidney failure or rapidly ad-

vancing cancer. Those are some instances where it is, unfortunately, the awful, awful, awful decision of the mother's life or continuing on.

The second is even more grisly to talk about, and those are the discovery of fetal anomalies that are inconsistent with life.

What am I talking about there? I am talking about a child that has no kidneys or a fetus that they find only has one chamber in the heart or that it has large amounts of brain tissue missing or the brain is on the outside or it does not have a head. All of these conditions are inconsistent with life. Again, we cannot usually determine these until late in the pregnancy because sonograms are not that accurate until the fetus is larger.

So when we have either of those alternatives, medical officials and families are faced with some of the most gut-wrenching decisions any American could ever be faced with.

When I have talked to people about this bill, they come up with all sorts of questions about why can they not.

Well, you cannot do a caesarean because you have to cut through the muscle wall. The muscle does not thin out until 36 weeks, so you really are seriously damaging the woman's ability to have future children. You cannot do a dilation because the cervix just is programmed not to dilate until about 36 weeks, and so it is a very long, long, long and painful process that may go on to 4 or 5 days. And if the child dies in utero, it starts to disintegrate and can become a great life threat to the mother because she will lose her ability to clot and bleeding and other things.

These are the serious things this House will be tampering with if we start telling doctors what they can and cannot do. I hope Members really look at this and say this is not our role as Members of Congress.

RESTORING EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT TO ORIGINAL INTENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from California [Mr. KIM] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, today I want to talk about the so-called EITC, [earned income tax credit]. I hope that my folks from California are listening to me this morning.

I did not know anything about EITC until I joined Congress. I was busy running my own business, trying to support my family. I did not know what the EITC is. I know welfare. I know food stamps. I know a little bit about Medicare and Medicaid, but EITC, what does it do? That is what I would like to talk about this morning.

Before I do, last week, this House passed the 1996 budget reconciliation bill. The bill was historic. It contains the spending cuts necessary to balance the budget by the year 2002, 7 years.

During this process, we have been hearing all kinds of misrepresentation, all kinds of distortion, sometimes flatout lies. Let me give some examples.

They say we are cutting Medicare, when we are actually allowing Medicare spending to grow by \$80 billion a year.

They say we are cutting Medicaid, when we are actually allowing Medicaid spending to grow by \$30 billion a year.

They say we are cutting school lunches, when our plan increases spending on school lunches by over \$1 billion over the next 5 years.

What we are trying to do is slow down the growth of out-of-control spending. We have been spending and spending, and it has become out of control.

But the biggest distortion, the biggest misrepresentation, is on the EITC. Let me talk about it this morning for a couple of minutes.

What is the EITC? It was passed back in 1975. It is called earned income tax credit.

What does it do? Well, the Government tries to help those people who work but do not earn enough money to support their families, children. Therefore, the Government helps them.

If you make less than \$26,000 a year, with kids, then the Government will match up to 36 percent of a person's income with a tax credit. In other words, as I said earlier, if you work full time but you cannot support your family, then Government supports you.

How many people know about this EITC? I bet not that many.

What is wrong with this program? Nothing. I think it is an excellent idea. I would rather see that we help the people who work every day than just give free handouts to folks who are not working. The free Government handouts, why would anyone try to work?

It is an excellent program. We support it. Republicans support it. Democrats support it. I think it is a pretty good idea.

What is wrong with it? The program has gone out of control. It is way out of control. Why? Because we keep adding more and more provisions, adding some other language, trying to add more people in it, gradually expanding it and expanding it. This EITC program, as a result, becomes out of control.

□ 1245

The original intent was to help those folks who have a family, children. But what happened? Now, anybody, even though you do not have a family, can get EITC credit. Look at this chart in here. It used to be sort of flat, about this time. About that time, we changed the laws so that anybody can claim, even if you are single, even if you do not have any family.

It went up. It has gone up a thousand percent. The cost has gone up a thousand percent. The cost has gone up a thousand percent in the last 10 years, totally out of control. That is what is

wrong with it. It is not the program itself. It just has gone out of control.

Why? Because waste and fraud in EITC had grown faster than the program itself. This is really a shame. IRS says that 1 million EITC recipients are illegally receiving this. One million people should not receive a penny of it. GAO says 40 percent of EITC recipients are illegally receiving more money than they deserve, more money, more than they are entitled to. That is what is wrong with this. That is why it has gone up a thousand percent.

The waste and fraud in the program has gotten so bad that IRS lately had to stop issuing electronic tax refunds because of EITC fraud schemes.

Mr. Speaker, I will continue tomorrow.

FEDERAL-TERRITORIAL RELATIONS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. EVERETT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Guam [Mr. UNDERWOOD] is recognized during morning business for 5 minutes.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, as a Delegate to Congress representing the people of Guam, a great deal of my work here in Washington revolves around the Federal-territorial relationship and how that relationship impacts on our island.

On October 17, a joint hearing was held by the Subcommittee on Native American and Insular Affairs and the Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere to discuss the political status plebiscite held in Puerto Rico last year. While Guam was not the focus of the hearing, any talk of political status change is of great interest to our island due to our own efforts to improve our own relationship through the establishment of a Commonwealth of Guam. Any talk in Congress of improving the relationship between the territories and the Federal Government has to be viewed as constructive. It is far more damaging to have the Congress be oblivious to the desires of the territories. While the discussion on Puerto Rico is dominated by the statehood question, no such statehood option is realistically being offered to the smaller territories such as Guam, the U.S. Virgin Islands, and American Samoa.

This means any discussion of reinventing government, political devolution to the states is not being considered seriously for the small territories, and the small territories must take their own steps to get involved in the debate.

The issue for Guam, then, is that if statehood is not a viable option for the foreseeable future, what can we do within the framework of the Constitution to improve on this political relationship? We have proposed a commonwealth document, which I introduced earlier this year as H.R. 1056, the Guam Commonwealth Act, that describes our

vision of a new commonwealth based on the consent of the governed.

The Guam Commonwealth Act is a roadmap for the Federal Government to navigate the many issues that are important to Guam. It addresses everything from self-determination for the indigenous people of Guam to telecommunications, air rights, and shipping. It is as much an economic blueprint for the future as it is a political blueprint.

The United States has a tremendous national interest in Guam, and likewise, Guam has an equally important interest in this political relationship.

It has not always been a balanced relationship. What has motivated the Federal interest more than anything else has been Guam's military value to the United States. This continues to be the bottom line for many Federal decisions. But lately, this Federal interest has taken some bizarre twists and turns since the end of the cold war.

The 1995 Defense Base Closure and Realignment Commission recommended that severe cutbacks on Guam that include closing our ship repair facility and our fleet and industrial supply center. We stand to lose more jobs per capita than any other American community hit by BRAC 95. And yet, the Department of Defense is now in the awkward position of renegotiating the Status of Forces Agreement with Japan, an agreement that includes the bases on Okinawa where the American presence is under fire by the local community.

These events send mixed signals to the people of Guam. They say on one hand that the military chooses to leave Guam to save a few bucks, and chooses to give the benefits of forward deployment in our region to other foreign communities where their presence is not welcomed. We, on Guam, meanwhile, will have to find a way to restructure our economy and take care of those Federal employees at the SRF and supply center on Guam while the military finds a way to keep the SRF at Yokosuka operating and the bases at Okinawa open. The message seems to be that Guam is American, therefore, no special effort needs to be expended by the military for the privilege of using our island.

This week, the Lieutenant Governor of Guam, the Honorable Madeleine Bordallo, is in Washington to meet with Defense and Navy officials to discuss the transition issues for the facilities to be closed on Guam. It is unfortunate that we must continue to go to great lengths to persuade the Navy what should be obvious to everyone—that Guam is their best insurance policy for an American military presence in Asia, and that the people of Guam are watching with great interest their handling of all the BRAC-related closure issues on our island.

The Federal-territorial relationship is strained—now is a very good time for the military, which has a vested interest in this relationship, to cooperate