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 advancing 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.