In a few weeks, Kevin will be going to work for the American Crystal Sugar cooperative in Moorhead, MN. He has very big shoes to fill, because he is taking over from former Gov. George Sinner. But I have no doubt that he will fill them well, because he also leaves behind big shoes for my next agriculture legislative assistant to fill.

On behalf of the people of North Dakota, I thank Kevin for a job well done and wish him well in his new endeavor.●

DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

● Mr. DODD. Mr. President, I rise today to speak about domestic violence. This subject has quite literally been brought more clearly into focus in recent days by photographs exhibited in the Russell Senate Building rotunda. As we begin the observance of October as Domestic Violence Awareness Month, the photographs of three Connecticut women who have lived through—and perhaps still endure—the pain of domestic violence are on display in the Russell rotunda, along with the names of many individuals from every state who have died as a result of domestic violence.

Mr. President, the statistics on domestic violence are horrifying. While the victims are not only women, women are significantly more likely to be victims of domestic violence than are men. Once every 15 seconds, a woman is beaten by her husband or boyfriend, according to the FBI's crime statistics. Four women a day are killed at the hands of their attackers, according to the National Clearinghouse for the Defense of Battered Women. And last year's National Crime Victimization Survey, conducted by the Department of Justice, showed that 29 percent of all violence against women by a single offender is committed by an intimate—a husband, ex-husband, boyfriend, or ex-boyfriend.

In Connecticut in 1994, there were 18,768 incidents of family violence that resulted in at least one arrest, according to the Connecticut State Department of Public Safety. And 29 people were killed by family violence in Connecticut in 1994 according to the same source.

But in the photographs displayed in the Russell rotunda, photographer Annie Liebovitz captures more than just the grim statistics. She brings into focus both the physical pain and emotional anguish suffered by victims of domestic violence. One can see the hurt and the horror, the shame and the solitude, and the fighting and the fear.

And while this pain, hopefully, will diminish one day, it will never completely go away. The battered individuals, Mr. President, are not the only victims. Domestic violence leaves scars on all those who live with it—especially the children.

Domestic Violence Awareness Month is a time when we can step up the effort to prevent domestic violence. We must educate Americans about this terrible problem and reach out to victims to let them know that help is available and that, sadly, they are not alone.

Mr. President, I am proud to support Domestic Violence Awareness Month and other measures to combat domestic violence, including a provision in the omnibus bill recently passed by Congress and signed by the President to prevent anyone convicted of any kind of domestic violence from owning a gun. I look forward to the day when we will no longer need to designate a Domestic Violence Awareness Month, but until then, I remain committed to preventing and healing the wounds of domestic violence.●

MEDICARE 50/50 ENROLLMENT COMPOSITION RULE WAIVER

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, I am disappointed that the bill introduced by Senator ABRAHAM and myself, which provides for a Medicare 50/50 enrollment composition rule waiver for the Wellness Plan of Michigan, has not been cleared. However, I look forward to working with my colleagues on the Finance Committee to ensure that we enact such a waiver as early as possible in the 105th Congress. We cannot continue to deny Michigan Medicare beneficiaries the opportunity to enroll in this well-established quality plan.●

UNITED STATES TROOP DEPLOYMENT IN BOSNIA

● Mr. FEINGOLD. Mr. President, I rise today to comment on the plan to send an additional 5,000 troops to Bosnia over the next few days. The report, which first appeared in articles in the Wall Street Journal and Washington Post earlier this week, came as a surprise to me and I am sure to many of my colleagues. Apparently, members of the media learned about this new troop deployment before Congress itself had been notified. Now I learn that Secretary Perry will appear before the Senate Armed Services Committee—only after the chairman sent him a stinging letter of rebuke.

I have held strong reservations about United States troop deployment in Bosnia ever since it was initially announced last year. As many in this Chamber will recall, I was one of the few Members of Congress to vote against the deployment of U.S. troops to support the Dayton accord.

I said then, and I reiterate today, that I doubted the value of a heavy U.S. investment in this region. I felt then, and I still feel today, that administration promises to have U.S. troops out of the region within a year's time were unrealistic and would not be kept. And I questioned then, and still question today, whether or not the Dayton plan would truly level the playing field between Serbs and Muslims.

I recognize that the Dayton accord, and the deployment of the NATO Implementation Force [IFOR] to enforce it, has not been without some real benefit. We can all be grateful that people are no longer dying en masse in Bosnia. U.S. troops, in conjunction with troops from other countries, should be applauded for having largely succeeded in enforcing the military aspects of the agreement.

In addition, many of the peacekeeping tasks delegated to IFOR troops also have been completed, including overseeing the transfer of territory, the demobilization of troops, and the storage of heavy weapons.

Furthermore, while they were not without problems, the September 14 elections have now created a new political structure in Bosnia, although its viability is yet to be tested.

In the past, I have raised concerns regarding compliance with the war powers resolution and the constitutional implications of troop deployment without prior congressional authorization. I will not revisit that larger issue now. In this case, I understood that there was an implicit—if not explicit—understanding between the administration and the Congress that the Congress would be consulted regarding any proposed changes in the mandate of United States troops in Bosnia. Certainly, this deployment of 5,000 more troops would fall within that understanding.

At a hearing before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on September 10, several administration witnesses noted that, even though IFOR's mandate will expire in December, it was unclear what the security needs on the ground would be in Bosnia at that time. But as Thomas Longstreth, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense and Director of DOD's Bosnia task force, made clear during the hearing, further decisions would ''have to be made in concert with our allies and, obviously, in consultation with the Congress between the [September 14] elections period and the end of IFOR's mandate [on December 20].''

I understood this to mean that the Defense Department would—at the very least—let the relevant congressional committees know about any troop enhancements before releasing such information to the press.

On Tuesday, October 1, at a followup hearing in the Foreign Relations Committee less than 24 hours before the Washington Post article appeared, no mention was made of this specific troop enhancement, but only passing references to the possibility that additional troops might be needed depending on the security situation on the ground in December.

Instead, at that second hearing, Assistant Secretary of State John Kornblum told the Committee that

> ''We fully understand and appreciate the need to work closely with Congress on questions that involve the deployment of U.S. troops. Clearly, the prospects for the success of any such effort, if it occurs, depend significantly on whether we have gained Congressional and public support.

Mr. President, I do not think releasing information to the press that has

not been released—formally or informally—to the Congress qualifies as ''working with the Congress.''

There are a number of questions that I believe must be answered about the mandate of these additional troops. How many additional troops are being planned for and what will they be doing? Will these men and women be an additional part of the U.S. contribution to IFOR? Or will they be deployed as part of a post-IFOR force of some kind? Will these new troops be under the command of NATO, or of a U.S. commander, and what rules of engagement must they abide by? Is the timing of this deployment at all related to NATO announcements last week that it was studying the anticipated security situation in Bosnia over the next few months?

Then there continue to be questions on the political-diplomatic side. The Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe [OSCE], the international body tasked with implementing the elections, recommended the postponement of municipal elections because of security concerns, allowing only national elections to take place on September 14. These municipal elections are currently scheduled for November, but many observers feel they should be postponed until the spring of 1997. My question is what kind of U.S. troop commitment will the Administration be looking for if the elections are postponed? And when do they intend to notify the Congress of their plans?

I know that many of these questions will be answered at today's hearing before the Armed Service Committee. But I also would like to remind my colleagues here, and at the Department of Defense, that the Senate Foreign Relations Committee continues to have a significant interest in the details concerning any deployment of U.S. troops. I think it is fair to assume that if the Administration expects to have Congressional and public support, as it has said in public testimony, then it should make some effort to consult with all the relevant committees before its plans are announced in the morning newspaper.

A year ago—in October 1995—I asked whether or not the U.S. would be able to withdraw troops from IFOR in December 1996, as the administration said then, even if the mission clearly had not been successful.

I had my doubts then that the stated goal—ending the fighting and raising an infrastructure capable of supporting a durable peace—would be doable in 12 month's time. I foresaw a danger that conditions would remain so unsettled that it would then be argued that it would be folly—and waste—to withdraw on schedule.

My concerns and hesitations of 1 year ago can only be compounded by the fact that additional troops are being deployed to Bosnia—perhaps even as I speak—without the Congress having been notified in advance.●

THE REPEAL OF CONTROLS ON INDEPENDENT COUNSEL COSTS

● Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, the appropriations bill we passed on Monday contained pleasant surprises, such as reasonable funding for education and research programs. But there have also been some troubling provisions. One was so troubling that I could not allow it to pass without some expression of my dismay. This provision, section 118, overturns one of the reforms Congress made in 1994 to independent counsel law to hold down costs.

The provision in the bill was never approved by any committee. It was never voted on by either House. It was never included in a bill that either body approved. This provision appeared for the first time in the omnibus appropriations bill on Monday and was presented to the Senate under rules that didn't permit a single amendment to the bill.

I first heard of this provision last week, when I was told that some House Republicans had added it to their wish list for the bill. Senator BILL COHEN and I, as chairman and senior Democrat respectively of the Senate subcommittee with jurisdiction over the independent counsel law, immediately expressed our joint opposition to the provision. We thought that bipartisan opposition from the authorizing committee would be enough to prevent such a last-minute circumvention of the committee system. But we were wrong. The provision somehow got included in the bill and is now law.

It is a mistake in process and substance.

In simplest terms, the issue relates to holding down the cost of independent counsel investigations. In particular, it has to do with commuting costs—whether and how long independent counsels and their staff can use taxpayer dollars to pay for transportation and living expenses when they reside in one city and agree to prosecute one or more cases in another city.

The issue arose in the context of the Iran-Contra case. In that case, the independent counsel, Lawrence Walsh, chose to continue living in his hometown of Oklahoma City, while prosecuting cases based in Washington, DC. There was no law against it, but when the bills came in for his hotel, airfare, and other living expenses, plenty of loud complaints followed. Some pointed out that any other Federal prosecutor who agreed to prosecute a case in another State would have to move there—taxpayers would not be required to pick up their hotel and transportation expenses. Then Senator Dole was in the forefront of the critics calling for reform, criticizing Mr. Walsh for ''spend[ing] most of his time in Oklahoma.'' These commuting expenses were a prominent part of calls for legislation to tighten controls and reduce the cost of independent counsel investigations.

In 1994, the Congress responded to these criticisms by enacting legislation which tightened controls over independent counsel expenses in a whole host of ways. One of the reforms we enacted was to limit commuting expenses. We revised the law to allow independent counsels and their staffs a maximum of 18 months of commuting expenses. After 18 months, independent counsels and their staffs were expected either to move to the city where the prosecutions were based or start picking up their own commuting expenses.

Section 118 of the omnibus appropriations bill effectively repeals that limit on expenses. If effectively permits independent counsels and their staffs to charge taxpayers for unlimited commuting expenses. Lawyers can live in one city, like New York or Los Angeles, prosecute cases in another city, and charge literally years of airfare, hotel meals and other living expenses to the taxpayer. That's an expensive proposition. It's why we created the limit in 1994. It's why the omnibus appropriations bill was wrong to change it. It is wrong to change it without any hearings, a consideration much less approval by an authorizing committee.

Limits on independent counsel expenses were enacted in the last Congress with bipartisan support. No case has been made for repealing these limits. Many would say that limits on expenses are needed more than ever. This issue needs to be revisited.●

FIVE CHALLENGES FOR PEACE: UNFINISHED BUSINESS IN FOREIGN POLICY

● Mrs. KASSEBAUM. Mr. President, for the past 18 years, I have been privileged to watch the march of world history from the vantage point of the U.S. Senate. The world has changed dramatically in my time here.

We live in an era of great transition from a terrible cold war order we understood to a new order we do not yet know. We are, to borrow from Dean Acheson's trenchant phrase, ''present at the *re*-creation.''

As I prepare to leave the Senate, I want to offer some parting thoughts on unfinished business in American foreign policy and five challenges we must meet in coming years.

I. INFRASTRUCTURE FOR PEACE

The principal challenge of our time is to re-engineer the structures that can sustain the peace we have won. From the institutions and alliances of the cold war, we have inherited an unprecedented infrastructure for peace.

That infrastructure rests on three pillars. Each must be strengthened.

The first pillar is the only worldwide institution focused on international peace and security—the United Nations.

We need to rebuild the consensus, both domestically and internationally, on what we want the U.N. to be and what we want it to do in the international system of the 21st century. I believe we must build this consensus among the major donor countries and powers.