(3) Submit a written statement to the Executive Director setting forth the reasons for not accepting the recommendations and for not reaching a settlement of all unresolved issues.

(b) A reasonable extension of time may be authorized by the Executive Director for good cause shown when requested in writing by either party prior to the expiration of the time limits.

§2471.11 Final action by the board.

(a) If the parties do not arrive at a settlement as a result of or during actions taken under §2471.6(a)(2), 2471.7, 2471.8, 2471.9, and 2471.10, the Board may take whatever action is necessary and not inconsistent with 5 U.S.C. chapter 71, as applied by the CAA, to resolve the impasse, including but not limited to, methods and procedures which the Board considers appropriate, such as directing the parties to accept a factfinder's recommendations, ordering binding arbitration conducted according to whatever procedure the Board deems suitable, and rendering a binding decision.

(b) In preparation for taking such final action, the Board may hold hearings, administer oaths, and take the testimony or deposition of any person under oath, or it may appoint or designate one or more individuals pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 7119(c)(4), as applied by the CAA, to exercise such authority on its behalf.

(c) When the exercise of authority under this section requires the holding of a hearing, the procedure contained in §2471.8 shall apply.

(d) Notice of any final action of the Board shall be promptly served upon the parties, and the action shall be binding on such parties during the term of the agreement, unless they agree otherwise.

§2471.12 Inconsistent labor agreement provisions.

Any provisions of the parties' labor agreements relating to impasse resolution which are inconsistent with the provisions of either 5 U.S.C. 7119, as applied by the CAA, or the procedures of the Board shall be deemed to be superseded.

THE VERY BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, at the close of business yesterday, Monday, September 30, the Federal debt stood at $5,224,810,939,135.73.

Five years ago, September 30, 1991, the Federal debt stood at $3,665,303,000,000.

Ten years ago, September 30, 1986, the Federal debt stood at $2,125,303,000,000.

Fifteen years ago, September 30, 1981, the Federal debt stood at $997,855,000,000.

Twenty-five years ago, September 30, 1971, the Federal debt stood at $412,268,000,000. This reflects an increase of more than $4 trillion—$4,812,542,939,135.73—during the 25 years from 1971 to 1996.

ADM. LEIGHTON W. SMITH, JR., USN

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to an exceptional American hero and one of Alabama's favored sons, Adm. Leighton W. Smith, Jr. Recently concluding his 34 years of service in the U.S. Navy, Admiral Smith has served this Nation as a man of honor, integrity, and great courage. It is this leadership which has led our forces through many challenges, most recently in Bosnia.

On April 4, 1994, Admiral Smith assumed command of Allied Forces Southern Europe, Commander Joint Task Force Provide Promise, and Commander U.S. Naval Forces Europe. Twenty eight hours later, under his command, NATO conducted its first ever air-to-ground combat operations near Gorazde, Bosnia. On numerous occasions between that April and August, 1995, NATO air forces supported the U.N. forces in Bosnia with close air support and air strikes. Simultaneously, as Commander Joint Task Force Provide Promise, he continued to oversee airland and airdrop support to the U.N. refugee program in Bosnia, saving thousands of lives.

As tensions continued to rise in the fall of 1995, Admiral Smith directed Operation Deliberate Force, NATO air operations against Bosnian Serb targets. These successful operations brought the warring parties to the peace accords in Dayton that November.

In December 1995, Admiral Smith assumed a fourth command hat—Commander Peace Implementation Forces, NATO's first ever ground operation entrusted with implementing the Dayton Peace Agreement. The JFOR became nearly 60,000 strong from 34 different countries. The mission was to create a militarily secure environment in order to build peace in a country which had been devastated from three and a half years of war.

Prior to Admiral Smith's most recent outstanding service, his record speaks to the numerous challenging situations he has faced and overcome. He was directly involved in operations in support of our men and women in Desert Shield/Desert Storm. This included directing combat operations into Iraq, the evacuation of civilians from Liberia and humanitarian support for the Kurdish refugees in northern Iraq. As the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Plans, Policy and Operations, Admiral Smith was a major contributor to Navy staff reorganization and the development of the naval strategy for the 21st century.

Throughout his Naval career, Admiral Smith has received numerous awards including two Defense Distinguished Service Medals, the Navy Distinguished Service Medals and three Legion of Merits, among others.

Whether you know him as Leighton, Smitty, Snuffy or Snoofoir, the Admiral is a down-home man of grit and tenacity who has committed himself fully to the duties associated with service. While his easy-going humor may be disarming, Admiral Smith has the tenacity of a pit bull. He will tell you pig-farming stories from his youth and how he made the upper 95 percent of his class at the Naval Academy look good, while simultaneously going toe to toe with our adversaries in order to protect, defend and support our men and women in uniform. His honor and integrity have anchored those who have had the privilege of serving with him through both internal turmoil and international instability.

On his retirement, my wife and I extend our personal wishes to Admiral Smith, his wife Dottie and their three children, Leighton III, Page, and Dee Dee.

SOME DEPARTING THOUGHTS ON OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE AND FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, this is one of a series of general policy speeches I am delivering as my tenure in the Senate draws to a close. I will focus here on national defense and foreign policy issues—what my priorities have been as a Senator, where we stand in terms of our preparedness, and what the future might bring. It is not my intent here to be entirely comprehensive, for that would necessitate far more time than we realistically have. Instead, what I want to do here is simply to look back over my 18 years in the Senate and draw upon specific debates, crises, decisions, programs, and legislative efforts to reflect upon where we were when I came here, where we are now, and where we might go tomorrow, after I am again a private citizen.

First, I wish to emphasize that we as a nation should be grateful that we face no immediate threat to our borders from foreign military powers. I am particularly proud that I have played some role in rebuilding our Armed Forces and military strength during the aftermath of the Vietnam war. This commitment on the part of our Nation contributed substantially to the collapse of the old Soviet Union and its Communist philosophy. In my opinion, it was probably the major reason. This commitment proved itself again during the Persian Gulf war.

With my own experiences in World War II and observations since that time, I have felt compelled that we must at all times endeavor to obtain lasting peace, and that the primary road to achieving this goal is through military strength.

It is often stated on this floor of the U.S. Senate that for the first time in decades there is no Soviet missile targeted at the United States. In general, we are fortunate that our national security and defense policy are no longer focused on a single massive Soviet adversary. But, in other ways, our decisions are now far more complex, for they must take into account far more players, some of whom may not be clearly identifiable. Moreover, I believe the United States needs to continue the development of certain initiatives originally intended to respond to the Soviet military threat. Although we no longer need to fear a nuclear superpower, other countries now have access to Soviet weapons. Many countries also have achieved the technological capability to produce nuclear weapons and