

(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the provisions of either 5 U.S.C. 7119, as applied by the CAA, or the procedures of the Board shall be deemed to be superseded.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 Snoofair, 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

other weapons of mass destruction. We still face the threat of an accidental launched missile with no reliable means of defending the continental United States.

Former President Reagan deserves a great deal of credit for pursuing his Strategic Defense Initiative in 1983. SDI has faced tough opposition from its inception. I have fought with many of my colleagues to fund the program in the Senate. In 1984, we managed to save the program and, in fact, the American Security Council, then-majority leader Howard Baker, and the President credited me with swaying the critical votes to save funding for that year. I will always remember the President phoning me and saying "Bless you. Bless you." It has remained a difficult task to continue to provide research and development funds for this program. In 1989, changing relations with the former Soviet Union continued to fuel the opponents of the program and debate has continued into the post-cold-war era.

I feel that we must continue our efforts here in Congress to deploy an antiballistic missile system. And in my opinion, we should do it in evolutionary stages. The space-based laser incarnation of the antiballistic missile program must have continued research technology for the future. Today, we have the technology to develop and deploy a missile system to defend against an attack or accidental launches. We should develop and utilize that technology.

Actually, I advocated this position some time before President Reagan called for the development of the SDI program. In fact, in a meeting with him, I urged him to call for such a program. When the President established an inter-agency panel to recommend the best way to proceed with the strategic defense initiative, I lobbied for this approach, and was quite pleased to learn that the panel reached the same conclusion. In later years, I introduced amendments that would require the focus of the strategic defense initiative to the deployment of ground-based systems first. Then, as now, we need a ground-based technology rather than a space-based system, like Brilliant Pebbles. The ground-based system proved itself in a theater concept during the Persian Gulf war.

The Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty has been both a consideration and a limitation in the deployment of this technology. I called for reconsideration of the ABM Treaty with the Soviets before it came up for review in 1982 while the nuclear arms race was ongoing. It seems to me a wiser approach to develop weapons that will be used only in a defensive nature. More recently, I urged the immediate deployment of a single antiballistic missile site that would be considered treaty compliant, and I have strongly advocated negotiations to allow the deployment of multiple ABM sites. Ultimately, the Congress hammered out a compromise the

President could accept and which complied with the treaty to allow an unspecified number of sites to be deployed in the year 2003.

Since the very early days, when critics labeled the strategic defense initiative as an absurdly futuristic plan, public opinion of ABM technology has changed. A poll last year indicated that 90 percent of the American people believe that the United States should develop a missile defense system. The Congress and the President of the United States have the support of the people, the technology to accomplish this and the means to deploy these systems. I strongly urge my colleagues in this Congress and future Congresses to not let this initiative die.

Mr. President, in order to continue the preeminence of the U.S. military strength, I believe we need to continue with the development of smart weapons technology connected directly or indirectly to strategic defense. A few examples of programs I have supported over the years include the ASAT [Anti-Satellite Missiles], THAAD and other ABM technology.

Even though the United States is preeminent in military technology, we must maintain a large and well-prepared conventional military force. Throughout my Senate tenure, I have always been a proponent of the American arms buildup. President Carter called for NATO nations to increase its military spending by 3 percent, which I supported. This was the first step toward rebuilding our military. In 1980, I pushed for increased defense spending because I feared that the Soviets had surpassed us in many ways, including conventional weaponry, chemical warfare, and most importantly, trained manpower. In the following years of President Reagan's two terms, I consistently supported his efforts to increase national security.

More recently, I have urged a slowing to our military cutbacks. I supported President Clinton's decision to seek higher defense spending levels to deal with increasing need for the U.S. involvement in world affairs, including Haiti, Somalia, Rwanda and Kuwait.

The conventional forces of the United States have assumed an additional role during my time in the Senate. In order to cope with the number of small-scale threats around the world, our Nation desperately needs to maintain its quick-strike capabilities. I first advocated this type of force during the Iranian hostage crisis. At that time, it became obvious to everyone that the United States could no longer rely on its nuclear arsenal to combat the increasing number of brush fires around the world. We in Congress must make a commitment to see that the men and women in the Armed Forces have the training, the support, and technology that is deserving of the commitment these young people have made to protect our interests all around the world.

Manpower remains a significant element of our national defense posture.

After the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan in late 1979, I supported the reinstatement of draft registration. I have also advocated increased compensation for the men and women in the military. The quality of our forces is essential to our security. Although I opposed including women in the draft and in combat, I have fought to ensure the military uses all of its personnel to the best of their abilities. I joined in introducing a bill in 1979 to end sexual discrimination in promotions, particularly in the Navy and Marine Corps.

The Navy may well be the most important element of our conventional forces. When I first came to the Senate, the United States had two ocean naval fleets. The Iranian Hostage Crisis, however, led me to believe that the United States needed to maintain a presence in the Indian Ocean and the Persian Gulf. I advocated this position at the time, but of course, it is even more important now. This region will continue to be a focal point in defense and foreign policy for years to come. We must be prepared to address unforeseen developments in other regions as well.

In 1981, I was alarmed to learn that our Navy had halved its strength since 1969. President Reagan and Secretary John Lehman's leadership called for the creation of a 600-ship Navy. This buildup turned out to be an effective tool in the cold war and we cannot allow too large a reduction in our current naval force. We need to maintain the ability to convey our Forces around the world and provide the strike potential of our carrier groups. For these reasons, I was particularly proud to support naming a carrier after President Reagan.

I also believe that the United States must continue to focus on continuing to improve air forces. Air superiority on the battle field often times determines the outcome before the ground forces are ever deployed. The United States must continue to upgrade its fleet of B-52 bombers. In fact, this was an issue in my first campaign. I have been a supporter of the B-1 bomber since 1979, because even then, the 30-year old B-52's needed replacement. Stealth technology was still on the design table and this aircraft in my opinion was the most reasonable alternative. Opponents argued that the United States did not need a manned bomber; however, I think the need was proven in the Persian Gulf war. We must continue to embrace the stealth technology and improve upon it to maintain our air superiority.

In this post Communist world, weapons proliferation still poses serious threat to our national security. For this reason, I would like to commend my colleagues, Senator NUNN and Senator LUGAR, for their hard work to prevent the distribution of the weapon stockpile of the former Soviet Union. We must also not lose focus and emphasis on the United States need to keep control over its own technology. I have opposed certain nuclear sales in

the past, such as President Carter's uranium fuel deal with India. India was, in my opinion, a blatant violator of the 1978 Nuclear Nonproliferation Act and I believe India also violated the 1963 act by using United States supplied nuclear fuel to build a bomb. I tried to prevent similar sales by joining in offering an amendment to the Export Administration Act of 1984 to require nuclear regulatory commission guidelines in fuel sales.

Chemical warfare is another increasing threat to American security. In 1980, I attended a briefing in Fort McClellan, Alabama and learned that the Soviets greatly outmatched our defensive chemical capabilities. The Soviets had significantly more trained specialists and their regular troops were much better equipped and informed. Furthermore, reports indicated that the Soviets were willing to use offensive chemical weapons, and in fact, they had delivered chemical attacks in Afghanistan, Cambodia, Laos, and Yemen. I was pleased that Secretary Haig called attention to this threat in 1981.

To respond to this threat, I supported the construction of a binary chemical weapons facility at Fort Smith, AR. My recollection is that then-Vice President Bush voted to break the tie vote on this issue after I cast the tie vote. The existing U.S. chemical weapons dated back 30 years; I felt they were obsolete and relatively ineffective. The threat of chemical warfare has not lessened. In fact, the potential danger is probably even greater now, as we learned in the gulf war. Increasing terrorism, like the Tokyo subway bombing, also underscores the need for chemical weapon response readiness. In order to address this problem, the Senate passed a number of chemical weapons provisions in its antiterrorism bill last year, including an amendment I offered to criminalize the possession of toxic nerve gas, which I was shocked to learn was not illegal to possess.

With this in mind, I have fought since 1990 to keep Fort McClellan and its chemical school open. Senator SHELBY, Congressman BROWDER, and officials from Calhoun County and the Federal Affairs committee at the Calhoun County Chamber of Commerce headed by Gerald Powell deserve a tremendous amount of credit for their efforts to advocate our position before the Base Closure Realignment Commission.

Even though the Defense Department last year recommended the closure of this facility, the BRAC Commission twice recognized the need to keep this facility open and viable. General Schwartzkoff offered a ringing endorsement to the U.S. Senate of the live agent training and the continued operation of Fort McClellan. The General noted that chemical training had bolstered the morale of troops serving in the gulf armed with the knowledge of dealing effectively with these deadly weapons. The commander of British

chemical training also argued that live agent training greatly increased confidence and morale. Even though the third BRAC Commission voted to close Fort McClellan—mistakenly, in my view—I still hold the conviction that the United States must continue vital chemical warfare defensive training and it must keep the live agent training in the chemical school at the same facility.

In order to maintain America's conventional forces at the highest level during a time of continued fiscal austerity and national debt, I want to emphasize the necessity of keeping the Pentagon at its most cost effective. In 1981, I sponsored a measure to establish an inspector general for the Department of Defense. At that time, estimates indicated that the simple elimination of waste might cut defense spending by nearly one-third. In 1983, Congress created the office, but I thought it was a mistake to make the inspector general accountable to the Secretary of Defense rather than being an independent official. I argued that an independent solution would have been more effective.

I have also been an advocate of consolidated development efforts within the Pentagon, as well as revolving door and contract guidelines to increase competition. I also fought for the establishment of a central procurement office at the Pentagon. My efforts were driven to some degree by revelations made during judiciary subcommittee hearings held in 1985. At these hearings, we learned that the Pentagon had lost control of its spending, pouring hundreds, and sometimes thousands, of dollars into a single hammer or other simple item.

Another way of increasing the cost-effectiveness of our Armed Forces is maximizing efficiency through consolidation. I worked throughout my time here to enact such a plan at Fort Rucker, AL. Beginning in 1979, I advocated a plan to merge helicopter training from all four branches at the fort, and continued my efforts during President Reagan's first years in office. I urged the Defense Secretary and the OMB Director to adopt the plan, and solicited studies to examine its feasibility. Senator SHELBY and I renewed this effort under President Clinton, but again, we were unable to get the Department of Defense to carry out the implementation. However, I remain firmly convinced that such consolidation plans, if put into place across the country, are obvious, commonsense ways to address wasteful duplication of effort.

Increased profit through defense conversion will also be a helpful means of saving money. To this end, I supported President Clinton's technical reinvestment project to provide grants for small firms to convert from defense production to the development of technology with a dual-use, both civilian and military.

With regard to antiterrorism efforts, I believe the United States needs to

maintain training to cope with attacks now more than ever in its history. One facility which has served our antiterrorism goals well is the bomb school at Redstone Arsenal, AL. When I came to the Senate, this school was the only facility of its type in the country. It was run by the Army and funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Later, when the LEAA was eliminated, Congress decided to fund the school through the FBI. There was a gap in the funding for fiscal year 1981, and we succeeded in including a line-item appropriation for the school.

The importance of these programs only continues to increase. After the Oklahoma City bombing in 1995, the Judiciary Committee held hearings to consider ways to prevent and combat terrorism in the future. We listened to testimony from the FBI director and officials from the Southern Poverty Law Center, among others. In fact, the bombing hit close to home for me personally, since just a little over 5 years before, a terrorist mailed pipe bombs to four locations in the South. My close friend, Judge Bob Vance, died in one of these attacks. Of course, I strongly believe in the individual rights provided in the Constitution, but we must work to strike a balance which preserves these rights, yet also prevents individual terrorist acts.

Espionage has also taken on a different form in today's world. We are now faced with spies who embrace a new motivation—greed. They do not act out of ideology or beliefs, and have no goals but their own gain. I introduced legislation in 1985 to address this new motivation. It would have stripped any convicted spy of anything acquired through espionage, and it would have denied movie or book rights about treason.

Since then, the Aldridge Ames case has demonstrated that this problem is only growing. We cannot allow ourselves to think that espionage is a thing of the past, nor that it exists only as a remnant of the Cold War. Instead, it will continue to increase, and we have as much or more to lose in the future if we cannot combat it effectively.

We need to keep a close eye on our intelligence community. When Ames was finally caught, I learned that the FBI and CIA did not have access to his personal financial records. I introduced a bill to require financial disclosures from key intelligence officers at the CIA. I believe such a requirement would protect intelligence officers while also preserving our security.

I also want to stress the importance of increasing our self-sufficiency in terms of energy consumption. In the past, events such as the oil crisis in 1979-1980 have taught us that the United States is too heavily dependent on foreign countries for its defense materials. Those same countries which provide us with vital raw materials could become our adversaries. At that time, I

called for contingency plans and investigation of the possibilities of utilizing our domestic resources, including the Alaska oil reserves. Since then, we have faced other energy scares, such as that which contributed to the Persian Gulf war. There is no reason to believe that such crises will not recur, and I urge Congress to continue exploring alternatives to dependence on foreign energy sources.

Military alignments among nations will be a major consideration in the future. One reason I supported the defense buildup in the 1980's was to reassert the U.S. position among our allies, which needs to be sustained. The expansion of NATO into the former Eastern bloc remains a key question of alignment. In 1993, NATO began to consider the admission of new members, including Poland, Hungary, and the Czech Republic, but Russia's position was unclear. The fall of communism did not bring a conflict-free Europe, but instead brought back some of the old alignments and hostilities that had existed before the two world wars. As chairman of the Senate delegation on the North Atlantic Assembly, I introduced a plan to provide specific guidelines for getting nations ready for NATO membership pursuant to the Partnership for Peace plan. Congressman DOUG BEREUTER of Nebraska, a vice chairman of the Assembly, joined me in this effort. Our plan calls for NATO applicants to demonstrate civilian control of the military and police, free and open elections, policies against international terrorism and crime, and other commitments desirable of NATO members. The plan also required the NAA's permanent committees to consider and report on any reform these countries might need to implement before NATO admission. I believe we need to be very cautious in the future about not treating NATO as a type of European United Nations, and remember that it is first and foremost a military alliance.

In my role as chairman and cochairman of the NAA Senate delegation, I have also gained direct input from European parliamentarians on such matters as lifting the arms embargo on Bosnia. Many of these leaders feared that a unilateral lifting of the embargo would cause a spillover. I argued that given the complexities of the war in Bosnia, there was simply no good way to know what effect it might have. With great reservation, I ultimately supported an amendment in the Senate to lift the embargo only under the auspices of the U.N. and NATO.

While I firmly believe in keeping our military strong—the best in the world—I also believe that reducing nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction should remain a top priority. In so doing, we must again look at recent history as a guide. When President Carter signed the SALT II Treaty in 1979, I had serious reservations about its provisions. Could we rely on the Soviets to be honest about

compliance? More importantly, could we confirm their compliance? These questions and others weighed heavily on my mind, as they undoubtedly did on those of all involved. There were methods available to verify Soviet missile tests and other related activities, including telemetry, satellites, and radar. But, if our then-adversary violated the treaty, the problem of dealing with noncompliance remained.

At that time, I advocated tough diplomacy backed up by definitive intelligence information. I felt this was the only realistic way to proceed. Of course, that was easier to say than do. What would the Soviet reaction have been? Would we have been able to rely on our own technology and intelligence for confirmation? Would they view such a stand as provocative or threatening?

Another problem was the fall of the Shah of Iran. A number of our primary detection stations were in Iran, and the CIA estimated that it would take at least 5 years to recover what we had lost, due to the instability there. Ultimately, the treaty died when the Soviet Union invaded Afghanistan.

To make the point even more clear, look at the situation in 1991, when Presidents Bush and Gorbachev signed the START agreement. I was very hesitant about ratifying that treaty. Its signing came shortly after the attempted coup in August of that year. This kind of instability would almost certainly come into play with other unpredictable nations who are becoming nuclear powers. In 1991, the outcome was favorable, but we cannot always bank on such an outcome.

When we do have to defend our vital national interests, economic sanctions and embargoes will continue to be an effective tool. I have usually supported sanctions over force, at least initially. I first called for the use of sanctions against Iran, after the hostage crisis began. I also introduced legislation to compensate the hostages from frozen Iranian assets in the United States. Similarly, I would have preferred the use of sanctions against Haiti rather than the threat of force.

But, we must be careful with the sanctions strategy, because it is not always effective, and sometimes it hurts Americans as much as the country we are trying to influence. I felt this was the case with the grain embargoes against the Soviet Union, which hurt United States farmers more than the Government of the U.S.S.R. Generally speaking, we should ensure the effectiveness of embargoes through a cooperative international effort.

Generally, I have been proud of the Senate for rallying behind the American President whenever he has determined the necessity of using our Armed Forces. The finest example of this resolve came during the Persian Gulf deployment in the fall and winter of 1990-91. I was 1 of 11 Democratic Senators to vote in favor of authorizing the use of force before the bombing

began, although the entire Senate formally back President Bush after the hostilities began.

I have been consistent in embracing the philosophy of supporting the Commander in Chief, regardless of the party or what I might have felt personally could have been done differently or better. I supported President Carter throughout the Iranian hostage crisis. There was nothing to be gained by second-guessing his decisions—even after the failed rescue mission of April 1980. I felt this support was especially important given the Ayatollah's strategy of portraying a weak resolve on our part. Along these lines, I was particularly horrified by Ramsey Clark's kangaroo-court style probe of United States policy toward Iran, and pressed for a criminal investigation. I also supported the invasion of Grenada to protect American citizens and the removal of the corrupt Manuel Noriega to protect our vital interests in the Panama Canal region.

There have been other instances where I have been opposed to military action itself, but felt the President had the constitutional authority to initiate such action. Haiti was one example of this. I voted against a resolution requiring the President to adhere to a waiting period, although I did not want to see United States troops sent to Haiti. Another example was the deployment of ground troops in Bosnia, which I did not view as serving our vital national interests. However, I did argue that it was important to unite behind the President once his decision had been made and the troops had been deployed.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I want to urge the Congress to be extremely careful about cutting back our Armed Forces in the years to come. Despite what we think of as a relatively stable world, the future, in reality, is very uncertain and unclear. The nature of threats to our security is unfocused at this time. Tensions in Iraq have again flared, and instability may return to other areas of the world as well. Although world peace is our ultimate goal, it would be a serious mistake to allow ourselves to think we have reached that goal. The tensions that remain all around the world dictate that we continue our military preparedness in a manner that will allow America to be victors in any conflict that may arise with the fewest casualties possible.

---

#### REFLECTIONS ON PROGRESS IN CIVIL RIGHTS

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, during my 18 years as a U.S. Senator, legislation of all sorts and in all issue areas has come before this body. Of course there were some issues I came to know best, sometimes because of the nature of my constituency, as was the case with agriculture and technology issues. But there are other topics the Senate addressed during this time which stand