level of expectations and attention given to the drug trade by our southern neighbors. This is what the certification process allows, and this is what our Nation must do.

THE FUTURE OF THE NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. FORD. Mr. President, shortly after Christmas, the New York Times printed a very one-sided portrayal of the National Guard. In that article, a senior Defense Department official is quoted as saying, ''There's a lot of the Army National Guard that's just irrelevant to our strategy. It's kind of like a welfare program for weekend warriors. * * *''

Aside from being grossly inappropriate, the statement is simply not true. Change is inevitable—not just for the Guard but for this Nation's military structure as a whole. And, while the Guard is prepared to face those new challenges, as we go forward, I'll continue to be guided by my unequivocal support for the Guard and by the knowledge that the Guard is in no way the problem, but rather the key to the solution.

I can also assure my colleagues that some nameless, faceless bureaucrat who equates the Guard—with its stellar performances in the Persian Gulf, Somalia, Haiti, the Sinai, and Bosnia—to a handout, will not be determining the Guard's fate. Instead, the Guard, sitting down as equals with the Army, will determine that future.

That's the message I delivered a few weeks ago to the Adjutants General Conference, that's the message I delivered when the Governors met here for their annual meeting, and that's the message I bring to you today. Because when representatives of the National Guard sit down at the negotiating table with the Army, I intend for both the Governors and Congress to be solidly behind them.

Our common goal has been to maximize the Guard's role both during times of war and peace, and to assure the Guard is ready and accessible. That goal has not changed. But, we must assure that this goal can adapt to the changing global, economic, technological, and political environment. I think that the Guard's accomplishments put us in an excellent position as we head into this debate, and ask the question, ''What are the military needs of this country, and how can we best meet them?''

We've already proven we can conform to the changing global demands being placed on our military. In his State of the Union Address, President Clinton said, ''We can't be everywhere. We can't do everything. But where our interests and our values are at stake—and where we can make a difference—America must lead. We must not be isolationists or the world's policeman. But we can be its best peacemaker.''

The Guard has proven itself 100 percent as a necessary and vital part of America's peacekeeping force. Any discussions about the Guard's future must recognize the interdependability of the regular Army and the Guard, rather than continuing to see them as having separate missions.

The Air Force and Air Guard are a perfect example of how we can make this integration work. Serving anywhere around the globe, there is no distinction between these two Air Forces. They fly as one, they work as one, and they succeed as one.

Another issue often mentioned is the changing technology and its impact on our military makeup. Again, the Guard is keeping pace with the changing demands. I'll use this opportunity to brag on Kentucky a bit. Our western Kentucky training facility, in conjunction with the high-technology training available at Fort Knox, puts Kentucky and the National Guard at the forefront of this country's military training.

Last year, 16,000 soldiers trained there. But, those numbers represent just the beginning in a long line of soldiers who will receive the best, state-of-the-art training this country has to offer.

The Kentucky Guard is certainly not alone in its ability to adapt to new high-technology opportunities and demands. And, who better than our citizen-soldiers with their added professional skills, to meet the high-technology challenges of the future? We've seen how these additional skills constantly come into play—a chief of police providing the know-how to set up policing operations in Haiti is just one example—and we'll see it when the Guard uses its outside expertise for the high-technology military of the future.

In the end, Mr. President, our greatest pleasure comes from budget realities and growing fiscal restraints. Last year, we essentially had to go in and write the Guard's resource and training needs into the budget. But, our hard work paid off and our priority items—Air National Guard force structure, military technician manning and the Army Guard operating funding—survived.

This year, things will get even more difficult. And as General Baca conceded a few weeks ago, we'll not only have to confront the issue of force structure, we'll have to accept change. But, the Guard can be the architects of that change.

In drawing up the plans for that change, I think we should be guided by the Adjutants General Association president, General Lawson's words. As he said last September, ''We may need less military, but we don't need the military less.''

Assistant Secretary of Defense Deborah Lee is right on target when she points out that our units cost 25 to 75 percent of active-duty counterparts. ''Making greater use of the reservists makes good sense in an area of shrinking budgets. This means that instead of reducing the Reserve components in the same direct proportion as the active components, more use should be made of reservists to control peacetime costs and to minimize the risks associated with active drawdown.''

And that last point is very important. As the executive officer of a Cobra helicopter squadron put it, ''If you dissolve units like this, it would take years to rebuild that ability if you ever needed it again.''

Major General Philbin put it another way: ''Since few conflicts evolve as anticipated, where would those reserve component forces be found if the Guard combat divisions are deactivated? The Army Reserve? Not structured for combat. Another draft? No time, since the Pentagon pundits are forecasting, however unrealistically, conflicts that arise like lightning bolts and are successfully concluded in a flash.''

When we go to the table to hammer out a new covenant with the Army, we must bring to the table our willingness to see changes to force structure. But we shouldn't leave behind our commitment to a relevant, viable and ready Guard that maintains a balanced force of combat, combat support, and combat service support, along with an equal level of command support to maintain balance across the Nation. These items will not be negotiable.

We're at a crucial juncture that will have long-felt repercussions for the National Guard and the Nation as a whole. But I hope we've reached that juncture, with Congress behind the Guard, with the Governors behind the Guard, and most important, with the American people behind the Guard.

That's because the citizen-soldiers of the National Guard find their roots in the history of this country, but equally important, in the communities of this country.

If you look behind the words in the Guard's theme—''Capable, Accessible, Affordable''—what you'll find are average folks who've struggled through some of the worst disasters imaginable.

They understand that taken together, these three words define with simplicity and clarity, the important dual Federal-State function of our National Guard, the decisive role they've played in our Nation's history, and will play in our Nation's future.

And taken together, they decree what the Guard has been, what they can be, and what they will be.

Mr. President, I look forward to working with my colleagues to assure that the Guard continues to play a major role in this Nation's military structure and mission.

CHARACTER COUNTS RESOLUTION, SENATE RESOLUTION 226

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, yesterday, I joined with my distinguished colleague Senator DOMENICI, in submitting Senate Resolution 226. This resolution which, I strongly support, would designate the week of October 13–19, 1996, as the third annual National Character Counts Week.