

issues can be satisfactorily resolved in a fair bipartisan conference. But they cannot be resolved if Republicans continue to quarrel among themselves and let the Dole campaign dictate steps that have nothing to do with reasonable immigration legislation. Bob Dole may not want action by Congress on illegal immigration but the country does, and the vast majority of Americans and Congress do.

I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the excellent editorial in the New York Times today.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A DANGEROUS IMMIGRATION BILL

As the White House and members of Congress make final decisions this week about a severely flawed immigration bill, they seem more concerned with protecting their political interests than the national interest. The bill should be killed.

Debate over the bill has concentrated on whether it should contain a punitive amendment that would close school doors to illegal-immigrant children. But even without that provision, it is filled with measures that would harm American workers and legal immigrants, and deny basic legal protections to all kinds of immigrants. At the same time, the bill contains no serious steps to prevent illegal immigrants from taking American jobs.

Its most dangerous provisions would block Federal courts from reviewing many Immigration and Naturalization Service actions. This would remove the only meaningful check on the I.N.S., an agency with a history of abuse. Under the bill, every court short of the Supreme Court would be effectively stripped of the power to issue injunctions against the I.N.S. when its decisions may violate the law or the Constitution.

Injunctions have proven the only way to correct system-wide illegalities. A court injunction, for instance, forced the I.N.S. to drop its discriminatory policy of denying Haitian refugees the chance to seek political asylum.

On an individual level, legal immigrants convicted of minor crimes would be deported with no judicial review. If they apply for naturalization, they would be deported for such crimes committed in the past. The I.N.S. would gain the power to pick up people it believes are illegal aliens anywhere, and deport them without a court review if they have been here for less than two years.

The bill would also diminish America's tradition of providing asylum to the persecuted. Illegal immigrants entering the country, who may not speak English or be familiar with American law, would be summarily deported if they do not immediately request asylum or express fear of persecution. Those who do would have to prove that their fear was credible—a tougher standard than is internationally accepted—to an I.N.S. official on the spot, with no right to an interpreter or attorney.

Scam artists with concocted stories would be more likely to pass the test than the genuinely persecuted, who are often afraid of authority and so traumatized they cannot recount their experiences. Applicants would have a week to appeal to a Justice Department administrative judge but no access to real courts before deportation.

The bill would also go further than the recently adopted welfare law in attacking legal immigrants. Under the immigration bill they could be deported for using almost any form of public assistance for a year, in-

cluding English classes. It would make family reunification more difficult by requiring high incomes for sponsors of new immigrants. The bill would also require workers who claim job discrimination to prove that an employer intended to discriminate, which is nearly impossible.

A bill that grants so many unrestricted powers to the Government should alarm Republicans as well as Democrats. This is not an immigration bill but an immigrant-bashing bill. It deserves a quick demise.

Mr. KENNEDY. I will read the lead paragraph and the final paragraph.

As the White House and Members of Congress make final decisions this week about a severely flawed immigration bill, they seem more concerned with protecting their political interests than the national interest. The bill should be killed.

A bill that grants so much unrestricted powers to the Government should alarm Republicans as well as Democrats. This is not an immigration bill but an immigrant-bashing bill. It deserves a quick demise.

I yield the remainder of my time. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. FRAHM). The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Senator is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. CONRAD. I thank the Chair.

THE DOLE ECONOMIC PLAN—IT DOESN'T ADD UP

Mr. CONRAD. Madam President, we are now about 7 weeks away from critically important decisions about our country's future. We are 7 weeks away from the Presidential election—7 weeks away from decisions on who will represent the United States in the Halls of Congress.

This election is becoming a debate on the economic policy that will guide this country's future. There can be no more important debate. For a long time the conduct of economic policy in this country has been central to the question of who will guide our country in terms of political leadership.

Madam President, once before we had a Presidential candidate who told the American people that we could cut taxes dramatically, we could increase defense spending while holding large parts of the Federal budget harmless, and that somehow it would all add up. We took that gamble once before. It didn't work. It didn't add up.

We can just go back to 1981, and administration of Ronald Reagan, when he told the American people we could have massive tax cuts, we could increase defense spending, large parts of the Federal budget would not be touched, and it would all add up. We can see what happened.

President Reagan inherited a deficit of about \$80 billion, but it quickly exploded to \$200 billion a year. Then we had years of some small improvement,

and years when the deficit jumped back up. But the deficit was averaging over \$200 billion. At the end of his term the deficit declined slightly.

Then President Bush came into office. He inherited a deficit of \$153 billion, and it promptly skyrocketed to \$290 billion in 1992. President Clinton came into office at that point, and every year since the unified budget deficit has declined. Four years in a row the unified deficit has gone down. It has now been reduced by 60 percent since 1992.

So that is the record of the last three administrations with respect to deficit reduction.

Madam President, this chart shows that, even though we have made significant progress on reducing the budget deficit, if we do not keep pressure on Federal spending and if we do not keep our eye on the need for deficit reduction, very quickly we are going to see the deficit rise again. In fact, if no changes are made, the deficit from 1997 to 2006 is going to start rising dramatically. This country faces a demographic time bomb. It is called the baby-boom generation. When those baby boomers start to retire in very short order they are going to double the number of people who are eligible for our basic Federal programs—Social Security, Medicare. And that is going to put enormous pressure on the Federal budget.

That is why it is critically important that we continue to keep our eye on deficit reduction. That means we have to do more, even though without question much has been accomplished under the leadership of President Clinton. The deficit has come down dramatically. But even with all the progress that has been made, much more needs to be done or this problem once more will get away from us.

This next chart shows in a very clear way the challenge that we face over the next 6 years. This chart shows what the spending will be under current law over the next 6 years—\$11.3 trillion. That is what will happen if no changes are made. And on the revenue side, if no changes are made, over the next 6 years we will get \$9.9 trillion in Federal revenue.

So we can see very clearly that we are going to be adding more than \$1.4 trillion to the national debt over the next 6 years if we do nothing.

What does Senator Dole propose? Senator Dole suggests, looking at these numbers—\$11.3 trillion of spending, \$9.9 trillion of revenue—that the first thing we ought to do is cut our revenue. He says the first thing we ought to do is, since we are going to have \$9.9 trillion of revenue, let us cut that \$550 billion. Let us dig the hole deeper before we start filling it in. Madam President, it does not take any great mathematician to figure out, if we are going to add more than \$1.4 trillion to the debt, if we do not make any changes, and the first change Senator Dole wants to make is to cut our revenue \$550 billion,

that instead of adding to the debt by more than \$1.4 trillion we are going to add more than \$2 trillion to the debt under the Dole plan.

Madam President, this is important for people to understand. Obviously, under the Dole plan we would add dramatically to the debt if we didn't do something. Senator Dole has said that his plan is to balance the budget by the year 2002.

Obviously, you would be adding to the debt held by the public until the point in 2002 when you finally reach unified balance. And so the debt would be increasing during this period, all the while we are moving toward unified balance in 2002, according to his statement about his plan.

So the question arises, how much do you need to cut the deficit in order to balance the unified budget by the year 2002? And we know the answers to those questions. We know that under the 1997 budget resolution, Republicans needed to cut the deficit by \$584 billion to balance in the year 2002 the unified budget of the United States.

The unified budget is a big word. It is very simple what it means. It means all of the revenues and all of the expenditures of the Federal Government put into the same pot. That includes all of the Social Security surpluses that we will run over the next 6 years.

We need \$584 billion of spending cuts in order to balance the unified budget over the next 6 years. But Senator Dole digs the hole deeper before we start filling it in. He wants \$550 billion of tax cuts that reduces our revenue. So instead of needing \$584 billion of spending cuts, we now need \$1.1 trillion of spending cuts. Of course, as I said before, that is to balance the so-called unified budget that counts all of the Social Security surpluses. And that is not really balancing the budget.

If we were going to honestly balance the budget, we could not use those Social Security surpluses. So if one does the appropriate calculation, you can see we would need the \$584 billion of spending cuts necessary to balance the unified budget, then we have to cover Senator Dole's \$550 billion of tax cuts, and then we would need another \$525 billion to stop using the Social Security surpluses, because under the Dole plan every penny of Social Security surplus between now and the year 2002 is going into the pot and is going to be used.

I call this a major problem with the Dole plan. Remember what we said here. To balance, counting his tax cuts, we would need \$1.1 trillion of spending cuts, and if we were going to honestly balance the budget, not use the Social Security surpluses, we would need another \$525 billion of cuts for a total of \$1.6 trillion. So if we want to balance without counting Social Security surpluses, counting Senator Dole's tax cuts, you would need \$1.6 trillion of cuts.

What has Senator Dole offered to us? What has he put on the table? Here are the numbers that Senator Dole has offered. He said he will start with the

1997 GOP budget, that cuts discretionary spending \$300 billion. By the way, that is education, that is law enforcement, that is highways, that is bridges. He is going to cut that \$302 billion for starters. Medicare, \$158 billion; Medicaid, \$72 billion; other mandatory programs and interest, \$174 billion, for a total of \$706 billion.

But remember, we said if you are going to balance this thing without counting Social Security surpluses, you need \$1.6 trillion—\$1.6 trillion. If you use the Social Security surpluses, you need \$1.1 trillion. So he is not even close here. So he has suggested another \$217 billion of cuts. By the way, he has not told anybody the specifics of these cuts. He has not told us where they are coming from. He has not told us what program he is going to cut to achieve this additional \$200 billion. That will be, I guess, a secret plan. Maybe he will tell us after the election where that money is coming. But even with that, he has got total cuts of \$923 billion. Remember, if we are going to balance and not count Social Security surpluses, we need \$1.6 trillion. He is nowhere close. To balance using Social Security surpluses you need \$1.1 trillion. He is not even close to that.

Madam President, this is what is wrong with the Dole economic plan. It does not add up. It does not add up. The spending cuts are not enough to balance this budget, even on a unified basis. They are not enough to balance it even if he uses all \$525 billion of the Social Security surplus.

Now, why hasn't Senator Dole told us more specifically where the money is coming? I think the reason is that when you start getting into the specifics, it does not make much sense to the American people.

Senator Dole is looking at the spending. This chart shows the Federal spending for the next 6 years. We are going to spend \$2 trillion on interest on the debt. We are going to spend \$2.1 trillion on Social Security; \$1.6 trillion on Medicare; defense, \$1.7 trillion; \$800 billion on Medicaid; other entitlements, \$1.4 trillion.

What are those other entitlements? Well, those are veterans' benefits; those are Federal retirement benefits; those are food stamp programs. That is the kind of thing we are talking about—child nutrition—in this category of spending. Then there is what we call nondefense discretionary. Non-defense discretionary, that is education, environmental enforcement, parks, roads, bridges, law enforcement.

However, Senator Dole has said we are not going to touch Social Security. So 19 percent of our spending is off the table. He has said we are not going to cut defense. That is 15 percent. In fact, he said we are going to increase defense spending. He says, of course, we cannot cut interest payments; that we legally owe. We cannot cut that.

In just those three areas, he has taken half of the spending off the table, but he has not stopped there. He said, well, we are not going to cut veterans, not going to cut veterans. He said we

are just going to cut Medicare by about 10 percent—\$160 billion. And he says on nondefense discretionary, this is the one that is going to have to take the big hit—the big hit.

Remember, he has about \$900 billion of cuts. Almost \$500 billion is going to have to come out of nondefense discretionary just on the cuts he has identified. Remember, the cuts he has identified do not do the job. But he is going to take \$500 billion out of discretionary spending of \$1.7 trillion over the next 6 years. So he is going to have to cut 30 percent. Education is going to have to be cut 30 percent; environmental enforcement is going to have to be cut 30 percent; parks, roads, airports, bridges. All of it is going to have to be cut 30 percent, and it still does not add up. It still does not balance. And you know what? Law enforcement is going to have to be cut 30 percent under the Dole plan. Those are the cuts he is going to have to make—\$500 billion out of this little chunk of Federal spending. This is the place he has targeted. This is the place he is going to take \$500 billion out of the \$1.7 trillion we are scheduled to spend.

So, this is the place that is really getting targeted. Because for all the rest of the budget he is just going to cut a little bit, or, he has said, he is not going to cut at all, or, he has said, he is going to increase. Madam President, there is no wonder this Dole plan does not add up. No wonder it does not add up. Because this is where the money is going and he said huge chunks of it are off the table.

Here is where the money is going to come from, over the next 6 years: Individual income taxes, about half of our income, 46 percent; corporate taxes, 10 percent; Social Security, 26 percent; and other revenue, 18 percent.

But let me just show kind of an interesting thing. Here is the revenue from Social Security. Here is the spending for Social Security. You notice something very interesting here—very interesting. They are not the same size. These are all on the same scale but there is a difference. Here is the revenue from Social Security: \$2.6 trillion over the next 6 years. And here is the spending: \$2.1 trillion over the next 6 years. We have way more revenue from Social Security than we have spending on Social Security. We have a difference of \$500 billion over the next 6 years, \$500 billion more in revenue for Social Security than we have expense for Social Security. Where is it going? Where is it going? Because I have already showed you that we have more expenditures planned over the next 6 years than we have revenue.

Madam President, I think we can see the \$500 billion of Social Security surpluses that Senator Dole is going to use in his plan. Again, I remind everyone who is listening, even with using that \$500 billion of Social Security surplus, every penny of it, his plan still

does not balance, it still does not add up. But he is using it, \$525 billion. It is interesting, that \$525 billion of Social Security surpluses that are going to be used over the next 6 years is very close to the \$551 billion of tax cuts that he has proposed. What earthly sense does this make? What earthly sense does this make? To take \$525 billion of Social Security surpluses that we get from payroll taxes, that we ought to be saving for the time the baby boom generation retires, and turn around and give it out in tax cuts, when we are not balancing the budget in any true sense over the next 6 years with this economic plan?

You talk about a plan that is spending the money today and borrowing from the future; that is the Dole economic plan. It does not add up. It does not make sense. It digs a very deep hole for the economic future of our country.

Madam President, I think one reason Senator Dole has been reluctant to be more specific is because, when you start being specific, you see how clearly the Dole plan does not add up. Let us just look at the education cuts that would be necessary to finance the Dole tax cut. Remember, the GOP budget last year that was vetoed by the President and rejected by the American people had tax cuts of \$245 billion. On education, they cut \$42 billion. I think that begs the question: What happens when you have the Dole plan that has, instead of \$245 billion of tax cuts, \$550 billion of tax cuts? How much are you going to have to cut education then? How much is education going to have to be cut to accommodate a \$550 billion tax cut?

The same can be asked of Medicare. Medicare—remember, the GOP budget last year had tax cuts of \$245 billion; the Medicare cuts were \$270 billion. Now Dole says he is going to have a \$550 billion tax cut. How much would he have to cut Medicare in order to accommodate this plan?

This is where Dole has not been specific. Because, when you get into the specifics, very quickly anybody who has been involved in these budgets knows it does not add up.

Medicaid cuts necessary to finance the Dole tax cut? Last year, again, GOP budget vetoed by the President, rejected by the American people: \$245 billion in tax cuts, Medicaid cuts were \$163 billion. Now he says we are going to have a \$550 billion tax cut. How big would the Medicaid cuts be? How big would they have to be in order to finance this plan?

Domestic discretionary spending: education, law enforcement, roads, highways, bridges. Last year, the GOP plan, \$245 billion of tax cuts, domestic discretionary cuts \$440 billion. With a \$550 billion tax cut, how big would the domestic discretionary cuts have to be in order to finance the Dole plan? It does not add up.

Madam President, I hope I have been able to communicate that the Dole

plan does not add up. There is no way there are enough spending cuts in order to balance the budget, even on a unified basis counting the Social Security surpluses, and certainly nowhere near enough to balance it without using every penny of the Social Security surplus.

In addition to that, we have to look at the Dole tax cut and who benefits. This chart shows the various income categories, who the big beneficiaries are. For example, for those who earn less than \$10,000 a year, they get a \$5 tax cut, on average; for those who are in the \$10,000 to \$20,000 category, they get \$120, on average. For those who are in the \$20,000 to \$30,000 category, they get \$400, on average. If you start adding these up, zero to \$10,000, that is 18 percent of the American people; \$10,000 to \$20,000 is 21 percent; \$20,000 to \$30,000 is another 16 percent of the American people. If you add that up, it is 55 percent of the American people get less than \$400 a year, on average, from this plan.

Look at what happens to those earning over \$200,000 a year, the top 1 percent of people in this country. They would get an average benefit of \$25,000. Does this strike you as fair? Does that strike you as a balanced plan? I do not think so. I do not think it is fair when the top 1 percent get a \$25,000 reduction on average and the 55 percent of the American people who are below \$30,000 a year in income get from \$5 to \$400 a year. That is not a fair plan.

One of the things that is perhaps most shocking, as you start to really look into the details of this Dole plan that has \$500 tax credit for children, what you find out is 40 percent of the children in America do not qualify, they do not get anything. They do not get a \$500 credit, they do not get a \$400 credit, they do not get anything. The reason is that their families do not have enough income to be eligible. Because of other parts of the Dole plan, his reductions in the earned-income tax credit, many families with child-care costs are not going to get a cut; they are going to get an increase in their taxes.

Thousands, millions of people in this country are not going to get a tax reduction under the Dole plan, they are going to get a tax increase under the Dole plan, because a child care credit doesn't work for you unless you reached a certain income level, and he is cutting the earned income tax credit.

Let's look at two examples. A two-parent family, four people in the family with an income of \$21,500 and \$400 a month in child care costs, under current law they pay \$172 in taxes. Under the Dole plan, they get a whopping increase. They pay \$609 in taxes. No tax cut under the Dole plan for these folks. They are getting a big tax increase. Interesting, isn't it?

If you are at the top, you are going to get the gravy under the Dole plan. If you are one of the fortunate few in

America, the top 1 percent that earns over \$200,000 a year, you are going to get a \$25,000 reduction on average. But if you are one of these folks earning \$21,000 a year, have children, have child care costs, under the Dole plan you are not going to get a tax cut, you are going to get a tax increase.

Under another example, a two-parent family with two children with income of \$25,000 and \$400 a month in child care costs, under current law, they pay \$1,176. Under the Dole plan, they would pay \$1,734. Not a reduction, not a cut, but a big tax increase.

Madam President, this Dole plan doesn't add up any way you cut it. It doesn't balance the budget. It doesn't have enough cuts to balance, even if he uses all the Social Security surpluses, and goodness knows, we ought not to use Social Security surpluses to balance the budget. That is just mortgaging the future.

Interestingly enough, Bob Dole has always himself rejected the so-called supply-side economic theory. The supply-side theory is the one that was in vogue in the 1980's. It is the one that led us into this swamp of debt and deficits in the first place.

Senator Dole, just last year, said this about supply-side economics. This is Senator Dole. He said:

What I could never understand is why, if you just cut taxes, you'd have this big, big revenue increase. You know, more jobs, more opportunity. And you didn't have to make hard choices about spending. That was the philosophy back in the eighties, particularly with Newt and the House Republicans. Don't make any painful decisions. Just cut taxes. In the eighties, we said, "Everything's going to be fine." Well, it wasn't.

That is Senator Bob Dole 1 year ago. Bob Dole was right a year ago when he said this. Bob Dole was exactly right. And I return to where I started. This demonstrates how right he was last year and how wrong he is this year. Because now Bob Dole, finding himself 20 points behind in the polls, all of a sudden is a born-again supply-side economist, believing in the tooth fairy, that somehow, somewhere the money will emerge.

Madam President, we tried that once before. We tried it back in 1981, and we know what the results were: the deficit skyrocketed—skyrocketed. It wasn't until President Clinton put in place an economic plan in 1993—an economic plan, by the way, that Senator Dole said would crater the economy—that we saw 4 years in a row of declining deficits, that we saw the country headed in the direction of a stronger economy, that we finally saw America getting back on the right course with dramatic deficit reduction, renewed economic growth, the creation of over 10 million jobs.

Madam President, we ought not to take the riverboat gamble of supply-side economics. That way lies a future of debt, deficits and decline.

I thank the Chair and yield the floor. Mr. BURNS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Montana.

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, I understand that Senator HEFLIN has the floor for the next 10 minutes. I ask unanimous consent that I be able to speak as in morning business just for 1 minute.

Mr. HEFLIN. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURNS. Madam President, we have seen a lot of charts and everything. Here, again, we are scaring people. We are absolutely scaring people about things that, No. 1, President Clinton inherited a trend that was already started; that we know that tax cuts put a spur in the economy and more revenues come into the Treasury.

I want to put everybody on notice about these scare things—what is going to happen, what might happen—that Americans don't back up very quickly; we don't scare very easy. We know we have a problem, and it will take America to solve it. And this last illustration is absolutely bogus.

So I just want the American people to put them on notice that we don't scare too easy. We didn't build this country to the pinnacle we have today by backing up, going in reverse in this country. We are not prepared to do that.

I yield the floor.

Mr. HEFLIN addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alabama.

TRIBUTE TO THE RT. HON. MICHAEL JOPLING, D.L., M.P.

Mr. HEFLIN. Madam President, several of us in the U.S. Senate, as well as some in the House of Representatives, have had the pleasure over the years of knowing and working with the Right Honorable Michael Jopling, a British Member of Parliament and former Minister of Agriculture under Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher. He has been a familiar and most welcome participant at both the North Atlantic Assembly sessions and at the British-American Interparliamentary Group meetings in which some of us have participated. He is well respected by his fellow Members of Parliament, both Conservative and Labour alike. Mr. Jopling, whose retirement from the House of Commons is imminent after close to 33 years in the Parliament, has served as secretary to this important and engaging interparliamentary group for the past 9 years and served the previous 4 years as its vice chairman. The position of secretary is a most important responsibility, since that officer is the chief liaison official with the American delegation. The secretaries of the delegations make most of the logistical decisions. The exchange plan he helped institute is an excellent program and vehicle for dealing with issues common to our two countries. He has referred to his activities with the British-American group "as a labour of love" and believes "with a great deal of passion that the continued warm relationship

between Britain and the United States is crucial for world peace."

Mr. Jopling was an outstanding and courageous Minister of Agriculture, Fisheries, and Food in the British government for two 4-year periods between 1979 and 1987. Some of his policies angered British farmers, since he was appointed at a time when food surpluses under the Common Agricultural Policy of Europe had reached very high levels. It has been said that he was a victim of Jopling's law, which says that whatever you do is going to be unpopular with the environmentalists for not going nearly far enough and with the farmers for doing far too much. For those of us who serve on the Agriculture Committee, Jopling's Law has particular resonance. Nevertheless, he stood firm and became a moving force during the 1980's for bringing the Common Agricultural Policy of Europe under control. Under trying circumstances, he endeavored to achieve a proper and reasonable balance on these issues and always acted in a manner that served the public interest. He was warmly praised and encouraged by former American Secretary of Agriculture Clayton Yeutter.

He also served as government chief whip. The government and the opposition in Parliament both appoint whips whose duty is to manage the affairs of the party and to organize their members to provide support. The government chief whip is in charge of the important responsibility of arranging the scheduling of the government's business in the House of Commons. This is done in consultation with the opposition chief whip.

In addition, he was assistant whip, spokesman on agriculture, deputy spokesman on agriculture, secretary of the conservative MPs' agriculture committee, and a member of the Select Committees on Science and Technology, Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, and Privileges. He was also vice chairman of the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association, chairman of the Select Committee on Sittings of the Commons, and president of the Auto Cycle Union.

Michael Jopling was born on December 10, 1930 in Ripon, Yorkshire. He was educated at Cheltenham College; King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne; and Durham University, where he earned a degree in agriculture. He is a farmer, sharing a 500-acre farm in Thirsk, Yorkshire "on some of the finest arable land in the country." He has also served as a consultant to the Hill and Knowlton public relations firm.

Mr. Jopling represents Westmorland and Lonsdale, an area of Great Britain which is dominated by agriculture and tourism, with some light industry. One British newspaper referred to it as "a curious mixture of farmers in tweeds and sprightly geriatrics * * *". While I do not think of him as being "geriatric," he certainly reflects the overall nature of his constituency. He has been called "a farmer in politics rather than

a politician who makes agriculture his specialty." He is known as being likable, engaging, and affable. I have had the pleasure on several occasions to swap humorous stories with him about the politics, government, and cultural idiosyncracies of our respective nations. He is a practical joker who has said that "riding a motorcycle is one of the life's most exhilarating experiences."

He is also a serious leader who pays close attention to the nuances of public policy and who judges by eye and instinct. His voice of reason at NAA meetings has helped guide favorably its deliberations and improved its decisions.

He has always supported a strong national defense and strong NATO. He often criticized backsliders like Canada "with its miserable 1.2 percent of GNP" for defense expenditures. He also warned the British cabinet to take "unpopular decisions, if necessary" to ensure the Army had the best tank possible.

His natural manner is one of caution, of getting all the facts before making a decision. He instinctively distrusts high-flown theory, preferring instead the directness of personal dialog and negotiation. His height, square build, and rustic manner often conjure up the image of a genial giant, but his country gentleman appearance often masks his shrewdness, keen sense of politics, and analytically sharp mind. All these traits come together to give him an unusual ability to take the full measure of a person, situation, or piece of legislation objectively, but always with an eye toward accomplishing his goals.

I am pleased to commend and congratulate the Right Honourable Michael Jopling for his outstanding leadership and dedication as a Member of the British Parliament and as a British good-will ambassador at-large. I wish him, as well as his red-haired, beautiful, and talented wife, Gail Dickinson Jopling, all the best as he approaches retirement. He deserves our profound thanks for his many lasting contributions over the years to British-American relations in general and for his personal commitment to preserving the special nature of the relationship between our two great nations. After he leaves government service, I hope he will continue to use his enormous talents and energies to benefit British-American relations.

Madam President, I thank the Chair, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. REID. Will the Senator withhold?

Mr. HEFLIN. I yield the floor.

Mr. REID. Madam President, I understand, under the standing order, that I have 10 minutes. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada is correct.

Mr. REID. Would the Chair advise me when I have used 8 minutes of the 10?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. We will let you know.