

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the amendment is agreed to.

The amendment (No. 1250) was agreed to.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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 President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUTCHINSON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. LOTT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 5 minutes each.

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

SURFACE TRANSPORTATION REAUTHORIZATION

Mr. FAITHCLOTH. Mr. President, I want to say a few words about the surface transportation reauthorization debate. North Carolina is the number one donor State. We received just 82 cents on the dollar for our gas tax contributions to the Highway Trust Fund under the 1991 ISTEA. In fact, over the 40 year life of the federal highway aid program, we have received just 87 cents for every dollar that we sent to Washington. There is no State that received a lesser rate of return on its gas taxes than North Carolina.

Mr. President, like other Donor State Senators, I will not support a reauthorization bill that fails to offer the Donor States some basic fairness. The Donor States accepted this role—and accepted it graciously—for forty years. The Chafee-Warner-Baucus bill is a step in the right direction. However, there is much work to be done. I served on the North Carolina Highway Commission and chaired it for four years. We understood the national importance of the interstate system. We were not happy about our Donor State status, Mr. President, but we accepted it. We understood that the interstate system was a national priority. However, the interstate system is now almost complete, and the rationale for Donor and Donee States is gone.

The Donor States are not asking for extra dollars. We're not asking to be made whole for past subsidies to the Donee States. We just want an equitable rate of return on our gas taxes. Just a fair return after forty years of our subsidies to other States. I believe that there is a real role for the federal government in transportation. But it must be a fair one. Make no mistake about it, now that the rationale for Donor and Donee States is gone, their argument is just plain old-fashioned politics.

Let me illustrate the absurd results of this long-term imbalance. One of the last additions to the 1991 ISTEA was a 3 billion dollar pot of money to reimburse States for the costs of roads built before the start of the Interstate system in 1956. This so-called "equity category" benefitted, for the most part, northeastern Donee States. These are the same States that enjoyed a huge windfall from the federal highway aid program during the Interstate construction era. Mr. President, these roads are more than 40 years old, and the construction bonds were paid off long ago. The toll booths are still up, though, collecting millions of dollars. These States received 3 billion dollars in ISTEA—for 40-year-old roads—but, apparently, that wasn't enough for them.

The Clinton Administration proposed in its NEXTEA that the American taxpayers continue to funnel their hard-earned tax dollars to these States. In the NEXTEA proposal—its plan for the first post-Interstate highway bill—the White House proposes not only to retain this program, but to increase it to 6 billion dollars.

These must have been pretty expensive roads. After all, Mr. President, they have been paid for several times. First, the drivers paid tolls to pay off the construction bonds, and these roads were all paid off more than a decade ago. After the bonds were paid off, though, the States kept collecting tolls. Then the federal government sent 3 billion dollars to pay for the roads again. And the States kept collecting the tolls.

Now they want 6 billion dollars to pay for the roads another time. And they will still keep collecting the tolls. North Carolina drivers lose 20 cents off every gas tax dollar to the Donee States. The Southern States are growing fast and have major transportation needs. But, not only can't North Carolina drivers get a dollar for dollar return, we are supposed to pay again and again for these 40-year-old roads. It seems just absurd to squander money like this. It is especially absurd since there is such a limited pool of transportation funds.

In fact, Mr. President, the transportation budget is so squeezed that we hear all this talk about new "user fees" for transportation. These are just new taxes, of course, just a euphemism for new ways to take money from the taxpayers. The American people are already overtaxed. These proposals to raise taxes just defy common sense. I find it interesting, however, that I don't hear much discussion about one of the most obvious ways to increase the value of our transportation dollars. It will not cost the taxpayers a dime and will boost the value of some transportation dollars by 15 percent.

The taxpayers' friends know that I am talking about repeal of the Davis-Bacon Act. I am talking about a Congress that favors the taxpayers over the union bosses. These Davis-Bacon

requirements, especially the "union work practices" provision, drive up construction costs because they promote inefficiency in many forms. Davis-Bacon is a needless surcharge, just a contribution to union bosses, on these construction projects. The Davis-Bacon Act drives up construction costs by an average of 15 percent. The Congressional Budget Office confirms that repeal of Davis-Bacon will save the taxpayers billions of dollars.

Incredibly, the White House proposed to expand Davis-Bacon in its transportation bill. It is no secret, though, that Davis-Bacon repeal is essential if we are serious about squeezing every penny out of the federal highway program. It is far better for the taxpayers to root out these inefficiencies than to raise the taxes of the American people. I know that some people find it hard to imagine that there are alternatives to new taxes in order to increase the transportation budget. This Senate voted this year for billions of dollars for a mission in Bosnia, which was supposed to be over last year, and for hundreds of millions of dollars in new welfare spending.

It is time to cut the waste—not raise taxes—to fund our transportation priorities. This is the first authorization bill in the post-Interstate era. It is also the first authorization bill subject to the constraints of a balanced budget plan. This bill brings new challenges. And, Mr. President, new obligations. This bill must be fair to the States that subsidized the Interstate system for 40 years. We need to get the most for each and every dollar in the transportation budget. We certainly cannot afford to squander taxpayer dollars on outdated rules in order to prop up the power of the labor unions.

It's time to tell the union bosses that the good times are over! This is not their transportation bill! North Carolina needs a transportation bill that builds highways, not government bureaucracies. A transportation bill that works for the taxpayers, not the labor bosses. Mr. President, if this bill is not fair to North Carolina taxpayers, I will be forced to filibuster it.

VISIT OF DAVID TRIMBLE OF THE NORTHERN IRELAND ULSTER UNIONIST PARTY

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, next week David Trimble, leader of the Ulster Unionist Party in Northern Ireland, will begin a visit to the United States where he will meet with many of us on both sides of the aisle in Congress who are deeply committed to helping achieve a lasting peace in Northern Ireland. There is perhaps no one better placed to make that happen than Mr. Trimble, who leads Northern Ireland's largest party.

Mr. Trimble is to be commended for bringing his party into the current talks, which now include Sinn Fein as a result of the restoration of the IRA cease-fire in July. Those talks are ably

chaired by our former Senate colleague, George Mitchell.

Mr. Trimble and his party faced many difficulties in deciding to participate in talks which include Sinn Fein. There is a long history of distrust by both sides in Northern Ireland, and the fears and concerns of unionists cannot be dismissed. Mr. Trimble spent the month of August consulting with many people and concluded that his constituents want his party to participate in the talks as the best hope for achieving a peaceful settlement.

Huge challenges lie ahead. Negotiating a solution which can obtain the support of both communities is a formidable task. But at long last, the principal parties are at the negotiating table and real dialogue is beginning. David Trimble deserves a significant share of the credit for this long-sought progress. I look forward to his visit to this country, and I ask unanimous consent that an excellent article in the September 29 issue of Time Magazine be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From Time, Sept. 29, 1997]

FACE TO FACE

(By Barry Hillenbrand)

It was no surprise last week when, just as historic talks began to try to dissolve the annealed hate that divides Northern Ireland, a 400-lb. bomb exploded in a largely Protestant town near Belfast. The hard men for whom terrorism has become a way of life were again trying to blow away the chance for peace. Nor was it a surprise that the Protestant politicians, who fear any change in their domination of the province, denounced the bombing as a Roman Catholic republican plot that made the talks impossible.

But it was a surprise when, one day after the explosion, the talks began anyway, bringing together for the first time the leaders of Sinn Fein, the political wing of the Irish Republican Army, which has waged war to drive the British off the island of Ireland, and the main leaders of their bitter Protestant Unionist opponents. That the talks began at all was a triumph of patience, persistence and cleverness by the governments of Ireland, Britain and the U.S., which are shepherding the broader peace process.

It was also a measure of how much has changed in Northern Ireland over the past half dozen years. Most important, the 1.6 million people of the province, Protestant and Catholic alike, have come to hate the war of hate and are demanding peace. Second, the terrorists have come to believe they can win more from talking than from killing. And finally, the huge parliamentary majority rolled up by Tony Blair and the Labour Party has stripped the recalcitrant Unionists of their veto over the efforts of the British government to change the status of its troubled province.

In the past the Unionists have been able simply to stonewall the peace process. But last week, there at the head of the Unionist delegation was David Trimble, a hot-tempered, frequently red-faced law lecturer who heads Northern Ireland's largest and most important Protestant party, the Ulster Unionist Party (U.U.P.).

For years Trimble, like many other Unionists, refused to sit down in the same room with Sinn Fein representatives. Once Trimble

stormed out of a TV interview in the midst of a live broadcast because he was about to be electronically linked with a Sinn Fein member in another studio. But in August the British government declared that a new I.R.A. cease-fire was genuine and that Sinn Fein was thus qualified to join the political talks jointly sponsored by London and Dublin under the chairmanship of former U.S. Senator George Mitchell. Suddenly, Sept. 15, the date set for the start of a new round of talks, became the moment of truth for Trimble. Sinn Fein would join the talks, but would Trimble take his party in?

If Trimble's temperament and political background were any guide, the answer would clearly have been no. As a young lecturer in law at Queen's University in Belfast in the late '60s, Trimble joined a fringe political group Vanguard, that condemned the U.U.P., the party Trimble was later to head, for being insufficiently hard line. He flirted with other extremist groups before finally coming to terms with the U.U.P. and being elected to Parliament as one of its candidates in 1990. His rise to the top of the party was swift. He won the leadership slot in 1995, largely on the strength of the militant image he had acquired by marching at the head of a triumphalist Protestant parade that bullied its way through a besieged Catholic neighborhood. "We were in despair when he was elected," says a moderate in Trimble's party. "We thought all hope for peace and accommodation was gone."

But Trimble has changed. Once he became leader of the party, there was a concerted effort by Britain and the U.S. to erode his narrow provincialism by getting him to travel outside Ulster, a process that had worked well with Gerry Adams, the leader of Sinn Fein. For a man who once bragged he had never set foot outside the U.K., it was a heady experience. Trimble visited the U.S., long shunned by Unionists as the bastion of fervent I.R.A. support. He had coffee with President Bill Clinton and chatted with the sort of Congressmen he once considered the enemies of Unionism. Now Trimble's office hands out copies of the *Congressional Record* featuring a speech paying tribute to the Irish Protestant tradition in America. Its author: *Ted Kennedy*, the Irish republican's greatest champion in Congress. Trimble also traveled to South Africa with delegations of other parties from Northern Ireland for a conference on Conflict resolution.

Trimble is still a staunch Unionist and profoundly leery of Sinn Fein. Before walking into the talks last week, he defiantly said he had come not to "negotiate with Sinn Fein but to confront them and to expose their fascist character." "Yet," says David Ervine, a senior official of the Progressive Unionist Party, who marched into talks with Trimble last week, "Trimble has come further than any Unionist leader in history." He has broken out of the siege mentality, which for years had Unionist leaders hiding behind banners proclaiming no surrender and refusing to consider any accommodation with the Catholic minority or with the Irish Republic to the south. "We are certainly going to address the views of those who consider themselves Irish and don't want to be part of the United Kingdom," says Trimble. "We have to respect their cultural identity and protect their civil rights. We are comfortable with that." But, of course, Trimble holds fast to the basic principle of Unionism: that Northern Ireland should remain part of the U.K.

Despite his firm belief that the I.R.A. cease-fire is a sham, Trimble recognized that the moral burden of continuing the peace process has fallen on him. "We could have stayed back and waited for the talks to collapse without us," says Trimble. But then we would have been accused of blocking peace."

Trimble also knew that the popular political mood in Northern Ireland was running strongly in favor of all-inclusive peace talks. The failure of the I.R.A. cease-fire which collapsed in February 1996, had profoundly depressed people. This summer sectarian tension once again ran high, and Northern Ireland teetered on the edge of what one of the senior members of Mitchell's team warned could have been "full-scale civil war." The I.R.A. cease-fire announced in July and the promise of peace talks in September again raised hopes. Says Christopher McGimpsey, a U.U.P. city councilor from Belfast: "We were hearing from the grass roots that we should enter talks."

Trimble also received a powerful shove through the negotiating gates from Blair. First, Blair warned Sinn Fein that if it wanted to have a say in the future of Northern Ireland, it would have to secure a cease-fire from the I.R.A. and agree to respect democratic principles. When it did just that, Blair turned his attention to Trimble's Unionists. "Some Unionists failed to understand that if we do not join the talks, London and Dublin could impose a political solution on us," says John Taylor, the deputy leader of Trimble's party. With that possibility staring him in the face, Trimble could hardly have said no to the talks.

Even after last week's bombing, Trimble arrived for the talks. "Two years ago," said Marjorie ("Mo") Mowlam, the tough-talking, no-nonsense British Secretary of State for Northern Ireland, "it would not have been possible for Trimble to move forward after a bomb like that. Now Unionism wants its leaders to be talking." And in the North, that is surprising progress.

HONORING THE WOODALLS ON THEIR 50TH WEDDING ANNIVERSARY

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, families are the cornerstone of America. The data are undeniable: Individuals from strong families contribute to the society. In an era when nearly half of all couples married today will see their union dissolve into divorce, I believe it is both instructive and important to honor those who have taken the commitment of "till death us do part" seriously, demonstrating successfully the timeless principles of love, honor, and fidelity. These characteristics make our country strong.

For these important reasons, I rise today to honor Elsa and James Woodall IV of Springfield, MO, who on October 18, 1997, will celebrate their 50th wedding anniversary. My wife, Janet, and I look forward to the day we can celebrate a similar milestone. The Woodalls' commitment to the principles and values of their marriage deserves to be saluted and recognized.

TRIBUTE TO DONALD J. BABB

Mr. ASHCROFT. Mr. President, I rise today to acknowledge and honor the achievement of Mr. Donald J. Babb of my home State of Missouri. Mr. Babb recently received the Shirley Anne Munroe Leadership Development Award from the American Hospital Association and the Hospital Research and Education Trust. Mr. Babb is the chief executive officer of the Citizens