

with what took place with the Montreal protocol and our efforts that were successful in controlling chlorofluorocarbons, so-called CFC's. There is an example where the first scientific body of opinion suggested that, indeed, the CFC's were destroying the ozone layer. There was great skepticism, not only in this body, but throughout the Nation. But gradually, through testimony and through powerful speeches and articles by those who were involved, this country came to recognize that, indeed, CFC's were destroying the ozone layer, were causing skin cancer to our population and the population of the world.

As a result of that, we moved forward and various meetings were held, which many of us remember, and capping it all off was the Montreal protocol, which called for substantial reduction of the production of CFC's in our country and the world.

At the time, it looked as though it would be very difficult to achieve, but as the Senator from Massachusetts pointed out, the United States' scientific and mechanical ingenuity rose to the surface and, lo and behold, we not only met those reductions but we exceeded them.

The results are now showing that the amount of chlorofluorocarbons in the atmosphere has been reduced, at least the increases have been reduced, and gradually we will see a reduction in the total body of CFC's, as it were, in the atmosphere, because all of this takes a long time to achieve.

I also say to the Senator from Massachusetts that I think it is important to stress not only the costs of complying with a global warming treaty—that is always what is portrayed, it is going to cost our farmers, it is going to cost our manufacturers, it is going to cost our automobile industry, the coal miners, and on and on it goes. The costs of complying. But rarely does anybody ask, what are the costs if we don't have the treaty?

The scientific evidence, as the Senator from Massachusetts was pointing out, is increasingly coming to be recognized that, indeed, the world is becoming warmer, just as the Senator pointed out what is happening to the ice accumulations, the glaciers. In every single place in the world, the glaciers are retreating. Why is that coming about? It is coming about because of the increased temperature, infinitesimal though it might seem, that is occurring throughout the world.

So more and more I believe we have to say to ourselves, what does it cost if we don't do anything? Just take Florida. I don't know what the height of Florida is above sea level, but it must be tiny. If they get an increase in the level of the oceans of the world, and particularly those in the Caribbean, for example, the effects to Florida can't help but be devastating. Indeed, in my State, likewise; Massachusetts, likewise. In all our States, we are doing what we can to increase seawalls. What

is happening? We are not sure. All we know is, once upon a time, our beaches were steeper and now they have been cut away. Now we have to have breakwaters and barriers and groins, as they call them, and so forth, to try and prevent the erosion of the soil.

The Senator from Massachusetts pointed out what one of the presidents of one of the oil-producing countries of the world had to say. I would like to also point out a statement by the chairman of the Ford Motor Co. finance committee, none other than William Clay Ford, Jr. This is what he had to say on October 11, just 10 days ago, as quoted in the Washington Post:

Ford Motor executive William Clay Ford, Jr., called global warming a genuine threat to the environment and said automakers who oppose a proposed treaty to address the problem risk being "marginalized" in the court of public opinion.

This is what someone, whose family owns 40 percent of the voting stock of Ford Motor Co., had to say.

The remarks by Ford, a leading contender to become chairman of the No. 2 automaker, distances himself from several Detroit executives who, in recent months, have criticized the proposed global warming treaty saying the phenomenon might not exist or its causes are uncertain.

So that's what the leader of the second largest automobile manufacturing company in our country had to say.

All I am saying to my colleagues, and substantiating what the Senator from Massachusetts said, is let's examine this thing carefully. Let's look at what the scientists have to say. We can say we don't agree with them. I don't know how many Nobel laureates there are in that group—are there 10 Nobel laureates in that most recent group? It is something like that—plus a total of 2,500 scientists.

I believe this thing is serious, and I think we ought to approach it with that attitude and not say, "No, we're not going to have anything to do with it because if we have anything to do with it and try and solve the problem it will be very expensive." Well, that is no way to approach things.

I commend the Senator from Massachusetts for the remarks he made, and I hope that all our colleagues were listening. This thing is serious; let's take it seriously. We may not agree. We may have different scientific evidence, but let's not just trash it because it is going to be expensive to comply with.

Mr. KERRY addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. KERRY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Rhode Island for his generous comments and also for his substantive comments. He has been dealing with this issue for a long period of time. As chairman of the committee of jurisdiction with respect to the environment, as well as a Senator from a coastal State, a neighbor of ours, he is very knowledgeable about these impacts. He serves also on the observer

group. So I appreciate his comments particularly and his leadership on it.

I will just say to my friend from Rhode Island, when I was in this discussion with the British minister just last week, he was quite dumbstruck, in fact, that Senators here are still questioning the science or that some people want to make an issue out of the science. There is almost a universal European acceptance among those in Government of the science. They really have stepped beyond that debate.

The debate now is not over the science. The debate is how do you really deal with this the best. The Senator from Rhode Island pointed out Ford Motor Co. Let me just share with my colleague the environmental commitment statement by the insurance industry. The insurance industry in America is increasingly concerned about this. Here is what they said:

Based on the current status of climate research and on their experience as insurers and reinsurers, the member companies of the UNEP-Insurance Industry Initiative conclude that . . . Man-made climate change will lead to shifts in atmospheric and ocean circulation patterns. This will probably increase the likelihood of extreme weather events in certain areas. Such effects carry the risk of dramatically increased property damage, with serious implications for property insurers and reinsurers . . . We are convinced that in dealing with climate change risks, it is important to recognize the precautionary principle, in that it is not possible to quantify anticipated economic and social impacts of climate change fully before taking action. Research is needed to reduce uncertainty but cannot eliminate it entirely . . . We insist that in accordance with the precautionary principle, the negotiations for the Framework Convention on Climate Change must achieve early, substantial reductions in greenhouse gas emissions.

So I think that increasingly businesses are aware of the fact that the costs of not doing something are the real measurement here.

I thank the distinguished chairman for bringing that to the Senate's attention. I yield the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

AMBIENT AIR STANDARDS

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, tomorrow we will be holding public hearings on a bill that is very significant. It is Senate bill 1084.

Back almost a year ago, in November of last year, the Administrator of the EPA, Carol Browner, came out with the recommendation and the rule change to lower the ambient air standards as they pertained to particulate matter and to ozone.

After looking at this, we found that there was at that time no scientific

justification for lowering the ambient air standards. Consequently we started having hearings.

Our first hearing was with the scientific community. We had representation there from CASAC, that is the Clean Air Science Advisory Committee. It was somewhat unanimous among all the scientific community that there is no scientific justification for lowering standards.

One of the things that was rather interesting that came up in that first hearing was a group of young children, we understand now, that came from some hospital who came in wearing masks, as if to say, "You must lower these standards or we're not going to be able to breathe."

I think a great disservice was done because it came out during the course of that hearing that these children used breathers, respirators; they were using various medical equipment that has the chemical CFC in it that allows them to breathe. At precisely the same time that the Administrator of the EPA was saying that we had to do something about lowering the ambient air standards so these young people could breathe, I asked for a show of hands as to how many of them used, in their particular medical devices, CFC's. Every hand went up.

I asked, "How many of you are aware of the fact that Administrator Browner, the same one who is advocating lowering the standards, has said she's going to take CFC's off the market so you folks would not be able to use these in your breathers?"

I was pleased to find out this morning that Senator TIM HUTCHINSON from Arkansas has introduced legislation that will keep the EPA and the other various bureaucracies from taking this chemical off the market. I certainly applaud him for that. I will join him in that effort.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

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

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

ISTEA AND CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I notice that we are in a situation today that is no different than the circumstances we found ourselves in before we left for the recess last week, and that is the bill that is on the floor of the Senate is the highway reauthorization bill, or ISTEA. Most people want to get some progress made on that piece of legislation.

I might say to the Senator from Rhode Island and the Senator from Montana who are managing that bill, I

think they have done an extraordinary job with that bill and I support what they have done. I very much want the Senate to be able to complete its work on the highway reauthorization bill.

I also am someone who believes that if the Senate leaves after this first session of Congress without having dealt with the underlying bill of the campaign finance reform issue, more specifically, McCain-Feingold, we will not have done what we should do for the American people on that issue. It is clear we have a serious problem in campaign finance. It ought not be lost on the American people. I am sure it is not. We have a system here that is broken. There is money ricocheting around every crevice of this political system.

There was a story in one of the newspapers today, some new groups are coming together, suggesting each of the organizations and groups contribute a million dollars so they can do new independent campaign expenditures. The fact is there is all this money ricocheting around the political system, and it ought not be lost on anybody that this system is broken and needs fixing.

How do we fix it? There are a number of different ideas, but the McCain-Feingold is one that has been worked on and a lot of time has been spent on that proposal. At least we ought to have the opportunity for a vote on the McCain-Feingold proposal. We were told prior to bringing the highway reauthorization bill to the floor of the Senate that we would debate campaign finance reform. In fact, it was on the floor of the Senate for some long while, but we never got to a vote on the substance of campaign finance reform because all we did was talk and talk and talk, and then it was pulled from the floor before there was an opportunity for a vote.

That is our dilemma. We have kind of a self-imposed set of circumstances here where shackles have been allied in this legislative process so that, first, we can't get a vote on campaign finance reform, and, second, we have the highway reauthorization bill on the floor which we need to pass—it is a good bill, incidentally, which we need to pass—but it is brought to the floor with a Byzantine kind of structure in which the parliamentary tree is filled with amendments and second degrees and they have done what is called fill the tree so that no one else can offer any amendments on this legislation. So we find ourselves in a circumstance where we have gridlock, a self-imposed gridlock, because some are worried that we will force a vote on campaign finance reform—a vote, incidentally, I think the American people would like to see us have. So the result is they take a bill such as the highway reauthorization and load it up by filling the tree so that you can't do anything on that, either.

Now, I am thinking that perhaps later this afternoon I should come

over—I guess what we have is a tree filled and the last amendment is a second-degree amendment—and maybe I should ask for the yeas and nays on the second-degree amendment. I think the yeas and nays would be in order on the second-degree amendment, so perhaps in order to try to end this gridlock, we ought to at least ask for the yeas and nays on the second-degree amendment.

In fact, let me just say for the record, the second-degree amendment as constructed by Senator LOTT, the majority leader, is one I will support. So if we get the yeas and nays, and I will vote for it, presumably a number of Members of the Senate would vote for it sufficient for it to pass, and then at that point the tree isn't full and people can come out here and offer amendments. Then we have one of two opportunities to do business: Either someone can come to the floor and offer an amendment to try to get a vote on McCain-Feingold, the campaign finance reform bill that will reform the campaign finance system, or someone can come to the floor and offer an amendment on the highway reauthorization act.

Either of those alternatives is preferable to the circumstance we now find ourselves in. It does no service to the Senate to say, first, we don't want to vote on campaign finance reform, so second, we will bring the ISTEA bill or highway reauthorization to the floor of the Senate and then tie it up with the same rope that we used to tie up campaign finance reform so that we are not able to move on either.

I again observe perhaps the approach should be for one of us, perhaps myself or someone else, to come over this afternoon and ask for the yeas and nays. I assume we can find enough friends to come and get a sufficient second, and at some point we can get the yeas and nays on the second-degree amendment, which is the lowest hanging fruit on this bitter tree that has been constructed, and at that point maybe we can offer some other amendments. My first choice would be campaign finance reform, get a vote on that and move on, but if it is not that, at least other amendments, so we can make progress on what I think is a very good highway reauthorization bill.

I began by complimenting the Senator from Montana. He was not here, and the Senator from Rhode Island, I don't know if he heard, but you have brought a bill to the floor of the Senate that is an extraordinarily good bill. I like this piece of legislation. This country needs your legislation. I think the country will be better served by having the Senate pass it and going to conference and getting more than a 6-month extension that seems to be the mood on the other side. To the extent we move this bill and put in law some very good legislation, the country will be best served.

In order to get to that point, however, we have to find a way to untie this whole process, first on ISTEA, especially on ISTEA, saying let's bring