

I look forward to engaging in this debate. I know there are some who are concerned, upset, and nervous about heading toward a vote that looks as if we probably will lose. But I say this: At least we are on the right subject for a change. At least we are talking about the right issue for a change. If talking about the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty takes goading the majority into saying to us: We are going to give you 10 days with no hearings, essentially, and then we are going to force you to vote and defeat this treaty because that is what we want to tell the world about our position on nuclear weapons and arms control, that is fine with me because we are talking about the right subject.

If we do not ratify this treaty now, we will ratify it next year, and if we do not ratify it next year, then we will ratify it the year after. Because at some point, when 82 percent of the American people want arms control to reduce the spread of nuclear weapons through the ratification of this treaty, and when the Joint Chiefs of Staff say it will not injure the security of this country, at some point the American people will say: We want to have our way on this issue, and we will impress our way on this issue by having the Senate come to this Chamber and vote for ratification. If not now, later. But at some point, the American people will demand this country provide leadership in reducing the threat of nuclear war and reducing the spread of nuclear weapons.

The Senator from Virginia, Mr. WARNER, is on the floor. I mentioned a couple of times—I did not mention his name—but I referred to him as “the Senator from Virginia.”

I say to Senator WARNER, I mentioned—when I think you were not on the floor—one of my great regrets is that you are not with us on this issue because I have great respect for you and your abilities. I also appreciate the fact that some hearings are being held this week.

But I confess, as I have said, I think this is not a good, thoughtful way to deal with something this important. I am not talking about the Senator's hearings. I am talking about, after 2 years of virtually no activity, saying: All right. Ten days from now we're going to have a vote. In the meantime, we'll cobble together a couple hearings and then figure how we get there, and vote the treaty down, and tell the world that is our judgment.

I do not think that is a good way to do it. I think that is treating the serious too lightly. I do not think it is the best we can do. The better way for us to have done this, in my judgment, is to have decided we would hold a comprehensive set of hearings over a rather lengthy period of time, develop a national discussion about the import and consequence of a treaty of this type, and then have the Senate consider it. That is not what is being done.

If we vote next Tuesday, I am here and I am ready. I am ready Friday and

Tuesday to debate it. But I very much wish this had been dealt with in a much more responsible way. By that comment, I do not mean to suggest the Senator from Virginia is in any way involved in that. I, again, appreciate the fact that he is holding some hearings this week, hearing from people who are weighing in on both sides of this issue.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. WARNER addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Virginia.

Mr. WARNER. I simply say to my good friend and colleague that I addressed many of the issues he has addressed in the last few minutes in a press conference today that I think covers the work of the Armed Services Committee.

We are trying to do a very thorough job. We have had 10 hours of hearings in the last 48 hours. We will go into lengthy hearings again tomorrow morning.

I thank my friend for his views.

HIGH DENSITY RULE

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, although I have serious reservations with respect to one or two provisions, I rise in support of the amendment by Senators GORTON and ROCKEFELLER to replace the slot-related provisions in the bill.

It won't surprise anyone to hear that my reservations primarily concern Reagan National. It is deeply regrettable that the amendment takes a step backward in terms of competitive access to Reagan National. The Commerce Committee overwhelmingly approved providing 48 slot exemptions for more service. This amendment will cut that number in half. I understand that this bill may not have come to the floor if this compromise had not been made, but I certainly am not happy about it. Nevertheless, some additional access is better than none at all.

The most frustrating aspect of this compromise is that the continued existence of slot and perimeter restrictions at Reagan National flies in the face of every independent analysis of the situation. To support my position, I can quote at length from reports by the General Accounting Office (GAO), the National Research Council, and others, all of which conclude that slots and perimeter rules are anticompetitive, unfair, unneeded, and harmful to consumers. Despite the voluminous support for the fact that these restrictions are bad public policy, we allow them to continue.

Reagan National should not receive special treatment just because it is located inside the Beltway. This amendment will already lead to the eventual elimination of the high density rule at O'Hare, Kennedy, and LaGuardia. If we believe it is good policy at those airports, why is it not the same for Reagan National? Arguments that opening up the airport to more service and competition will harm safety, exceed capacity, or adversely affect other

airports in the region are without merit. The GAO recently concluded that the proposals in the committee-reported bill are well within capacity limits and would not significantly impact nearby airports. In addition, the DOT believes that increased flights would not be a safety risk.

With any luck, the wisdom and benefits of increasing airline competition will eventually win out over narrow parochial interests. It saddens me to say that it will not happen today. Another opportunity to do the right thing by the traveling public is being missed.

But my concerns about the Reagan National provisions do not in any way diminish my enthusiastic support for the other competition enhancing provisions in the bill. Eliminating the slot controls at the other restricted airports is a remarkable win for the principle of competition and for consumers. As GAO and others have repeatedly found, more competition leads to lower fares and better service. And in the interim, new entrants and small communities will benefit from enhanced access, which is more good news.

I want to make our intent clear with respect to the provisions that govern the time period before the slot restrictions are lifted. We are providing additional access for new service to small communities and for new entrants and limited incumbent airlines. Because these airports are already dominated by the major airlines, which jealously hold on to slots to keep competitors out, we intentionally limited their ability to take advantage of the new opportunities.

The amendment directs that Secretary of Transportation to treat commuter affiliates of the major airlines the same, for purposes of applying for slot exemptions and for gaining interim access to O'Hare. Let me be perfectly clear about what this provision means. It means the Secretary should consider commuter affiliates as new entrants or limited incumbents for purposes of applying for slot exemptions and interim access to O'Hare. A major airline should not be allowed to game the system and add to its hundreds of daily slots through its commuter affiliates and codeshare partners. Genuine new entrants and limited incumbents are startup airlines that cannot get competitive access to the high density markets.

Many provisions in this amendment are just as that Senate approved them in last year's bill, so I will forgo a discussion of the various studies and other requirements that ensure people residing around these airports have their concerns addressed. Suffice it to say that the FAA and DOT will be very busy monitoring conditions in and around the four affected airports over the next few years. If these provisions begin having seriously adverse impacts, which I do not anticipate, we will certainly know about them.

The benefits of airline deregulation have been proven time and again in

study after study. But the job that Congress started 20 years ago is incomplete. We still retain outdated controls over the market. Even worse, these controls work to the benefit of entrenched interests and to the detriment of consumers and competition. The sooner the Federal Government stops playing favorites in the industry the better off air travelers will be. The majority of provisions in this bill will get us closer to the goal of completing deregulation.

I urge my colleagues to support the Gorton amendment and vote against any second degree amendment that might weaken its move toward a truly deregulated aviation system.

GORTON-ROCKEFELLER AMENDMENT TO S. 82, THE AIR TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT ACT

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I appreciate that the Senate has finally acted on S. 82 to reauthorize the FAA and to deal with some of our Nation's air transportation issues.

In particular, I am pleased that the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington and the Senator from West Virginia was adopted to allow exemptions to the current perimeter rule at Ronald Reagan Washington National Airport. I recognize that this is a serious matter affecting a number of cities and high-profile airports, and I commend my colleagues who worked long and hard to develop this amendment.

While I would have preferred that the final bill include the 48 exemptions contained in S. 82 as it was reported by the Commerce Committee, I recognize that reducing this number to 24 reflects a reasonable compromise. I believe the amendment proposed by Senators GORTON and ROCKEFELLER achieves the central objective, which was to maintain the current level of safety while improving air service for the flying public—which is now almost everyone at one time or another. The compromise also assiduously avoids adversely affecting the quality of life for those living within the perimeter.

Today, my constituents in Utah and in other western communities must double or even triple connect to fly into Washington, DC. The Gorton/Rockefeller amendment goes a long way to addressing this inconvenient and time-consuming process and to ensuring that passengers in Utah and the Intermountain West have expanded options.

I believe that use of this limited exemption should be to improve access throughout the west and not limit the benefits to cities which already enjoy a number of options.

Therefore, when considering applications for these slots, I think it is important for the U.S. Department of Transportation to consider carefully these factors and award opportunities to western hubs, such as the one in Salt Lake City, which connects the largest number of cities to the national

transportation network. I want U.S. DOT officials to know that I will be carefully monitoring the implementation of the perimeter slot exemption.

I look forward to working with Transportation Department officials as well as my colleagues in the Senate to ensure that the traveling public has the greatest number of options available to them. I thank the chair.

CABIN AIR QUALITY

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I rise to draw attention to a problem my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have no doubt encountered—poor air quality on commercial airline flights.

Cabin environmental issues have been a part of air travel since the inception of commercial aircraft almost 70 years ago. However, with the exception of the ban on smoking on domestic flights in 1990, no major changes have occurred to improve the quality of air on commercial flights.

Commercial airplanes operate in an environment hostile to human life. According to Boeing, the conditions existing outside an airplane cabin at modern cruise altitudes off 35,000 feet, are no more survivable by humans than those conditions that would be encountered outside a submarine at extreme ocean depths.

To make air travel more conducive to passengers and flight crews, airplanes are equipped with Advanced Environmental Control Systems. While these systems are designed to control cabin pressurization, ventilation and temperature control, they have not diminished the number of health complaints reported by travelers.

It should come as no surprise to my colleagues that the most common complaints from passengers and flight crew are headaches, dizziness, irritable eyes and noses, and exposure to cold and flu. With the amount we travel, I would not be surprised to learn some of my friends in the Senate have suffered some of these symptoms themselves. But complaints of illness do not stop there. Some passengers complaints are as serious as chest pains or nervous system disorders. This is a serious consideration and should be addressed.

Airlines say the most common complaints are a result of the reduction in humidity at high altitudes, or of individuals sitting in close proximity to one another. Airlines even say the air on a plane is better than the air in the terminal. But the airplane cabin is a unique, highly stressful environment. It's low in humidity, pressurized up to a cabin altitude of 8,000 feet above sea level and subject to continuous noise, vibration and accelerations in multiple directions. Air in the airplane cabin is not comparable with air in the airport terminal. It's apples and oranges.

The American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers—or ASHRAE—recently released standards it found suitable for human comfort in a residential or of-

fice building. ASHRAE determined that environmental parameters such as air temperature and relative humidity—and nonenvironmental parameters such as clothing insulation and metabolism—all factored in to create a comfortable environment. Airlines immediately chimed in, saying average cabin temperatures and air factors fell within the ASHRAE guidelines for comfort.

But once again, the air in an airplane cabin is not comparable to air in an office building. The volume, air distribution system, air density, relative humidity, occupant density, and unique installations such as lavatories, galleys all make for a unique condition. The ASHRAE guidelines simply do not translate to the airplane cabin.

It is high time we make a concerted effort to study the air quality on our commercial flights and make some changes. Studies done by the airlines are simply not thorough enough. My amendment directs the Secretary of Transportation—in conjunction with the National Academy of Sciences—to conduct a study of the air on our flights. After completion of the 1-year study, the results will be reported to Congress. It is my sincere hope this will be a step toward more comfortable travel conditions for everyone.

I thank the Chair.

JUDICIAL NOMINATIONS

Mr. BUNNING. Mr. President, I voted yesterday to oppose the nominations of Ronnie White to serve as District Court Judge for the Eastern District of Missouri, and Raymond C. Fisher to sit on the Ninth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals.

As a newly elected member of the Senate, I am acutely aware of our obligation to confirm judges to sit on the Federal courts who will enforce the law without fear or favor.

But, after carefully considering Judge White's record, I am compelled to vote "no." I believe that he has evidenced bias against the death penalty from his seat on the Missouri Supreme Court, even though it is the law in that State. He has voted against the death penalty more than any other judge on that panel, and I am afraid that he would use a lifetime appointment to the Federal bench to push the law in a procriminal direction rather than deferring interpreting the law as written and adhering to the legislative will of the people.

Although Judge Fisher has been recognized as "thoughtful liberal," I cannot in good conscience vote to appoint him to serve a lifetime appointment to the Ninth Circuit Court. Over the last decade, the Ninth Circuit has been a fertile breeding ground for liberal judges to advance their activist agenda—a fact evidenced by the Supreme Court's consistent reversal of cases referred to them from the Ninth Circuit—and I am afraid that Judge Fisher would continue this disturbing