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 office 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 trend. Probably more than any other circuit in the America, the views of the Ninth Circuit are unquestionably out of alignment with mainstream America, and I believe the panel badly needs a sense of judicial balance. I do not believe that Judge Fisher would have helped to provide that balance.

AMERICA'S HEALTH CARE

Mr. GRAMM. Mr. President, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues one of the most insightful articles that I have read in regard to the most effective way to promote health care and patient's rights.