

allow an American couple to adopt a Liberian child and automatically make that child a citizen while at the same time we deport Liberian families in which the children are already American citizens having been born here. Again, not fair, not just. Even though this adoption bill is quite worthy—it will likely become law; I will support it—what about the Liberians?

So what we have seen is that legislation that has been introduced after legislation I introduced has already proceeded through the House and the Senate and will likely become law to the benefit of these good people, but what about the Liberians?

I have tried all I can to get a fair hearing for the Liberians in this country. I hope, in the last few days, we will get that hearing, through the intervention of the White House and through the consideration of my colleagues.

There are about 10,000 people here who have become important parts of our communities, who have sunk roots deep in our communities, many of whom have children who are Americans. It is not fair and it is not right that they are being ignored. I have tried to prevent at least that from happening, of them being completely ignored and being deported. They have suffered our indifference. I hope we can work this out in the next few days.

I thank my colleagues for their indulgence.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Idaho.

#### PUERTO RICAN ELECTIONS COMMISSION

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, this Congress has taken a historic step to advance the process of self-determination of the American citizens of Puerto Rico by approving an appropriation of \$2.5 million as requested by the President for a grant to the Elections Commission of Puerto Rico to be used for voter education and a choice among the island's future status options. As an advocate of that process and the need to resolve the island's political status after 102 years, I am pleased that we have acted.

This is historic because it represents the first authorization from Congress for the United States citizens of Puerto Rico to choose the ultimate political status for their island. Presidents since Truman have been seeking such an authorization and each house has passed similar language in the past, but the same language has never passed both houses and been enacted into law. Our approval of this appropriation should be read as Congress' determination to resolve the century-long question of the island's ultimate status and let Puerto Rican Americans choose a fully democratic governing arrangement if they wish to replace the current territorial status.

By adopting this provision as part of the unanticipated needs account of the

Office of the President, it is Congress' intention that its support for a future vote in Puerto Rico be coordinated with the Administration's efforts to provide realistic options to be included on the ballot in the island's next referendum. In recent months the President has brought Puerto Rico's major political parties together in an unprecedented effort to define the available political status options. Our approval of the \$2.5 million request evidences our expectation that the White House will provide realist options upon which to base a future status referendum. It can only responsibly allocate the funds for the consideration of options that are realistic.

Mr. President, the ultimate resolution of Puerto Rico's political status will require that Congress and the American citizens of Puerto Rico work together to make a choice based on clearly defined status options that are consistent with the U.S. Constitution. The action we have taken is a major contribution towards that goal.

#### CLIMATE CHANGE AND GLOBAL WARMING

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to speak for a couple of moments on an issue that I know is important to many of us and has been addressed by both myself and the chairman of the Energy and Natural Resources Committee who has now joined us on the floor, Senator Frank MURKOWSKI of Alaska.

Last night, the Vice President stated his belief that global warming is caused by fossil fuel use. The Senator from Alaska and I have both introduced legislation to deal with the question of climate change and global warming. We have looked at this issue extensively over the last several years, and through the eyes of the committee by a resolution, expressed on the floor of the Senate, as it related to the Kyoto Protocol.

With all of that, the Vice President said one thing last night. Governor Bush said he was not certain that climate change was a direct result of fossil fuel use. In fact, he said, science would govern environmental decision-making in his administration, and he did not believe that science had yet fully resolved that fossil fuel use and the creation of greenhouse gases was, in fact, creating climate change.

I happen to agree with the Vice President. I say that because the scientists we have had before us may generally agree that our globe is gaining some heat, with some temperature change, but they do not yet agree that fossil fuel usage and the aftereffects, the greenhouse gases, are in fact the sole cause or are they causing climate change?

Which opinion is more supported by the scientists themselves? On Monday, the Washington Post reported, in unusual detail, a new theory of global warming that is being advanced by sci-

entists from Denmark to UCLA. It goes like this:

First of all, they say, charged particles from space, better known as cosmic rays, cause cloud formation by changing atmospheric molecules with neutral charges into charged ions. The charged ions cluster, forming dense, low clouds.

Now, this may sound like a scientific lecture, but this was the kind of detail that the Washington Post was giving in this article.

They said, secondly, the Sun's magnetic field deflects much of the cosmic rays away from the Earth, reducing their ability to trigger cloud formation.

With less cloud cover to shade the Earth, the Earth gets warmer.

That seems like pretty reasonable logic, doesn't it?

It turns out that satellite data over the last 20 years reveal an uncanny correlation between changes in the Sun's magnetic field and cloud cover. Meanwhile, Greenland ice-cores show that cosmic rays have declined over the past century.

James Hensen of NASA, once a leading proponent of the human cause theory that the Vice President embraces to the exclusion of all others, now acknowledges in the Post that the Sun has probably been a significant contributor in past climate change. But Hensen would still like to see some convincing evidence. Hensen, by the way, has also published recent work suggesting that methane gases, many of which are emitted naturally, may be as large a contributor to climate change as CO<sub>2</sub>.

How can we find out what is right? Here is what the Post reports:

A consortium of more than fifty scientists have petitioned CERN, the European particle physics facility in Geneva, to conduct an experiment that could help settle this theory, this argument, this general issue, as reported by the Washington Post.

The researchers want to use one of CERN's particle beams as a source of artificial cosmic rays that would strike a "cloud chamber" containing the equivalent of air in the lower atmosphere. If there is a clear link between cosmic rays and cloud formation, the experience should reveal it.

The scientists proposing the experiment say:

If this link is confirmed, the consequent global warming could be comparable to that presently attributed to greenhouse gases from the burning of fossil fuels.

In other words, what the scientists are saying is, if this theory and this test were proven accurate, then cosmic rays and their influence in the atmosphere and the formation of clouds could have equal or greater influence over the Earth's atmosphere and climate change or global warming.

How can we in the Senate use this information? If this experiment indicates that changes in solar magnetic fields account for all of the detected warming, then burning fossil fuel might account for none of it. Interrupting our

economic growth by arbitrarily curtailing energy use either by taxing it or regulating it could be a far costlier experiment than the one these scientists have proposed at CERN. And because the human cause/effect is so weak and so few countries are likely to join our self-destructive experiment, useful scientific results may never materialize.

Let's do the real science, and do it now. In other words, I believe Gov. George Bush was right last night when he said, I believe there is a field of science we ought to understand and err on before we send this country down the road. He said his administration would make decisions on climate change based on science, not the politics or the popularity of the politics of the day.

Let's make science drive the issue. Science has to drive public policy in this area, not vice versa. We dare not let public policy drive science.

Meanwhile, let us hold off on dangerous experiments such as Kyoto that place our economy at risk in an attempt to prove one man right in the face of so much doubt. Truly, the kind of taxation the Vice President proposes and proposed but wouldn't own up to last night could certainly turn our economy into a recession and disadvantage our producers against other producers around the world.

In other words, what the Washington Post reported in great detail in an article well over a half a page long, on Monday, was exactly what Governor Bush was saying last night.

Mr. Vice President, the jury is still out. And the jury is scientists all over the world who have not yet confirmed, nor do they agree, that fossil fuels are the sole cause of a climate growing warmer.

Let's err on the side of science and not politics as we make these decisions.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Alaska.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I share the concern expressed by my good friend from the State of Idaho with regard to the issue of global warming. Much of the rhetoric that has been used is not based on sound science. The reality that we have the technology, if given an opportunity to apply that technology, particularly in the developing Third World nations, results in a meaningful decrease of the concentrations of pollutants that we are all concerned about in association with clean air.

I commend my friend from Idaho for bringing this matter, again, to the attention of this body with the recognition that, indeed, through science and technology, we can make a significant difference in reducing overall the emissions, particularly from the emerging nations.

#### THE BREAKDOWN IN PEACE PROCESS IN MIDDLE EAST AND ITS EFFECT ON THE ENERGY CRISIS

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, my purpose in coming before the Senate at this late hour is to bring to your attention a rather catastrophic situation that is occurring in the world today.

We are all familiar with the devastation associated with the breakdown of the peace process in the Mideast and the tensions associated with the conflict between Israel and the Palestinians. I think it is important to recognize another significant factor that has occurred today; that is, the price of oil has increased about \$3.40 a barrel in one day. Currently oil closed at roughly \$36.40. That is just a few cents under the all-time high of 3½ weeks ago where oil closed at \$37 a barrel.

Clearly, our increased dependence on Mideast oil, where we import about 58 percent of the total oil we consume, is a significant factor in recognizing that any conflict in the Mideast not only affects oil prices in the United States, because our supply is threatened, but it affects our stock market which has dropped rather dramatically today as well.

Let me highlight a few things that I think represent an inconsistency in the administration's policies towards developing a sound energy policy.

Perhaps you noticed, I am not wearing a dark shirt, a dark tie, the kind worn by Regis on "Who Wants To Be A Millionaire?" As you know, this is a TV show on ABC where contestants compete to win up to \$1 million in prizes. It is my understanding that to win, contestants on the TV show must answer some questions, just as the administration has had to answer a series of questions regarding the lack of an energy policy.

If contestants on the TV show get stumped by a question, they can use a so-called lifeline. For example, they can phone a friend. Well, we have seen when oil prices rose, this administration phoned their friends. They phoned the Saudis and asked them for more crude oil, and the Saudis obliged.

Now, contestants can ask the audience—in other words, consult the polls—to see who has the right answers. Doesn't that sound familiar? The administration, of course, loves polls.

Finally, TV contestants can use a 50/50 where only two choices are presented, one of which is the right answer, helps them out a little bit, not unlike the two contrasting energy policies that were presented by the major Presidential candidates. Well, the administration has used about all of its lifelines and still doesn't have an answer with regard to the energy policy. Now we find we are playing the game "Who Wants to be a Millionaire" with the Strategic Petroleum Reserve at the expense of our national energy security.

Some of the lucky winners, speculators who bid on this crude oil re-

leased from SPR recently, stand to profit handsomely; there is no question about it. But we should reflect on what the purpose was. The purpose was to build up heating oil inventories in the Northeast. Well, it is pretty hard to make a case that anything realistic has been done as a consequence of the SPR sale to build up those reserves.

I recall that the Vice President called on the President a few weeks ago to authorize the release of 30 million barrels of oil from the SPR. That was on September 21. Interestingly enough, the President responded the very next day. It is important to grasp that the aim of the emergency release, according to the administration, was to increase heating oil stocks in the Northeast and prevent high heating oil prices this winter. But what has been the result, Mr. President? Heating oil stocks in the Northeast have actually declined. They have declined 600,000 barrels since the President made his announcement. Those figures, which we reviewed, came from the American Petroleum Institute. That is a very disturbing trend because we are entering the winter season. It is getting colder up there and the reserves, again, are 600,000 barrels less than when the President made his announcement on September 21.

One can question the motive. Was the motive to lower prices and provide an excuse, cover, throughout the winter heating season, and perhaps throughout the elections, to ensure that the administration was doing something about the energy problem, something about the price of oil, something about our dependence on the Mideast, something about meeting the obligation of having adequate heating oil reserves?

I think the administration's premise was flawed from the start. If you consider these realistic facts, at the time of the SPR release, our refineries were operating at between 95 and 96 percent of capacity. That is a fact. Now, the oil in SPR is crude oil. In order to refine it, it has to go to a refinery. Furthermore, our pipelines for crude and finished product are already operating to capacity. We haven't had a new refinery for nearly two decades. And 37 refineries have been closed in this country in the last 10 years. So what we have is a situation where we have a bottleneck at our refineries, regardless of how much crude oil we have.

New heating oil resulting from SPR releases can't be delivered until late November at the earliest because you have to take this oil out of the SPR in the salt caverns of Louisiana on the gulf coast and you can only recover about 4 million barrels a day maximum, and you have to move it through a pipeline, put it on a tanker, and transport it to a refinery that is already full. There would be no guarantee that the crude oil released from SPR would have to be turned into heating oil for use in the United States. In other words, when they made this sale, they didn't make any requirement that