

natural disease as well as disease used potentially as an instrument of terror.

We can take, for example, the outbreak of monkeypox about which we are reading and listening today. We know monkeypox causes fever, headache, cough, and an extremely painful rash with pus-filled sores that can spread across the body. We know in children and those individuals who have a suppressed immune system, whether it is because of cancer or treatment for cancer or other autoimmune diseases, it can cause death.

Monkeypox is suspected to have originated with the importation of an exotic pet, actually a rather popular exotic pet called the Gambian giant rat. Then the monkeypox virus apparently jumped to infect the pet prairie dogs, and then jumped to infect human beings. We know there are 37 suspected or confirmed cases of monkeypox that are currently being investigated by the Centers for Disease Control. Public health officials, we learn, fear the prairie dog owners will release their infected pets into the wild and, thus, spread the disease through communities, regions, and, indeed, throughout North America.

Some also believe that this outbreak of monkeypox is the tip of a growing problem of infectious diseases being brought into the country through the importation of exotic animals.

Not too long ago—and, in fact, even right now—we focused on SARS. As we have seen with SARS, international travel by humans is also proving to be a conduit of disease. As I speak, Toronto is struggling with yet another suspected outbreak of SARS and at any point could go back on the World Health Organization's travel advisory list.

The SARS epidemic continues to disrupt international travel, continues to affect and, indeed, depress national economies.

Monkeypox, SARS, West Nile virus, which we know is seasonal—it has been 4 years since it first arrived in New York, and it has claimed 284 deaths and 4,156 infections. Several years ago, people did not know what West Nile virus was. Several months ago we did not know what SARS was, and several days ago we did not know what monkeypox was. Last year, just in this region of Maryland, Virginia, and the District, the West Nile virus killed 11 people. After what has been a wet spring in this region, where mosquito breeding is facilitated, officials fear—again not to be an alarmist—there will be another explosion of infections this summer. West Nile has spread across the United States of America. It is now firmly established, entrenched as a North American disease. West Nile, SARS, and now monkeypox—we will see emerging infections continue to appear, at least at this rate. These are the natural health threats.

Equally alarming is this whole arena of bioterrorism, the use of microbes, viruses, bacteria, and other microbes

as biological weapons to threaten others. This very body, the Senate, has been attacked with anthrax. We know there is an entity called the plague which, indeed, wiped out about a third of Europe in the 1300s.

We know the risk of smallpox. We know one gram of botulinum toxin, if aerosolized, has the potential for taking the lives of a million and a half people.

I mention all of this not to be an alarmist but to give some definition to what I think we all know today but we did not think very much about 3 or 5 years ago, and that is these threats, those of bioterrorism and the naturally occurring, are real.

With regard to bioterrorism, I do commend President Bush for successfully leading America and indeed the world to face these new realities of terrorists. We have disrupted terrorist networks. We have frozen terrorist assets. We have removed terrorist leaders and indeed have arrested more than 3,000 individual terrorists worldwide. We have toppled two of the world's most notorious terrorist regimes in Afghanistan and Iraq with decisive victories.

With regard to our domestic response, we are finally rebuilding our public health system after a long period of neglect. As a nation, this has enabled us to respond, in an appropriate way, to the potential spread of SARS much more effectively than other countries. We must continue to invest in and enhance our public health system to detect and respond to such emergencies, for, as I said earlier, we will see more.

We must actively lead the way to develop new treatments in vaccines, and that is why when I come to the floor each morning and mention the importance of vaccine research, vaccine development, and specifically bioshield legislation, which is sitting before this body perched and ready for us to act upon it, but there are certain problems we have had among ourselves in coming to an agreement, how best to bring that to the floor—but that bioshield legislation is in exact response to these issues I mention today.

I should also add that we, and our friends and allies across the world, must not allow other countries to pursue biological weapons programs. President Bush has set the United States, with the help of our allies, along a proper course to ultimately win the war on terror. I, for one, am grateful he and his national security team have answered the call to serve in this perilous time. We will defeat the forces of terror. We must take our enemies seriously, but because of globalization they are closer than ever. I am optimistic. We have an obligation in this body to respond and indeed prepare for and prevent, whether it is those naturally occurring infections or any attempt of others to use these biological agents as weapons of mass destruction.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. THOMAS. We are in morning business, is that correct?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

REFORM OF OUR GOVERNMENT

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I will make a couple of comments that are a little different than the subject we have been talking about. It is something that I do not have the recommendation as to how we resolve it particularly, but I am persuaded we need to spend a little more time on it, which I intend to, and that is government activities we are involved in. Of course, the many government activities we are involved in are probably the largest combined organizational thing we do in this country. It would be interesting to know, and I intend to see if there is not a way for all of us to do so, to get a look at all the kinds of programs and different activities the Federal Government is involved in. It is massive, of course.

We spend trillions of dollars on activities in the Federal Government. I do not suggest that is not legitimate. The Federal Government has a job to do and we need to do it. What I do believe is that because of the nature of it and because of the nature of this body, frankly, we do not really work very hard at ensuring that the delivery of these services is done as efficiently as it could be. We are a little different, of course, than the private sector in that there are some inherent barriers in the private sector. If one is not very efficient, they are not able to continue to compete with others and they are not able to go on. That is not true in the Government, of course. There is not that kind of limitation.

So it seems to me we ought to give a little more thought to how we do things. It is quite natural that when there is a need somewhere, through the political process we bring up some resolution to the need, some way to work on the need, and it usually creates a new agency or creates a new department within an agency or a new function, and there is no real way to ensure that that blends in to what is already being done in an efficient way.

There certainly must be lots of opportunities within this huge organization we have to be able to blend one thing in to another to do it more efficiently, to deliver it more efficiently. I think clearly there is reason to believe that activities that were begun 30 years ago may need to be reviewed to see if they still are needed, and if they are needed that they are done in a way that is most effective and efficient.

I am really not critical of the people who are doing these things. I am critical, I guess, or at least inquisitive about the system, because the system is set up in such a way that it does not have a way to even consider change

very often. As I say, in the private sector, people are forced to change from time to time in order to continue to be effective and to continue to modernize. I do not think it is reasonable to think that a program that started in the 1950s, and it is now 2003, that that program is being done as efficiently as it might be. I frankly sometimes think it would be a good idea if the various things we pass that go into some kind of services, some kind of activity, should expire and we should have to go through the process of reexamining what that operation is doing and if it is still needed—and it may or may not be—then see if it is being done in the most efficient way possible.

There are operations in the Government, of course, that are designed to do that, such as OMB, the Office of Management and Budget, but it is very difficult.

I am pleased that President Bush has a modernization program going, but there is all kinds of resistance. The resistance can be political: If it does not happen to suit one's particular community as a politician, why, they are opposed to that. I think it is fair to say clearly that the labor union leaders who are involved with Government unions are overreacting to the idea that some things ought to be made available to be done in the private sector, which I think is a very reasonable thing to do.

We now have sort of an overstatement of things that are trying to be done in the National Park Service. Well, there should be a few things that are competitive with the private sector, but the whole Park Service is not going to be turned over to the private sector. No one has suggested that, but that is the kind of thing we get.

I do think we ought to pay a little more attention to how we could make the delivery of services more efficient and how we could review the services that are being delivered to see if indeed they are in keeping with the times. That has to be done in a special way because it just does not happen automatically. Politics keeps it from happening. Sometimes labor unions are resistant to any change. I think it is our responsibility, and I intend to continue to look for opportunities, to examine, evaluate, and try to move forward in making the delivery of essential services more efficient whenever possible.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I understand we are to resume debate on S. 14 at 10?

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. That is correct.

Mr. CRAIG. The chairman of the committee who is managing the bill is not yet on the floor. Until he comes, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for no more than 10 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. REID. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I wonder if the bill should be reported and then go into morning business.

Mr. CRAIG. I am going to talk on energy, anyway, so we could do that. I would withdraw my UC.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

ENERGY POLICY ACT OF 2003

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will resume consideration of S. 14, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 14) to enhance the energy security of the United States, and for other purposes.

Pending:

Feinstein amendment No. 876, to tighten oversight of energy markets.

Reid amendment No. 877 (to amendment No. 876), to exclude metals from regulatory oversight by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from the great State of Idaho.

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, we are now resuming debate on S. 14, the national energy policy for our country. I have been on the floor several times over the last number of weeks as we have debated different amendments. Yesterday, there were a couple of critical votes as it related to nuclear. We have a derivatives amendment at this time by the Senator from California, and I think the Senator from Nevada has a second degree on it.

A fundamental question again emerges, and emerged yesterday at a hearing on the Hill, with the statement of our Federal Reserve Chairman Alan Greenspan as to the importance of a national energy policy.

Why is the Chairman of the Federal Reserve, who is interested in the prime rate and the management of monetary supply of our country, concerned about energy? It is fundamental why he is concerned about energy. He is concerned about the economy of our country and its strength, stability, and ability to grow and provide jobs for the men and women who currently do not have them, and to strengthen and stabilize those jobs for the men and women who currently do have jobs.

What was he talking about yesterday? He was talking about one of the primary feed stocks for energy in our country, natural gas; the problems that we currently have with the supply of natural gas because this country has not effectively explored and developed, for a variety of reasons, our natural gas supply.

In the context of not providing supply, we have provided extraordinary de-

mands on the current supply. Under the Clean Air Act, to meet those clean air standards, and out in the Western States and those air sheds specifically, the only way you can meet those standards and bring a new electrical generating plant on line is to choose to use gas to fire a turbine, to generate electricity. That is a tremendously inefficient way to use the valuable commodity of natural gas, but that is exactly what the Federal Government has told our utilities over the last two decades: If you are going to bring a new generation on line, it will be a gas-fired electrical turbine. Coal has problems; we are working on clean coal technology. This legislation embodies trying to get us to a cleaner technology to fire the coal electrical generation in our country.

As a result, what are we talking about? What has been said and what we believe to be true is that there is now rapidly occurring a major shortage in natural gas. As a result, that is not only going to drive up the cost to the consumer in his or her individual home—and I will read from an article: Another witness, Donald Mason, head of the Ohio Public Utilities Commission, predicted that the average residential heating bill next winter will be at least \$220 higher per household than last winter.

That is a real shock to an economy and to a household and why Alan Greenspan is obviously worried that you spread that across a consuming nation, and we are talking about hundreds of millions of dollars pulled out of the economy to go to the cost of heating when it had not been the case before. That was one of the concerns.

The other concern is the tremendous price hike we are seeing at this time and the impact that will have. Gas prices have nearly doubled in the past year to about \$6.31 per Btu, and there is a 25-percent change expected. We expect prices to peak and we have seen one instance, about 3 months ago, over a 200-percent increase in the price of natural gas as a spike in the market.

S. 14 is legislation to help facilitate the construction of a major delivery system out of Alaska. In Alaska at this moment we are pumping billions of Btu's of gas back into the ground because we simply cannot transport it to the lower 48 States, and we do not want to flare it into the atmosphere as has been the approach in the past in gasfields. It is too valuable a commodity, and we do not want to do that to the environment.

We have also looked at other opportunities for access. Part of the difficulty today is delivery systems and building gas pipelines across America. This legislation has provisions to help facilitate more of that as it relates to right of way and, of course, the recognition of the environmental need and the consequence and appropriate adjustment there.

What Alan Greenspan underlines in his comments, what Donald Mason