

Mr. BIDEN. I now ask for its second reading and object to my own request. The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Washington is recognized.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, what is the business before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. S. 2045.

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business, using such time as I may consume.

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

PIPELINE SAFETY IMPROVEMENT ACT OF 2000

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, earlier this afternoon, the distinguished chairman of the Commerce Committee, Senator MCCAIN, and my distinguished colleague, Senator MURRAY, and I believe others on both sides of the partisan divide, came to the floor to speak about the Pipeline Safety Improvement Act of 2000. That bill was passed by the Senate unanimously. It resulted from a broad, bipartisan coalition that worked over a period of more than 1 year here in the Senate. It was sparked by my colleague and myself as a result of a terrible tragedy—an explosion in a gasoline pipeline in Bellingham, WA, that snuffed out the lives of three wonderful young men, destroyed a magnificent park, and left physical damage that will be years in repair.

No individual involved in this debate got every single element in that bill that he or she wished. Liquid and natural gas pipelines are vitally important to the Nation and the transportation of fuels.

Some thought renewal of the act would be somewhat weaker than the present statutes. Others, myself included, wanted considerable strengthening, particularly with respect to local input into the way in which such pipelines are managed in communities near homes, schools, parks, and the like.

The net result, however, is a pipeline safety renewal that is a considerable and significant improvement over the present act. There will be more notice. There will be more severe penalties. There will be greater opportunities for local comment and local participation.

But in spite of all of this work, in spite of the passage of this bill, little is happening in the House of Representatives.

The Bellingham Herald, the daily newspaper in the community subjected to this tragedy, pointed out just a little bit more than a week ago that the passage of the Senate bill means nothing if it is not passed by the House.

Almost immediately, however, after the passage of the Senate bill, a number of Members of the House of Representatives began to place roadblocks in the way of the passage of the Senate

bill, claiming it wasn't strong enough and it didn't do this, or it didn't do that, or it didn't do something else.

The House of Representatives has had exactly the same opportunity to deal with this issue as the Senate.

After a brief hearing a month or so after the accident took place, literally nothing at all took place in the House of Representatives. Many of us here were led to believe that if the Senate bill were passed in its ultimate form, it would be taken up and easily passed in the House of Representatives—until these last-minute critics began to point out what they consider to be the facts.

Talk is cheap. But talk doesn't create safer pipelines in the United States. Those who oppose this bill have proposed nothing with the remotest chance of passage by the House of Representatives, much less the Senate of the United States.

We have only a short time left. Those who criticize the bill as being too weak would do far better to pass the reforms that we have and attempt to build on them later than to destroy a bill which, if it does not pass within the next few weeks, will have to begin its process all over again next year, with highly questionable prospects.

Believing that accomplishment is better than demagoguery and that a bill beats oratory any day, I come here to join with both Republican and Democratic colleagues to plead with the Members of the House of Representatives to take up the Senate bill, to debate it to the extent the House wishes to do so, and to pass it so we can get it signed by the President and enacted—which, incidentally, I am confident would take place if the House were to pass the bill.

PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I wish to speak on a subject in a happy vein.

Yesterday, the President sent a letter to the Speaker and to our majority leader on the subject of prescription drugs. In that letter he said:

I urge you to send me the Senate legislation to let wholesalers and pharmacists bring affordable prescription drugs to the neighborhoods where our seniors live.

That proposal was passed by the Senate a couple of months ago as an amendment to the appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture. It was sponsored by my colleague from Vermont, Senator JEFFORDS, and by Senator DORGAN of North Dakota on the other side of the aisle, others, and myself. It is one of two or three ways that I have determined to be appropriate to reduce the cost of prescription drugs—not just to some Americans, not just to seniors, not just to low-income seniors, but to all Americans—by ending, or at least arresting, the outrageous discrimination that is being practiced by American pharmaceutical manufacturing concerns that are benefiting from American research

and development aspects, benefiting from the research paid for by the people of the United States through the National Institutes of Health, but still discriminating against American purchasers by charging them far more—sometimes more than twice as much—for prescription drugs than they do for the identical prescription drugs in Canada, in the United Kingdom, in Germany, New Mexico, and elsewhere around the world.

The proposal by Senator JEFFORDS and others to which the President referred at least allows our pharmacies and drugstores to purchase these drugs in Canada or elsewhere when they can find identical prescription drugs at lower prices than the American manufacturers will sell them for to these American pharmacists, and to reimport them into the United States and pass those savings on to our American citizens.

I don't often find myself in agreement with President Clinton, but I do in this case. I believe he is entirely right to urge the Speaker and the majority leader to include this proposal in the appropriations bill for the Department of Agriculture or, for that matter, any other bill going through the Senate and the House of Representatives, so that we can take this major step forward to slow down, at least, this unjustified discrimination in the cost of prescription drugs to all Americans.

In this case, I join with the President in asking both the Speaker and our majority leader to use their best efforts, as I believe they are doing, to see to it that this overdue relief is in fact offered.

MICROSOFT APPEAL

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, the Supreme Court, with eight of nine Justices concurring, has just agreed with Microsoft that the notorious prosecution of Microsoft by the Department of Justice should go through the normal process of appeal and should be determined and should be examined by the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals before any possible or potential appeal to the Supreme Court of the United States.

This was a correct decision for a number of reasons, not the least of which is the complexity of the case and the length of the record which, under almost any set of circumstances, would go through the normal appeals process.

The district court judge who decided the case and who has determined, I think entirely erroneously, that Microsoft must be broken up, wished to skip the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals, stating that this matter was of such importance that it should go directly to the Supreme Court. The real motivation of the lower court, I suspect, however, was the fact that one of the vital elements of the district court's decision is directly contradictory to a decision of just about 2 years