come in on Friday until Thursday morning.

I would just like to indicate to the distinguished majority leader and any other Members who might be interested in the Veterans Day ceremonies that took place out in Hawaii, I will be happy to forward newspaper accounts and television transcript excerpts to them if they want to be informed about them, inasmuch as that is the way that I had to find out about them myself.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether the majority would be prepared to tell us at this time whether or not we can anticipate leaving tomorrow or the next day or the next day, or any day thereafter.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 1999, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

CHINA'S POTENTIAL ENTRY INTO THE WORLD TRADE ORGANIZATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHERMAN. Madam Speaker, I rise with the sense that I am standing in front of a moving train. Today's media has almost already brought China into the World Trade Organization, and already declared that we are going to get enormous benefits from that entry, and from a decision that they presume will be made on this floor to grant China permanent most-favored-nation status, which some call normal trade relation status.

Let us review where we are now on our trading relationship with China. We have the most lopsided trading arrangement in the history of a Nation's life. We have a situation where we export roughly $14 billion and import close to $70 billion from China.

China is shameless in maintaining and expanding that lopsided trading relationship. It maintains high tariffs on American goods, but what is worse than what China does officially in its published laws is what it does to restrict the access of American exports through hidden, through unofficial, through cozy relationships between the Communist party of China and those business enterprises that could be involved in importing American goods if they only chose to do so.

We would think, then, that any change in this relationship would be a change for the better, since it is already the worst trading relationship I could identify. Yet, I have to question the idea of this House giving most-favored-nation status to China on a permanent basis.

Madam Speaker, I cannot judge the deal in advance. It is yet to be presented to us formally, and just perhaps it will have some mechanisms in it that will allay my concerns. My chief concern is that what we would be doing in giving permanent most-favored-nation status to China is making permanent the current situation.

That situation is one in which we are a country of laws, so any American businessperson can import goods from China, subject only to our published tariffs and restrictions and quotas. So many business people work here in the United States that they assume that if we could only change China's laws, that their business people would be free to bring in our goods. Nothing is all that clearcut.

Imagine, if you will, some business enterprise in China seeking to import American goods receives a telephone call from a Communist party cadre telling them, don't buy American goods, buy them from France, buy them from Germany. The Communist party of China is angry at speeches made on the floor. The gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) took the floor again, you had better not buy American goods.

An American businessman would simply laugh at some party official telling him or her what to buy and what to import, but a Communist Chinese citizen would ignore advice, oral advice, nonprovable advice, from the Communist Party of China only at their peril. China is not a country where the rule of law prevails. Accordingly, getting China to change its law accomplishes perhaps very little. We cannot assume that our trade deficit with China will go down.

What we have now is an annual review of our trading relationship with China, so that if China were to move into Tibet and slaughter hundreds of thousands of people, we could react in a way that they would understand, by cutting off most-favored-nation status; that if China were to engage in massive nuclear proliferation, we could react. If China continues to widen its trade deficit and use unofficial means to exclude our exports, we could finally summon up the determination to react here on this Floor. If we give China most-favored-nation status on a permanent basis, then we will not be able to react in any meaningful way.

Madam Speaker, I have come to this Floor three times, to vote in favor of giving China most-favored-nation status one more year, and a second year, and a third year, because I am not ready to use our most powerful weapon in the Chinese-U.S. trade relationship at this time. But it is a long way between saying we are not willing to use that weapon and that we want to engage in unilateral disarmament.

CONCERNING THE UNWARRANTED REGULATIONS TO BE IMPOSED ON MICROSOFT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCINTOSH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to comment briefly on the findings of fact that were issued on Friday, November 5, in the United States District Court by Judge Penfield Jackson in the Microsoft case.

Madam Speaker, this week we celebrate the tenth anniversary of a great moment in time when the Berlin Wall that divided Europe for generations came tumbling down. I was a young lawyer in the White House staff with Vice President Quayle in the fall of 1989, and I will never forget the sense of joy that I had in watching that accomplishment.

When the Berlin Wall was torn down, the spirit of free enterprise flowed like a river, irrigating economic wasteland that had been Communist East Germany. How ironic, Madam Speaker, that at the same time that we are celebrating the tenth anniversary of the tearing down of the Berlin Wall, we are forced to watch the spectacle of this Justice Department attempting to build up a wall around a pioneering American company that has helped to make our Nation the unchallenged technological leader of the free world.

While Microsoft fights to protect its freedom in court, freedom to innovate and to compete in the free market, this administration, the Clinton-Reno Justice Department, presses forward with its zeal to erect a Berlin Wall, if you will, of government regulation around America's most successful technological enterprise.

Madam Speaker, this Justice Department's zealous campaign against Microsoft is the latest manifestation of the liberal obsession with punishing success. Here in Washington, because of the tasteless class envy that many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continually wage, Mr. Gates and other successful men and women have been vilified.

☐ 1930

Yet in America, in the heartland of America, at the latest trade show, Mr. Gates and his company were applauded for bringing yet more new wonderful technology that will benefit all people in this world.

Mr. Gates is a man who had a dream, a focus, a passion, an intelligence, and the savvy which for 25 short years has revolutionized the computer industry. Today, because of Bill Gates and his colleagues in the computer industry, people like me, my family, my grandmother, my wife's father, Hoosiers all over Indiana, and Americans everywhere can simply flick a switch and play video games against each other, access the same documents thousands of miles apart, and view real-time video images of their children, their grandchildren, and their family.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the enormous contribution that Microsoft has made towards making the United States of America the technological

leader, and I am proud that a young man who served on this House floor 27 years ago, Bill Gates, had the freedom and the opportunity to succeed so that a magnificent country such as ours could benefit from someone who pursued that American dream.

Now, what does this decision say to the next young man or woman who wants to be Bill Gates? Who wants to create their own Microsoft? What does it say to our children in the 20-something years that have an idea and want to see it succeed? To me it says if one succeeds, then the government will come after them and will stifle their success.

There are two central flaws in this opinion, this finding of facts. First is the finding that Microsoft's development of the Windows operating system has created an ''applications barrier to entry.'' In this theory they broke the law by trying to preserve that so-called barrier, including trying to destroy competing products. In my estimation, Microsoft has simply acted as any very rational competitor in the industry would act, trying to forward their product. They have a superior product. In most cases it appears to have been in the interest of the other companies to have their products work with Windows.

For example, when they reached a deal with America Online to distribute their Internet browser instead of the Netscape browser, AOL did so not because of threats from Microsoft but because it benefited their customers. They wanted to sell the product because it was a better product. And then at the end of 1998, when they could have ended that exclusive arrangement, they decided they wanted to extend it. While Microsoft has been very aggressive in promoting its products, we do not punish aggressive competition in America.

But, Mr. Speaker, the more egregious flaw in the findings is the reason that it is based on a pitifully outdated theory of tying. Now, if some competitor comes along with a better browser, frankly Microsoft can rapidly find itself at the losing end of that competition, and there is no reason or rationale to apply the theory of tying one product with another in the computer world; as Professor George Priest has so aptly stated. As such, the traditional tying theory, Professor Priest argues, may be irrelevant in this case because it simply did not apply to computers.

Madam Speaker, I would hope that my colleagues would pay attention to this and make sure that this Justice Department does not end up putting a damper on the innovation and technological growth that has made this country great.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. WILSON). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. KIND addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

NORTHWEST TERRITORY OF THE GREAT LAKES HERITAGE AREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. SOUDER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOUDER. Madam Speaker, as a member of the Subcommittee on National Parks and Public Lands, and as a representative of historic Ft. Wayne, Indiana, I rise this evening to introduce a bill to create the Northwest Territory of the Great Lakes Heritage Area. I am pleased to be joined by original cosponsors, these Members representing both political parties from not only Indiana but the Old Northwest States of Ohio, Illinois, Michigan, and Wisconsin: The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HASTERT), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GILLMOR), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. LATOURETTE) the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BOEHNER), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. PORTMAN), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BARCIA) the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. EWING), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROEMER), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. MCINTOSH), the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SAWYER), the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PHELPS), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GREEN), the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW), and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. OXLEY).

The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ENGLISH) who represents Erie, Pennsylvania, is also a cosponsor. Though Erie was not part of the Northwest Territory of the Great Lakes, Erie, Pennsylvania, was intimately involved in our history, including being the launching place for Commodore Oliver Hazard Perry's fleet to victory on Lake Erie and as the final resting place of General Anthony Wayne.

Mr. Speaker, many of the sites from the Northwest Territory period are now lost, but throughout the Midwest there are still key buildings and sites that have been preserved. As my colleagues can see on this map of the Northwest Territory, this is the original Northwest Territory of the United States, including all of Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, and Illinois. And at that time, Illinois also included the State of Wisconsin and Minnesota east of the Mississippi River.

In Ohio, we not only have the Battle of Fallen Timbers Historic Site and the International Peace Memorial to Commodore Perry at Put-in-Bay at South Bass Island in Lake Erie, but other diverse sites as well including the Fort Recovery State Memorial, where General St. Clair was defeated; Fort Meigs at Toledo; and such pioneering sites as the Golden Lamb Inn in Lebanon which dates from 1803, has played host to 10 Presidents; the 1807 mansion of Thomas Worthington in Adena; in Lancaster, Ohio, is the Square 13 Historic District that includes a number of homes from the 1810s and 1820s, including the 1820 home of William Tecumseh Sherman; and in Marietta, ''Campus Martius: The Museum of the Northwest Territory,'' which includes the Rufus Putnam house, the only structure from the original stockade, and the 1788 plank-and-clapboard Ohio Land Company Office.

In Indiana, we have numerous sites related to this period as well: The Lincoln Boyhood Memorial; New Harmony, the first State capital; and Governor William Hendricks home in Corydon; the historic town of Madison; the Connor Prairie Museum; National Historic Sites at Vincennes and Tippecanoe; and the battle sites in Ft. Wayne, including the forts; Little Turtle; and Indian village sites including the Richardville House; and Johnny Appleseed Park and Gravesite.

Illinois, Wisconsin, and Michigan have important sites as well, but they were less settled at that time. Mackinac Island was a trading anchor of the upper Midwest and has many historic buildings in a beautiful location where automobiles are still banned. These wonderful historic sites, however, are somewhat lost without a cohesive story. The Lewis and Clark Trail, in which they charted America's frontier, has numerous informative materials about its history as well as visitor centers along the trail. However, in the Midwest this is not as true.

In the legislation that we are introducing this evening, it includes only those sites from the Northwest Territory period of 1785 to 1835. It forms a management authority consisting of appointees by the governor of each Northwest Territory State, including a Native American appointee from each State, as well as representatives of each State's historical society.

Duties and powers include the ability to receive funds, disburse funds, make grants, hire staff, develop a management plan, and to ''help ensure the conservation, interpretation, and development of the historical, cultural, natural, and recreational resources related to the region historically referred to as the Northwest Territory of the Great Lakes during the period from 1785 through 1835.''

Madam Speaker, this may include developing an Internet Web site and other marketing programs, erecting signs, recommendations on conservation, funding and management for development of the Heritage area, but only within existing State and local plans and with comments of residents, public agencies, and private organizations within the Heritage Area.

The Act specifically forbids taking any action which ''jeopardizes the sovereignty of the United States'' and