

maintained by an employer contributing to the multiemployer plan in applying the limits on contributions and benefits except in applying the defined benefit plan dollar limitation;

(3) Applied the special rules for defined benefit plans of governmental employers to multiemployer plans, thus eliminating the high-three-year average limitation; and

(4) Increased reductions of the dollar limit prior to age 62 for defined benefit plans of governmental employers and tax-exempt organizations, qualified Merchant Marine plans and multiemployer plans from \$75,000 to 80 percent of the defined benefit dollar limit.

In addition, measures to relieve the inequity of applying the three year high average had been passed three times prior to the passage of the Taxpayer Refund Act of 1999 by the Senate, most recently in the 1997 Taxpayer Relief Act.

The provisions contained in the Domenici Amendment to the bankruptcy bill would:

(1) Increase the limit for defined benefit plans from \$90,000 to \$160,000;

(2) Increase the limit to be adjusted before the Social Security retirement age from \$90,000 to \$160,000; and

(3) Increase contribution limits from \$30,000 to \$40,000.

While these proposals are important to ensuring retirees get the benefits they deserve, they do not go far enough to create parity between retirees in multiemployer plans and retirees in public plans.

Mr. NICKLES. Note that the Senate Finance Committee approved most of the provisions outlined by Senator STEVENS and later all of the provisions in his proposal were included in the Senate version of the Taxpayer Refund Act of 1999 that passed the Senate on July 30th. The problems for working people in multiemployer plans associated with section 415 concern me and I understand the Budget Chairman will join me in working to secure the provisions described by Senator STEVENS.

Mr. DOMENICI. Yes. The assistant majority leader is correct.

Mr. STEVENS. I thank the distinguished budget chairman and the assistant majority leader.

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent that there be a period for the transaction of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak for up to 10 minutes each.

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

MICROSOFT FINDINGS OF FACT

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, it was recently reported that Department of Justice anti-trust chief Joel Klein attended a party to celebrate James Glassman's new book "Dow 36,000." During the party, Mr. Klein, who is prohibited from buying and selling

stocks while he serves in his current post, was overheard saying to the author, "Wow. Dow 36,000—I hope it'll wait until I get out of office." Mr. Glassman reportedly responded that Mr. Klein was already doing his part to keep the Dow down.

Mr. President, I am here to report that not even Joel Klein and the Department of Justice can shake the confidence of investors all across this great land who responded to Judge Jackson's Findings of Fact with a mild yawn. Apparently, investors understand that punishing trail blazing companies that have brought dramatic and positive change to consumers never has been, and never should be, the American way.

Despite the Government's attempts to turn the public against Microsoft, Microsoft continues to be one of the most respected companies in America. A majority of Americans believe Microsoft is right and the Government is wrong in this current lawsuit. In fact, a Gallup poll conducted over the weekend suggested that 67 percent of Americans still have a positive view of Microsoft despite the efforts of the Federal Government.

Judge Jackson made clear early in the case that he shared the administration's desire to punish Microsoft for being too successful. His Findings of Fact do not remotely reflect the phenomenal competition and innovation that is taking place in the high-tech industry every day. Reading the Findings, it is clear that even this judge could not document tangible consumer harm. Judge Jackson's thesis is that Microsoft is a tough competitor and that that toughness must stifle innovation and must harm consumers. But the judge could document no tangible harm * * * and this is why he will be reversed.

When you look at the world around us, whether in the workplace, at home, in schools, you see first-hand how 25 years of innovation in the high-tech industry has empowered and enriched people from all walks of life.

Every family and every community in America has benefited from the information revolution fueled by Microsoft. Sitting on the desktop in every office, school and hospital is a machine that brings power directly to people. Ten years ago only governments and large institutions had the power that so much information and knowledge brings. Today, because of competition among software and Internet businesses, that power runs to people and to families in cities and towns everywhere.

While the trial was going on, the high-tech industry has changed dramatically and reinvented itself a dozen times. Competition is alive and well and consumers are reaping the benefits.

Do the following numbers sound like they come from an industry that is stifled by monopolistic practices?

In 1990, there were 24,000 software companies. Today there are 57,000. And

this growth shows signs of accelerating even further.

The high-tech industry accounts for 8.4 percent of America's GNP and one-third of our economic growth.

This year, the software industry alone will add almost \$20 billion in exports to America's balance of trade.

It is particularly amazing that Judge Jackson found that barriers to entry into the market are too high. Apparently Linus Torvalds didn't get that memo. The 21-year-old student at the University of Helsinki recently disseminated into cyberspace the code for a computer operating system he had written. This experiment has evolved into the Linux operating system, which now has over 15 million users and is supported by such industry heavyweights as IBM, Intel, Hewlett-Packard, Dell, Gateway, Compaq, and Sun Microsystems.

Also fascinating is the fact that the co-founder of Netscape, Marc Andreessen, created the technology for the Netscape web browser when he was a student at the University of Illinois. Four years later, the company he founded sold for \$10 billion. Clearly, anyone with a great new idea can compete in this fast-paced competitive economy.

Although Microsoft is at the center of this fantastic growth that has helped the economy and brought incredible technological advances to consumers, its position as a market leader is not secure. It remains true that anyone, from any background, can by hard work and determination, take on the most successful corporation of the 20th century. As the explosive growth of Linux shows, Microsoft, too, must be allowed to compete, or be relegated to the slow lane of the information superhighway.

The competitive environment in high-tech has never been stronger. Every day new alliances change the face of the industry. America Online has transformed itself into a web, software, and hardware dynamo by purchasing Netscape, forming an alliance with Sun Microsystems, and investing heavily in Gateway. It is competitors like this who are positioned to ensure that vigorous competition, which is a boon to consumers, will lead the way into the 21st century.

Should the Federal Government intervene, our entire economy will suffer. By picking winners and losers, stifling innovation and attempting to regulate through litigation, the Federal Government can do immeasurable harm to an industry it admits it doesn't even understand. Need I remind you that these are the same people who have brought you models of efficiency such as the IRS?

Regardless of the exponential growth and vigorous competition in the high-tech industry, Judge Jackson seems convinced that consumers have been harmed by Microsoft. This he believes despite the testimony of the government's own witness, MIT professor

Franklin Fisher, who when asked whether consumers have been harmed by Microsoft, responded, "On balance, I'd think the answer is no."

Nevertheless, I was stunned when listening to Joel Klein proclaim that the Findings were great news for consumers. When is it good news for consumers to learn that the Federal Government is now running the high-tech industry? When Bill Gates, Scott McNealy (Sun CEO), or the head of a new high-tech start-up want to integrate new products or features into their software they will first have to get clearance from the de facto CEO of high tech, Joel Klein.

Speaking of the Associate Attorney General, if you were watching CNN last Friday evening without the volume on, you would have thought from the looks on their faces that Janet Reno and Joel Klein had just won the POWERBALL lottery or been given \$10 million dollars by Ed McMahon. Mr. President, I repeat—this decision is not good news for consumers. The findings represent a terrible precedent, not only for Microsoft, but for high-tech companies in Silicon Valley, Austin, TX and the Dulles corridor in Virginia. The message is: if you get big, or too successful—you will be punished. The Department of Justice is keeping an eye on you—be careful or you may be next. The capital of the high-tech world isn't in Silicon Valley or Washington State, it's conveniently located within our Department of Justice on Pennsylvania Avenue.

But, Mr. President, I have been a frequent critic of the Department of Justice's attacks against Microsoft and the high tech industry for a long time now. I will continue to ask questions—I will continue to defend the ability of high-tech companies that wish to compete without the threat of government intervention. I will continue to be deeply concerned about how the Department of Justice's action on Friday will jeopardize America's standing as a global leader in the field of technology. The Department of Justice has now invited Microsoft's foreign competitors to use their governments to limit Microsoft's success. Joel Klein has just tilted the balance of power in favor of high tech companies abroad, in effect saying to Microsoft: Slow down and let the rest of the world catch up.

But I am sure many of these same questions and concerns will be raised by Microsoft's own employees next week when they host Vice President GORE on the Redmond campus.

To conclude, I repeat: This case should be dropped because antitrust laws exist to protect consumers—people who buy goods and services. Antitrust laws were not created to protect Microsoft's competitors, but that is what this Justice Department is doing. It is using the power of the Federal Government to punish Microsoft for being too successful in comparison to its competitors.

In the end, I believe, higher Federal courts will throw this case out. The

truth and the correct legal analysis will prevail—Microsoft has not harmed consumers and, thus has not violated our antitrust laws.

EDUCATION

Mr. GORTON. Mr. President, two major debates are taking place in the Congress and in the White House at the present time, two major debates relating to education.

Tomorrow we are likely to take up an amendment to establish the Teacher Empowerment Act. And tomorrow we will almost certainly deal, finally, with the appropriations bill for Labor, Health and Human Services, an appropriations bill that includes billions of dollars for public education in the United States of America.

There is a profound difference between the President of the United States and what I believe is a majority of the Members of both Houses of Congress over how that money on education should be spent. This morning's Washington Post summarizes that argument in quotations from our majority leader, Senator LOTT, and the President of the United States.

Senator LOTT said:

The big issue is, who controls it? Will Washington bureaucrats assert and control where this money is used, or will there be some discretion at the local level, based on what local needs are, whether it's books or computers or training for teachers, or for teachers themselves?

The President of the United States, according to the Washington Post:

... told reporters that the federal money for new teachers does not belong to states and local school districts. "It's not their money," he said.

What arrogance. The money does not belong to President Bill Clinton. This is money that comes out of the pockets of the American people across the United States, money they want to be used on the most effective possible education for their children.

The American people believe very firmly that decisions relating to the education of their children can be made more effectively and more sensitively at home by elected school board members, by superintendents, by principals, by teachers, and by parents than they can be by bureaucracies in the Department of Education in Washington, DC, or even by that national superintendent of public instruction, the President of the United States.

In fact, during the course of this debate over whether or not we should grant more authority to local school districts and to teachers and parents, a number of studies have come out on the question of whether the primary need in education in the United States is more teachers.

One of them comes from my own State from the Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee, the "K-12 Finance and Student Performance Study." That study, just a little bit earlier this year, stated:

An analysis of 60 well-designed studies found that increased teacher education, teacher experience, and teacher salaries all had a greater impact on student test scores per dollar spent than did lowering the student-teacher ratio. According to one researcher, "Teachers who know a lot about teaching and learning and who work in settings that allow them to know their students well are the critical elements of successful learning." Given limited funds to invest, this research suggests considering efforts to improve teacher access to high quality professional development. A recent national survey of teachers found that many do not feel well prepared to face future teaching challenges, including increasing technological changes and greater diversity in the classroom.

The legislature's approach to funding K-12 education is consistent with the JLARC [Joint Legislative Audit and Review Committee] and national research. The legislature has provided additional funding for teacher salaries, staff development, and smaller classes, with more funding going to support teachers and less for reducing the student-teacher ratio.

In fact, the chart accompanying this study shows that increasing teacher salaries is 4 times more cost efficient than reducing class size, increasing teacher experience is 4.5 times more cost efficient than reducing class size, and increasing teacher education is 5.5 times more cost efficient than reducing class size. Given this information, it is clear that the President of the United States is putting politics ahead of academic achievement for our children.

There is another interesting statement on this subject written in April of this year by Andy Rotherham at the Progressive Policy Institute, an arm of the Democratic Leadership Council. He now, incidentally, works for the President. But he wrote in April:

... President Clinton's \$1.2 billion class-size reduction initiative, passed in 1998, illustrates Washington's obsession with means at the expense of results and also the triumph of symbolism over sound policy. The goal of raising student achievement is reasonable and essential; however, mandating localities do it by reducing class sizes precludes local decision-making and unnecessarily involves Washington in local affairs.

During the debate on the Clinton class-size proposal, it was correctly pointed out that research indicates that teacher quality is a more important variable in student achievement than class size. In fact, this crucial finding was even buried in the U.S. Department of Education's own literature on the issue.

Finally, another quite liberal organization, the Education Trust, agrees that we cannot afford to make schools hire unqualified teachers. Kati Haycock, executive director of the Education Trust, said yesterday:

The last thing American children need—especially low-income children—is more under-qualified teachers. If the White House hopes to ensure that the Class Size Reduction program will boost student achievement, it should accept the Congressional Republicans' proposal that would allow only fully qualified teachers to be hired with these funds.

Teacher quality matters, and it matters a lot. Highly qualified teachers can help all students make significant achievement gains, while ineffective teachers can do great