have sponsored the Compact on behalf of all my colleagues from the New England delegation. Adoption of the Compact could not have happened in Congress without the help of Dan Smith, and without the years of dedicated work from a veritable army of Compact supporters throughout New England.

This tribute reflects that with the success of the Dairy Compact we recognize the commitment to and importance of our dairy farmers. The Dairy Compact holds great promise for the New England region to preserve the viability of agriculture and to protect a special way of life●

TRIBUTE TO COUDERSPORT, PENNSYLVANIA

● Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, this year marks the 150th anniversary of Coudersport, PA. Today, I rise to discuss the establishment, growth, and achievements of this town.

Coudersport was named for Mr. Coudere, a European investor in the Ceres Land Company which owned 175,000 acres in this area of Pennsylvania. Established in 1848, the town had only 48 buildings and about 200 residents. After it was approved as the seat of the Potter County government, the village slowly grew. Just before the Civil War, Coudersport's population nearly doubled. Anti-slavery sentiment ran strong in this town. Residents held fundraisers to benefit abolitionist causes. Reminders of the town's rich history still stand. Six of the original 48 buildings are still inhabited. Today, the population of Coudersport stands at 2,854, and it is still the hub of Potter County. Although Coudersport has changed with the times, it never lost its small town charm.

Mr. President, the people of this town are proud of their history and their traditions. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating Coudersport on its 150th anniversary.●

INNOVATION AND GLOBAL LEADERSHIP

● Mr. FAIRCLOTH. Mr. President, we talk a lot around here about innovation, competitiveness and global leadership. The vast majority of us agree that these values are important and worthy of concern.

Those of us who see the inherent limitations of government know that promoting innovation and U.S. economic competitiveness is largely about getting government out of the way and letting the free market work its will.

Unfortunately, playing out today is yet another episode of government doing things to business rather than getting out of the way. Microsoft Corporation, one of America's most successful companies, has come under attack by the Clinton Justice Department at the urging of its competitors.

The Justice Department's newly aggressive Antitrust Division is waging a slick, media-intensive antitrust campaign against Microsoft. The Justice Department claims to be acting in the name of promoting competition despite the fact that the computer industry is the most dynamic, open and competitive business sector the U.S. has ever witnessed. Prices are falling, innovation is thriving and consumers are empowered as never before.

But in their wisdom, Clinton antitrust lawyers and bureaucrats have decided that the heavy hand of government will improve innovation and help consumers.

Frankly, I am fearful that this is the government's first attempt to begin regulating America's high tech industry. In my opinion, this would be a disaster.

Despite the artful and high-minded rhetoric coming from Clinton Antitrust lawyers and their few industry cheerleaders, it is inconceivable to me that government regulation will improve innovation and consumer welfare.

And it is clear that the computer industry agrees. On April 30, 1998, for example, twenty-six computer companies wrote to Joel Klein, the Assistant Attorney General, Antitrust Division, expressing their ''strongest possible concern'' about the effect on the U.S. economy of the government's campaign against Microsoft. The companies who signed the letter ranged from such industry leaders as Intel Corporation, Compaq Computer Corporation and Dell Computer Corporation, to smaller companies such as Insight Enterprises, Inc. of Tempe, Arizona and Elsinore Technologies, Inc. of Raleigh, North Carolina.

I am concerned that, in addition to threatening the freedom to innovate and consumer choice, this aggressive pursuit of Microsoft may threaten U.S. global leadership in the software and computer industry. When Congress crafted the antitrust laws, the world was a different place. Most markets were not global. Capital was not mobile. Our focus was largely domestic. In today's economy we must concern ourselves with the global implications of policy decisions.

I respect that within clear and narrow limits, basic antitrust laws are necessary to preserve free markets. But from where I sit, the track record of the Antitrust Division is hardly stellar.

For example, in 1969 the Justice Department opened a case against IBM that lasted 13 years. But by the time the government dropped the case, IBM had experienced a serious erosion of its market share at the hands of new computer startup companies, including—ironically—Microsoft. The marketplace and consumers had their say, not government.

Mr. President, is this an outcome we want for Microsoft? Is the idea to sap Microsoft's vitality through litigation so that its competitors, whether domestic or foreign can play catch-up?

Another case involved the Schwinn Bicycle Company. Once a proud and successful American manufacturer of bicycles, it found itself the subject of an antitrust prosecution in 1967. The case opened the door to foreign companies, and a weakened Schwinn ultimately declared bankruptcy in 1992. Again, is this the model for Microsoft?

Business historian Alfred D. Chandler attributes an antitrust consent decree against RCA as precipitating the decline of the U.S. electronics industry. The subsequent rise of the Japanese electronics industry is now well known.

The push to regulate the software industry under the guise of antitrust law should concern us all. It is government regulation by any other name; and like the cases above, will prove shortsighted. Who can take comfort in the thought of a federal judge deciding which features will go into software products? We have tried this before and no one should welcome a repeat.

America is the leader in software and computer innovation because government has stayed out of the way. The creative process and innovative genius marked by the software industry is fragile. The heavy hand of government regulation, whether direct or at the hands of antitrust lawyers and judges, threatens the innovations of tomorrow and the U.S. global leadership of today.

Mr. President, somewhere today, there is a 22 year old, working in his garage on a new product. Ten years from now—he or she may be America's richest individual. We don't know. But what I do know is that I don't want to deny him or her the right to be creative. To start a company and to give the big companies a run for their money. But if we go down the road of regulating this industry, I am certain that we will call to a close a very prosperous era for the U.S. I don't think we want our vibrant economy washed away because some people at the Justice Department had nothing else better to do with their time.●

''WE THE PEOPLE . . . THE CITIZEN AND THE CONSTITUTION'' STATE OF MAINE COMPETITION WINNERS

● Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise to congratulate Old Orchard Beach High School of Old Orchard Beach, Maine, for winning first place at the Maine state competition of the ''We the People . . . The Citizen and the Constitution'' program, and for their strong effort at the national finals which took place here in Washington May 2 through May 4.

I am proud that these outstanding young men and women have represented my home state. Their participation in the national finals is a direct reflection on the tremendous amount of hard work and commitment that the Old Orchard Beach students have invested in this project. The outstanding members of this class are: Lauren Asperschlager, Lucy Coulthard, Chad Daley, Rose Gordon, Krista Knowles,