

²⁵ Wall Street Journal, "Microsoft's Windows Bucks the Pricing Trend," March 23, 1998. (Appendix R)

²⁷ Ibid. (Appendix R)

²⁸ Response of Bill Gates to Supplemental Questions from Senator Hatch, p. 11. (Appendix S)

²⁹ *U.S. v. Microsoft Corporation*, Memorandum, at 17, and note 10. (Appendix T)

³⁰ *U.S. v. Microsoft Corporation*, Memorandum, at 2-3. (Appendix U)

Mr. HATCH. I suggest people who are interested in this issue not only listen to what I have to say here today but that they read this. I think they will find that this is a group that basically disassembles on many issues. Frankly, I don't think they need to disassemble. All they have to do is come in and tell their case forthright and in a fair and reasonable manner and do it on the merits. If you read this, I think you will realize this is a much more serious set of problems than some in the media make it, especially some of those who seem to think there should never be an enforcement of the antitrust laws.

You don't get people from the left to the right, or right to the left—from Bork to you-name-it on the left—saying that there are things that are wrong here, that there is an exploitation of the monopoly power of 90 percent of the operating system and the desktop operating systems throughout the world to crush competition and to do a number of other things that basically are violative of our laws, without their being some heat to some of the arguments that they are making.

I have to say, our committee hearings have shown that there are some things that are wrong here. It is a matter of getting people in the software industry to have the guts to come forward and tell their stories. For instance, the OEM, the original equipment manufacturers, are terrified because they depend totally on Microsoft's underlying operating system to run their machines. All Microsoft has to do is to delay the delivery of that underlying operating system or anything else they do to the OEMs by 1 week and they could be multimillions of dollars in the hole as others get an unfair advantage. We have had people come in and tell us, who are afraid to testify for fear they would lose their business, that they have been warned they better not cooperate with the committee or they better not tell the story.

This happens in a wide variety of things according to people who have come to us. Now I think they have to have the guts to get in front of the committee and tell their stories and let the chips fall where they may. If they are true, if what they have been alleging to us and to the Justice Department is true, then we ought to find out about it and Microsoft ought to have some answers for it.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan.

NOMINATION OF VICTORIA ROBERTS

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. President, in a few moments we will be voting on two judges for the Federal court. The second of those judges is Victoria Roberts, a woman who I recommended for nomination to the President of the United States. She is exceedingly well qualified by temperament, by experience, to be a district court judge. She is only the second person in our history in Michigan who has been elected both president of the State bar of Michigan and the Wolverine Bar Association.

I just thank Senator HATCH, the members of the Judiciary Committee, Senator ABRAHAM, for their support of Victoria Roberts. I am delighted that her name has been recommended to the Senate and that we will be voting upon her confirmation in a few minutes.

I thank the Chair, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SESSIONS). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. THOMAS. I ask that I may speak for 3 minutes as in morning business.

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

A BIENNIAL BUDGET

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I would like to just mention again, as we enter into the real depth of appropriations, one of the things that we have talked about a great deal that I feel very strongly about, and I think we ought to think about as we do that, is a biennial budget.

Each year in this institution we spend about half or more of our time dealing with appropriations, which leaves us very little time to do the other things that are very necessary—particularly oversight. Almost all legislative bodies in this country have biennial budgets, which gives an opportunity, first of all, for the agencies to have two years with which to know what their spending will be. Secondly, it allows the institution to have time to oversee the spending that is authorized.

Rather than take more time to talk about it, I just raise the question again and urge the leadership to give some consideration to a biennial budget, where we would make a budget for two years and then have a chance for oversight, have a chance for the agencies to know what they are doing longer, and have a chance to do some of the other business that properly comes before this body.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

NOMINATION OF A. HOWARD MATZ, TO BE U.S. DISTRICT JUDGE FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will now go into executive session for the consideration of executive calendar No. 574, which the clerk will report.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of A. Howard Matz, to be U.S. District Judge for the Central District of California.

Mrs. BOXER. Mr. President, I am very pleased that the Senate is considering today the nomination of A. Howard Matz to be U.S. District Judge for the Central District of California.

With all the support Mr. Matz has from both Democrats and Republicans, I know the Senate will agree he is eminently qualified to sit on the U.S. District Court for the Central District in California.

I first recommended Mr. Matz for this seat on the federal bench on July 23, 1997, and said then that Howard Matz is an exceptional attorney and person. His experience, intelligence, and integrity make him extremely well-qualified for the Federal bench.

Howard Matz is currently a partner in private practice. He represents largely business clients in civil and white-collar crime matters. His clients have included IBM, Walt Disney Co., the cities of Anaheim and Riverside, Yale University and numerous individuals, partnerships, lawyers, and law firms. I would like to note here that I am not related to Joel Boxer, a partner in Howard's firm.

Mr. Matz received his undergraduate degree from Columbia University and his law degree from Harvard University. In addition to working in various law firms, early in his career he clerked for U.S. District Court Judge Morris Lasker. As an Assistant U.S. Attorney in the Criminal Division, in charge of the Los Angeles Fraud and Special Prosecutions team, he has always believed the punishment should fit the crime. Mr. Matz is highly regarded in the legal community, having written many articles on legal topics and having served as a speaker and panelist on legal matters numerous times. He has received many awards and other distinctions from representatives of the Securities and Exchange Commission, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Department of Health and Human Services, and the Internal Revenue Service for cases he handled as a prosecutor.

Complementing his exceptional legal career, Matz also engages regularly in pro bono work and is very active in his