

(Mr. BURTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

MAY FREEDOM AND LIBERTY CONTINUE TO FLOURISH THROUGHOUT CENTRAL EUROPE

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

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to commemorate the 10th anniversary this week of one of the most astounding events of the 20th century, the collapse of the Berlin Wall on November 9, 1989, and the collapse of Communism throughout central Europe.

What started as a ripple, solidarity's triumph in Poland in June of that summer, Hungary opening its border with Austria that summer, led to a deluge of East Germans streaming across the Berlin border and eventually tearing down the symbol of oppression in Europe, the Wall. A few short weeks later came the Velvet Revolution that changed Czechoslovakia.

One of my most cherished possessions that I keep on my desk here in Washington is a chunk of that Berlin Wall with some of the graffiti paint still on it, coincidentally, shaped like Wisconsin. I was able to knock out this piece with a sledgehammer while I was in Berlin on October 3, 1990, celebrating the reunification of both Germanys.

Today, the political map of Europe looks completely different. As this map depicts, Mr. Speaker, democracy has been flourishing and sweeping across Europe. The countries shaded in blue are those democratic nations that existed before 1989. The purple-shaded area are those countries that have evolved into democratic nations since the revolutions of 1989. Obviously, we still have some work to do in Belarus and down in the Balkans and Serbia, as represented by the red countries shown on the map.

Now, 10 years later, the events seem preordained. But at the time, no one could predict these events or know how to respond to them. Today, many want to claim credit. But the most important wall that fell was not even visible. It was the wall of fear inside people. It is difficult to describe the role that fear plays to maintain a totalitarian state.

Mikhail Gorbachev, however, changed the dynamics by sending out messages that his rule would not be sanctioned only by guns and tanks. His policies of Glasnost and Perestroika showed that not only would he not oppose reforms, but actually encourage them.

As a third-year law student, I watched with rapt attention, as the rest of the world did, to the unfolding of these events during 1989. It came at a critical point in my life. I was feeling

a little disillusioned, a little bit cynical about our own democratic process in this Nation. So I went to central Europe a few months after the resolutions, lived out of a backpack, and traveled throughout the capitals of central Europe to see these changes first hand.

While traveling there, I met the real heroes of the revolution. People who restored my hope for the institutions of democracy. They were students about my age who were on the front lines of the demonstrations, literally staring down the barrel of guns and Soviet-made tanks, not knowing if they were going to succeed or suffer another Prague Spring like in 1968 or Budapest in 1956.

History later showed that in the case of the Velvet Revolution in Czechoslovakia, velvet to symbolize the smooth and peaceful transition of power that took place, the Communist Politburo voted just five to four against ordering a massacre.

When I spoke to those students, they remembered two distinct things about the demonstrations: how cold they were during the candle light vigils that took place all night, and how scared they were knowing the history of previous reform attempts in their own country.

They did not have weapons to fight back with, only their courage. They knew they were risking it all, but they chose to do so for the sake of their own future. And they prevailed.

It is a magnificent irony of history today that one of the most oppressive Communist regimes throughout central Europe, Czechoslovakia, would later be led by former poets and playwrights in the country, one of whom was Vaclav Havel. He was one of the key leaders of the Velvet Revolution. He was the first democratically elected leader of Czechoslovakia since Mazaryek and Eduard Benes before the Second World War. He was also one of the founders of Charter 77, the moral blueprint for change in Czechoslovakia. He helped form the Civic Forum, the political alternative to the Communist regime, but not before he was in prison four times as a political dissident.

In fact, during one of his stays in prison, he became deathly ill. The Communist authorities, afraid they were going to have a martyr on their hands, went to him and told him that the people in New York who give out the Obey awards were willing to host him so he could direct his own play on Broadway as well as receive proper medical attention and care.

He asked them one question, if he went, would he be allowed to return to Czechoslovakia. They could not give that assurance. So he said I will stay instead. The rest, as we now know it, is history.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to pay a special tribute and wish a special anniversary to a few students who inspired me. To Andreas of Dresden, Peter of Krakow, Jitka, Ladka, Ivana, and Pau-

lina of Prague, happy anniversary and thank you for showing with your courage that there are some causes and ideals greater than oneself worth risking everything for. May freedom and liberty continue to flourish throughout central Europe.

GOOD TIME FOR CONGRESS TO REASSESS ANTITRUST LAWS

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

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, by now, the Microsoft antitrust case should have caught every Member's attention. This is a good time for Congress to reassess the antitrust laws.

Under current law, collusion, negotiations, or even discussions about markets may be enough to find someone guilty of breaking these laws. Prices in one industry that are too high, too low, or all the same are suspect and could be used as evidence of monopoly practices.

We must remember bigness in a free market is only achieved by the vote of consumers, supporting a company that gives them a good product at a low price.

It is an economic truism that the only true monopoly is government protected, such as the Post Office or a public utility. There is nothing more annoying than a government bureaucrat or Federal judge gleefully condemning a productive enterprising capitalist for doing a good job. These little men filled with envy are capable of producing nothing and are motivated by their own inadequacies and desires to wield authority against men of talent.

In a free market, the consumer is king, not the businessman. The regulators hate both and relish their role of making sure the market is fair according to their biased standards.

Antitrust suits are rarely, if ever, pursued by consumers. It is always a little disgruntled competitor, a bureaucrat who needs to justify his own existence.

Judge Jackson condemned Microsoft for being a "vigorous protector of its own self-interests." Now this is to be a crime in America. To care for oneself and do what corporations are supposed to do, that is, maximize profits for stockholders by making customers happy, is the great crime committed in the Microsoft case.

Blind to the fact that there is no conflict between the self-interest of a capitalist and the consumers' best interests, the trust busters go their merry way without a complaint from the Congress which could change these laws.

Only blind resentment drives the economic planners and condemns business success, good products, low prices, and consumer satisfaction while undermining the system that has provided so much for so many.

Many big companies have achieved success with government subsidies,

contracts, and special interest legislation. This type of bigness must be distinguished from bigness achieved in a free market by providing consumer satisfaction.

To help rectify the situation, Congress should first stop all assistance to business, no more corporate welfare, no bailouts like we saw to Lockheed, Chrysler, Long-Term Capital Management and many others.

Second, we ought to repeal the archaic and impossible-to-understand antitrust laws.

Next, we should crown the consumers king and let them vote with their money on who should succeed and who should fail.

We should then suppress the envy which drives the anticapitalist mentality.

The Bill Gateses of the world can only invest their money in job-creating projects or donate it to help the needy. The entrepreneurial giants are not a threat to stability or prosperity. Government bureaucrats and Federal judges are. But strict enforcement of all the ill-inspired antitrust laws does not serve the consumer, nor the cause of liberty.

WE ARE NOT GOING TO RAID THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND

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

Mr. MINGE. Mr. Speaker, this week, Congress and the administration are struggling over how we handle the so-called end game with the Federal budget. Those of us here in the House of Representatives are a critical part of this end game negotiating process in the votes that it will take to pass the budget.

One of the chief rallying cries that I hear from my colleagues is, we are not going to raid the Social Security Trust Fund. We are not going to raid the Social Security Trust Fund. We will not raid the Social Security Trust Fund. The phrase is repeated ad nauseam. But I challenge my colleagues to really accomplish what we have stated we intend to accomplish.

□ 1930

And the reason that I say this is that for many it is feared that we are only pandering to the misunderstandings and the naivete almost of the American public in claiming that we are not invading the Social Security Trust Fund to finance Federal expenditures.

I would like to point out that claims that we will not invade the Social Security Trust Fund come from all quarters, but today I was amazed to see a letter signed by the leadership of this body, the Speaker, the majority leader, the majority whip, and the conference chair on the other side of the aisle that included a sentence to this effect: "We will not schedule any piece of legislation on the House floor that spends one penny of Social Security."

I would like to contrast this with an article in the Wall Street Journal a week ago Friday that reports that the Congressional Budget Office estimates that the GOP spending bills are already over the targets by \$31 billion, and that if we look at the report from the Congressional Budget Office, we will see that the GOP spends \$17 billion of the Social Security surplus.

What is most troubling to me about this is the duplicity that is involved. We are breaching the faith of the American public. It is absolutely wrong that we resort to smoke and mirrors and gimmicks to claim that we are not going into the Social Security Trust Fund. It is all together too familiar. We heard all of these statements during the Reagan administration and during the Bush administration when we had enormous deficits. And now that we are on the verge of balancing the budget without using Social Security, I think we have just as much an obligation to the American people to be candid, to be forthright, and not resort to smoke and mirrors and tricks.

The Wall Street Journal article, which is up here, illustrates one of the problems that is involved, and that problem is picking and choosing what numbers are used to do the accounting. Anyone who has worked with certified public accountants understands accounting principles and a financial statement in terms of its integrity. And the integrity of that financial statement requires that generally accepted accounting principles must be consistently applied. That concept of consistent application is what has been violated by the leadership here in the House of Representatives by picking and choosing where the numbers come from, the Congressional Budget Office at one point, the Office of Management and Budget at another.

This violates a fundamental rule in accounting, not consistently applying the accounting principles; or, in this case, the budget forecasting. Picking and choosing. And we should no more let the White House do that than let Members of our own body do that. We in Congress should stand square behind the principle that we insist that the budget forecasting process have integrity, and that we not claim that no such bill has been on the floor of the House when the Wall Street Journal has already reported that we have done it and when the Congressional Budget Office has already reported that we are \$17 billion into the Social Security surplus.

We must improve our practices if we are going to continue to have any credibility. We cannot have letters of the type that are circulating in this Chamber today. And, Mr. Speaker, I will submit this letter for the RECORD.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, November 8, 1999.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: Many of you are asking when we expect the budget negotiations to be completed. We expect budget negotiations to be complete when we have a balanced budget that doesn't raid Social Security,

doesn't raise taxes and pays down the debt for the third year in a row.

Earlier this year our conference committed to stop the 30-year raid on Social Security—and according to the Congressional Budget Office, we have done that. The President began the budget negotiations by taking a large step our way and joining us in our commitment to lock away every penny of Social Security. We're working with him in a bipartisan fashion to protect retirement security.

The key to the whole puzzle is protecting Social Security and paying down debt. We will not schedule any piece of legislation on the House floor that spends one penny of Social Security. That said, we expect to adjourn for the year when we've ensured that every penny of Social Security is locked away.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact us personally.

Sincerely,

J. DENNIS HASTERT,
Speaker of the House.
DICK ARMEY,
Majority Leader.
TOM DELAY,
Majority Whip.
J.C. WATTS,
Conference Chairman.

ONE PENNY ON A DOLLAR WILL SAVE SOCIAL SECURITY

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

Mr. KINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to start off by just kind of rebutting my distinguished colleague. The Wall Street Journal is a great newspaper, but, tell me, have my colleagues ever read a newspaper that does not sometimes get it wrong; does not stretch the truth?

Here is a report from the Congressional Budget Office. Now, I know the good folks at the Wall Street Journal know everything there is about Congress and spending and so forth, but these people are actually hired to do this job, they are the ones who are in the room. CBO stands for Congressional Budget Office, and they have certified that the Republican budget does not raid the Social Security Trust Fund, as have the Democrat budgets for the past 40 years. Here is what it says: Projected on-budget surplus under the congressional scoring, the way it is done, \$1 billion, and this is as of October 27, 1999.

Now, it is real odd to me that people who have been voting against every single appropriations bill because they do not spend enough money are now coming in here in the 11th hour and trying to rewrite the rules. Where was this fiscal austerity back during the September and October debates? All we heard from the liberal side of the aisle was, "You don't spend enough money, so we are going to vote no."

Well, hello, where does the money come from? Social Security. We have held the line on it, we have passed the appropriation bills, 13 of them on Republican votes, because we could not