Senate again. This legislation enjoys the strong support of both of the SEC's regulated industries and the administration. It is crucial that the Senate take up and pass this legislation today, to protect the smooth operation of our markets, to ensure that investors are protected, and to guarantee the efficient operation of our Government.

GATT

Mr. DANFORTH. Mr. President, I will vote in favor of the Uruguay round implementing legislation when it comes before the full Senate later this year.

The Uruguay round GATT agreement is a historic achievement. It was negotiated by three Presidents. It is the world's largest tax cut. It will cut worldwide tariffs on U.S. exports by almost 40 percent. The reduction in these trade barriers will create hundreds of thousands of high-paying jobs for American workers.

Equally important, the new agreement expands the rules of the GATT to cover important areas of international trade previously outside the GATT. The agreement establishes international trading rules to protect U.S. intellectual property rights and to govern trade in services—two areas where the United States has a clear competitive advantage. It also phases out quotas on textiles and apparel goods over 10 years. And the agreement for the first time sets limits on agricultural subsidies. European agricultural export subsidies that have injured U.S. farmers will be cut by 21 percent over 6 years.

Furthermore, the Uruguay round establishes a new dispute settlement procedure to ensure that we can enforce our rights as a nation under the GATT. Under current GATT rules, a country that loses a dispute can block the GATT from enforcing the rules against it. The European Union has used this loophole against the United States in numerous cases where we had won cases at the GATT. Under the new World Trade Organization, other countries will no longer be able to block GATT cases against them. This will permit us to enforce the rules of the GATT to open foreign markets to our exports.

Finally, it should be noted that several concerns that I and other Republican Senators had expressed regarding the implementing legislation for the GATT have been successfully resolved during the drafting of that legislation in the Finance Committee.

As my colleagues know, I had serious objections to the new subsidies rules negotiated by the Clinton administration. These rules permit certain green light subsidies to be granted by governments without the possibility of imposing countervailing duties to offset the injurious effects of those subsidies. These green light rules would put the United States on the horns of a dilemma, forcing us to choose between subsidizing our own industries, or allowing them to lose out to subsidized foreign competition. To address this problem, several provisions were added to the implementing bill to define narrowly what constitutes a green-lighted subsidy, to sunset the green light categories at the end of 5 years, and to provide a new trade remedy for U.S. industries injured by foreign green-lighted subsidies.

There was also substantial Republican opposition to the administration's request for a grant of fast track authority linking trade policy to labor and environmental issues. I oppose any linkage between trade and labor and environmental policies because it would subordinate trade policy to these other objectives, and would lead to the closing of the U.S. market rather than the opening of foreign markets to U.S. exports. In the face of these concerns, the administration agreed to drop its request for an extension of fast track authority from the Uruguay round implementing bill. Instead, the Senate will consider separate legislation to renew fast track authority next year. The resolution of this issue earlier this month cleared the way for consideration of the implementing bill this year.

Mr. President, given the clear benefits of the Uruguay round to the United States, I urge all my colleagues to support quick passage of the implementing legislation before we adjourn next week. The sooner we can pass this historic trade agreement, the better off we will be as a country.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE REPUBLIC OF CHINA ON ITS 83D NATIONAL DAY

Mr. WALLOP. Mr. President, on the occasion of the 83d National Day of the Republic of China, I offer my best wishes and congratulations to President Lee Teng-hui, Vice President Li Yuan-zu and Foreign Minister Fredrick Chien of the Republic of China on Taiwan. Together they have made Taiwan into one of the most democratic and prosperous nations in East Asia.

It is my hope that the Republic of China will be able to become a member of GATT and the United Nations in the near future. The Republic of China is clearly an economic power and deserves full participation in world affairs.

It is also my hope that there will be further strengthening of relations between Washington and Taipei. In the not too distant future, we hope to be able to welcome President Lee Teng-hui and other ROC leaders to Washington, DC. Furthermore, we hope that our Government will soon see the efforts made by the ROC in environmental protection, including wildlife, and pollution control.

I am confident that the future of our relations with Taipei will remain as bright as ever, and I urge my colleagues to work with Taipei's new representative in Washington, Ambassador Benjamin Lu, a diplomat of impeccable credentials.

ON THE 125TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF MAHATMA GANDHI

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, I rise to bring to my colleagues attention a very important anniversary which will be celebrated over the weekend. Sunday, October 2 is the 125th birth anniversary of Mohandas Karamchand Gandhi—the Mahatma.

It is difficult to capture the profound impact that Gandhi had on our world. His is still a household name admired some 125 years after his birth. A name which calls up inspiring images of a single man dressed in hand-spun cloth, leading a nation to independence. The effects of his nonviolent actions were not limited to his country, nor his time. Leaders of today continue to study his life and adopt aspects of his thought.

If I may invade ever so slightly the privacy of the President's luncheon table, in May, 1994, Mr. Clinton had as his guest the distinguished Prime Minister of India, Mr. P.V. Narasimha Rao, who in his youth was a follower of Mahatma Gandhi. In a graceful passage, the P.M. related how it came to pass that Mahatma Gandhi, caught up in the struggle for fair treatment to the Indian community in South Africa, and in consequence in jail, read Thoreau's essay on "Civil Disobedience" which confirmed his view that an honest man is duty-bound to violate unjust laws. He took this view home with him, and in the end the British raj gave way to an independent Republic of India. Then Martin Luther King, Jr. repatriated the idea and so began the great civil rights movement of this century. A movement even so, still far from fulfillment.

It is no fluke that in 1994, when the heads of two democracies governing over one-fifth of the world lunch, that Mahatma Gandhi should be a topic of conversation. Even as we pause on the threshold of a new millennium, we recall how his legacy shaped us and how it will be carried into the future.

U.S. COMMUNICATIONS LAWS

Mr. PRESSLER. Mr. President, I was disappointed by Commerce Committee Chairman HOLLINGS' announcement Friday that S. 1822 would not be considered by the Senate prior to sine die adjournment. I will not say that S. 1822 was a perfect bill. Commerce Committee members worked diligently to fashion a bill that would be acceptable to the Senate. As a member of the farm team, a group of original cosponsors of the bill who represent small city and rural areas, I want to commend Chairman HOLLINGS, ranking minority member DANFORTH, and their staffs for their willingness to consider provisions to ensure that all Americans have the opportunity to benefit from advanced communication services, whether they live in New York City or Humboldt, SD.

We need to revise our Nation's communications laws. The current statute is 60 years old, and does not address the realities of today. The Modified Final Judgment [MFJ] entered into by AT&T and the Federal court in 1982 is still in force. The Bell Operating Companies created by the MFJ to this day must seek relief from the judge charged with overseeing the 1982 agreement. These companies are proscribed from entering into the long distance service market and from manufacturing telecommunications equipment. These companies have been pursuing opportunities to expand their services through the U.S. court system. This is precisely why Congress must act. It is poor public policy for the U.S. judicial system to bear the burden of administering and adjudicating a significant segment of the Nation's telecommunication industry. Providing appropriate laws for this important industry sector is a legislative branch responsibility. I know many of my colleagues believe as I do that it is important for us to address this issue early in the next Congress.

Failure to act on legislation to set appropriate guidelines for such an important industry would hurt us internationally as well as domestically. The U.S. telecommunications services and equipment industries are the most competitive in the world. Our telecommunications companies are in the international market and are doing well, frequently against great odds that are stacked against them in many countries.

United States telecommunications executives in Europe privately have complained to me that the majority of the European Union [EU] member countries resist opening their markets. The Europeans will quickly point to United States restrictions on foreign ownership of radio licenses to make a weak argument that the United States market is not open. This is a red herring. The U.S. telecommunications equipment market is wide open. Ericsson, Philips, British Telecom, Siemens, and other European firms know this well and provide jobs to thousands of Americans in their plants in the United States.

The United States has used quiet diplomacy to encourage the European Union countries to open their markets. The goal adopted by the EU was liberalization of all telecommunications markets by 1998. Earlier this year, I had an article printed in The Wall Street Journal outlining why the United States could not wait until 1998 for liberalization. I ask unanimous consent that this article appear at this point in the RECORD. Shortly after this article appeared, the European Parliament adopted a resolution to delay liberalization past the 1998 target. That is unacceptable.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Wall Street Journal Europe, July 7, 1994]

U.S. CALLERS PAY FOR EUROPE'S MONOPOLIES

(By Larry Pressler)

U.S. communications companies are working hard to do business in Europe. Their task is not easy. Despite Europe's professed commitment to open its telecom markets, government-owned phone monopolies are still preventing U.S. firms from competing on their turf.

The failure of Europeans to open their markets affects not only U.S. communications equipment and service suppliers. It also affects everyone in America who uses a telephone, since U.S. long distance carriers and their ratepayers must subsidize European telephone companies. European nations received approximately $554 million from U.S. carriers in 1993. Approximately $411 million were subsidies imposed on U.S. carriers for the right to have customers' calls connected in Europe.

These subsidies are a direct charge to U.S. consumers: It is estimated that the average U.S. international caller pays $100 each year due to the above-cost accounting subsidies to foreign telephone companies.

Here's how it works. International carriers negotiate a rate for calls placed between two countries. This negotiated rate does not reflect the real economic cost of connecting the call, nor does it reflect the rates charged in the calling country. For example, Germany's Deutsche Bundespost Telekom, a government-owned monopoly, could insist in its negotiations with any of the 183 U.S. carriers offering service from the U.S. that it will cost $1.18 per minute for calls between the U.S. and Germany. This figure may be far above the real cost.

Deutsche Telekom has been able to price international calls above the actual cost because there has been no other carrier in Germany. The German collection rate for an international call exceeds the actual economic cost of the call by as much as 75%. In 1993, U.S. carriers paid Deutsche Telekom almost $196 million as settlement for calls placed from Germany to the United States. Approximately $146 million of this figure represents a pure subsidy. Calling rates between European countries are generally lower, though European consumers also pay for the lack of competition in telecommunications by higher rates than are found within, say, the U.S.

The result is an irrational and anti-market system of international communications whereby American international long distance carriers and consumers are subsidizing phone rates in Europe. The cost of sending a letter between points in Europe and the United States is the same. But a telephone call from Frankfurt, Germany, to Sioux Falls, South Dakota, will cost significantly more if placed from Germany than from the United States. This defies logic.

The EU is scheduled to implement internal liberalization of the telecoms market by January 1998. To be sure, some progress is being made. European companies are exploiting loopholes in EU law and lobbying politicians to open their markets to competition. The electric utility holding company Viag AG, for instance, will be offering telephone service to big German companies in late next year, presenting for the first time an alternative to Deutsche Telekom. The EU Commission has supported this in principle, but the bureaucratic hegemons of state telecom monopolies, flanked by the unions, are not anxious to comply. Moreover, this spirit of liberalization has not translated to open markets for foreign competitors.

By opening their basic telephone services market to competition, the cost of calling would be reduced, encouraging more Europeans to make phone calls to the United States. Without market liberalization, the U.S. carriers—and U.S. ratepayers—will continue to pay higher settlement costs to European companies each year.

The U.S. Congress should consider requiring the adoption of a telecommunications trade-in-service agreement as a condition for the implementation of the new GATT agreement. No proposal is on the negotiating table currently and U.S. negotiators report that, despite the rhetoric, real progress on getting Europe to open its markets is slow.

If the EU is unwilling to negotiate, the United States must seek bilateral agreements with nations, such as the U.K., that have made a real effort to liberalize their markets. If the U.S. is to approve the proposed purchase of 20% of U.S.-owned Sprint by European telephone monopolies Deutsche Telekom and France Telecom, then it is only fair that U.S. companies be able to provide basic telephone services in Germany and France.

The U.S. market may be criticized for not being completely open in all sectors, but it is still the most open market in the world. If Europeans want to compete in our backyard, they should be ready for the U.S. to compete in theirs. We cannot wait until 1998.

Mr. PRESSLER. The U.S. international telecommunications carriers pay settlement rates to European nations of approximately $554 million each year. Of this figure, $411 million is a pure subsidy. Worldwide, our carriers are paying $4 billion a year in settlement rates, of which an estimated $2.3 billion is a subsidy. This is not a small amount of money; it is a major outpayment of U.S. hard currency that is equivalent to approximately 30 percent of our total foreign assistance budget.

International accounting rate settlements and foreign market liberalization must be given greater attention by Congress and the administration. I have no quarrel with the acquisition of stakes in U.S. carriers by foreign telecommunication companies. Indeed, such acquisitions may result in the accelerated liberalization of markets in France and Germany.

AT&T Chairman Robert Allen addressed Comm Week's International Network Economy Conference in Washington Monday on this point. He forcefully addressed the U.S. international carriers' need for relief from paying excessive subsidies for the completion of telephone calls to foreign nations. I agree with Mr. Allen that the Federal Communications Commission [FCC] must give priority to the development of a comparable market access standard for foreign companies. I have written to FCC Chairman Reed Hundt about this matter, and I will have the opportunity to speak with him about it this week.

Mr. President, I ask permission for AT&T Chairman Robert Allen's timely and frank speech to be printed in the RECORD at this point.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEYNOTE SPEECH OF ROBERT E. ALLEN, COMM WEEK INTERNATIONAL NETWORKED ECONOMY CONFERENCE

Thank you Denis, and good morning everyone.

It goes without saying that it's a privilege to keynote the first session of this conference. And it's an honor to follow Anne Bingaman.

It's also a little ironic that the last time I was invited to speak at a Comm Week conference in Washington, AT&T was in the throes of acquiring NCR. Now we've just completed the acquisition of McCaw Cellular.

It's beginning to look like a major acquisition is a prerequisite for getting invited; and if that's the case, we can't afford to have me come back again too soon.

When I was here in 1991, the term "Information Superhighway" wasn't quite in mass circulation.

Today some people object to that term on aesthetic grounds. They're just plain tired of hearing it.

But I have to confess, I like it.

There's a good reason why the highway metaphor has become so widely used. It's a form of short-hand for the collective expectations people all over the world have for what information technology can deliver.

Expectations differ from country to country, from business to business and household to household. But around the world, there's a well-justified sense of excitement about the benefits of emerging information technology. And more than a little concern about how those benefits should be delivered.

Part of the appeal of the superhighway is the image it gives of high speed, high volume traffic with easy access.

A highway system like that expedites trade in goods between people in distant places. A Global Information Superhighway should do the same thing for trade in information and services.

To build an information superhighway, we need a strong foundation in the form of a global communications market that offers the same kind of access and mobility associated with a modern highway.

We need a market where customers consistently have access to competitive choices.

We need a market that can provide multinational companies with truly seamless, worldwide services.

And we need a market where communications companies are free to cross national borders to give customers the services they want.

Clearly, we don't have a market like that yet; not in most parts of the world. The main reason we don't have it is the lingering fear of competition, especially when it comes to providing basic network services in countries outside the United States.

But anyone who went through the competitive revolution in the United States over the last ten years understands the benefits of competition to customers. And what's good for customers is good for industries and countries.

Conversely, any industry or country that ignores what's good for customers is ignoring its own long-term interests.

Earlier this month a group of visiting telecommunications officials from developing counties in Africa met with FCC Chairman Reed Hundt, who'll be speaking to us at lunch. He told them it was an illusion to think that any nation can't afford to have competition in its telecom market.

Specifically, the chairman said, quote: "Countries and consumers can't afford NOT to have competition. Competition helps lower prices, increase efficiency, improve and expand service. It encourages the entry of the most modern technologies and increases a country's competitiveness in the world market."

We've all heard that the winds of competition are blowing in communications markets around the world. And that's true. The need for competition is recognized just about everywhere, first and foremost by customers. But after years of discussion, those winds of competition aren't much more than a light breeze.

In the industrialized countries of Western Europe, the European Union has consistently called for liberalized market access and competition. That's a sincere effort. But even the most optimistic view of the EU's plans doesn't include concrete market results for voice infrastructure competition until 1998, at the very earliest.

But one thing IS certain; the same trade barriers that are impeding competition in the market for communications services are also impeding construction of the Global Information Superhighway.

Consider the five principles of Global Information Infrastructure issued by Vice President Gore at the World Telecommunications Development Conference last March in Buenos Aires.

Number one, encourage private investment.

Number two, promote competition.

Number three, create a flexible regulatory frame work that can keep pace with rapid technological and market changes.

Number four, provide open access to the network for all information providers.

And number five, ensure universal service.

I think those five principles make excellent construction guidelines for the Global Information Superhighway. And they remind us that technology alone won't get us where we want to go.

The most efficient rule for traveling on the Information Superhighway is a high-octane blend of technology and competition, with a light touch of public policy.

The ideal mix differs from country to country. But too many countries have trouble applying the competition element of this formula—especially when it come to basis network services in their own markets.

On the other hand, the interest in technology has set off a boom in infrastructure investment worldwide.

You can pick up the Wall Street Journal or the Financial Times almost any day and see headlines about high tech alliances and budding multimedia services. But keep in mind that two-thirds of the world's households don't even have telephones.

One half the world's population, about three billion people, are still waiting to make their first phone call. Never mind accessing a multimedia data base.

So it's no wonder that visions of the Global Information Superhighway look different in different parts of the world.

But there's universal recognition of the link between information technology and economic growth. Many countries are playing catch-up, and playing it well, especially in East Asia, Latin America, Eastern Europe and the former Soviet Union.

In fact, the UN just reported a record of $80 billion in private foreign investment in developing countries last year. And the majority of that investment went to countries with ambitious infrastructure programs. Twenty-six billion went to China alone.

The growth of China's infrastructure is even more breathtaking than the double-digit growth of its economy.

China is expanding its national network at the rate of 12 million lines a year. Six years from now it plans to be expanding at almost that rate—20 million lines a year. In terms of capacity that's the equivalent of creating a new Bell Atlantic or Nynex every year.

China seems intent on realizing its potential of being an economic superpower in the 21st Century. And its leaders recognize that they need a world class information infrastructure to make that happen.

AT&T has memorandum of understanding with China that covers a long-term partnership to provide services, equipment and technology throughout the system. And I can assure you that the Chinese not only have a voracious appetite for more capacity, they also have gourmet tastes in technology.

The Chinese government is determined that their information infrastructure will be in the fast lane of the Global Information Superhighway, and they are by no means alone in that desire.

I was in Saudi Arabia this summer for the launching of the biggest single network expansion project ever outside the United States. The Saudis are doubling their national network, from 1.5 million to 3 million lines, all digital.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is looking for economic diversification. And they, too, want an infrastructure that can take full advantage of anything coming down the global information superhighway.

We've seen the same kind of determination at work in South Korea, Mexico, Argentina and many other countries.

But the newest chapter in the world infrastructure story is being written right here in the United States.

Until just the last few years, the market for transmission and switching systems in the U.S. was huge, but barely growing. That's changed dramatically.

The regional Bell companies, GTE and some of their competitors in the cable television business, are investing in the technology to deliver multimedia consumer services—the kind of services people in this country associate with the idea of an information Superhighway. We're working as a technology supplier to both industries.

The advanced state of technology is due in no small measure to the advanced state of competition in the U.S. market. For a variety of reasons, the fuel of choice on our National Information Superhighway is blended in about equal parts of technology and competition. And so far, public policy has walked the fine line of supporting the expansion of information technology while leaving the actual work to competitors in the marketplace.

There's still some work to do in getting the FCC and some state regulators out of the business of regulating prices in long distance. And we still have some work to do in introducing competition into the local exchange market.

That's the newest frontier in America's continuing competitive revolution. And the action is centered right here in Washington.

Congress has been debating the first major communications legislation in this country in 60 years.

Unfortunately, events compelled withdrawal of the Hollings bill in the Senate on Friday. So apparently there won't be telecommunications reform this year.

We've supported the Hollings bill because it provides a logical approach to the expansion of competition.

It anticipated the local exchange companies' eventual freedom to enter the already competitive long distance market. But not until the introduction of real competition, in the local exchange market, where the local exchange companies still have a monopoly.

That arrangement strikes me as fair. And hopefully, these principles will be part of any legislation proposed in congress next year.

Meanwhile, the size and relative openness of the U.S. market have attracted competition from all over the industrialized world. Unfortunately the open door policy of the U.S. market has not generated comparable progress in other countries. They want the freedom to compete for customers in the United States, but they haven't taken significant steps to dismantle their monopoly control at home.

I don't mean any disrespect to my fellow panelists or to their companies. And I certainly don't want to suggest that anyone in America should be telling another country how to run its telecommunications system.

France Telecom and the Deutsche Bundespost have created some of the best technical infrastructure in the world. They've been serving their own populations for most of this century without any policy advice from the United States, thank you very much.

But the problems created by closed markets transcend the borders of any one nation.

The proposal of France Telecom and Deutsche Bundespost Telekom to enter the U.S. network services market through their investment in Sprint goes well beyond the internal policies of any of the countries involved. It underscores the question of whether America can afford to open the door to competitors from countries which offer very little in the way of comparable market access.

If I may be permitted to answer my own question: The time for this lop-sided arrangement is long past.

Not just because it strikes many people as unfair, but more important, it deprives U.S. customers of competitive choices in the global market, and it poses the risk of reducing the competition that's already the strength of the U.S. market.

Meanwhile, business and residential customers are looking for the best possible combination of price and service here and abroad. They want the option of buying exactly the services they want from the carrier of their choice. And they want that carrier to meet their needs inside and across the borders of other countries.

Even putting aside the new information services that will be coming down the superhighway, competitive access is crucial for delivering the full benefits of the voice and data services that make up most of the global market right now.

The big multinational customers whose buying power drives that market are growing impatient. They've been teased long enough with the promise of competitive choices for seamless global connections through the world's public switched networks.

That's impossible right now. Not because technology is lacking, but because competition is lacking. And competition will remain lacking as long as carriers from other countries are allowed to compete in the U.S. at the same time they sharply restrict access to their home markets.

This just doesn't make sense for customers. They are being denied the economic benefits of facilities-based competition among carriers outside the United States.

Permitting any country to operate this kind of a closed market while its own affiliate competes on an equal footing in the United States is not in the best interests of full and fair competition.

And the France Telecom/Deutsche Bundespost Telekom/Sprint deal as proposed now would not fit any reasonable definition of full and fair competition.

Not as long as France and Germany maintain their tight grip on competition in switched voice services and infrastructure.

It's encouraging that France and Germany have recently made significant strides in bringing international settlement rates down closer to cost—a practice we'd like to see more countries emulate.

American international callers pay out $4 billion a year more than the U.S. takes in from all foreign governments. An estimated $2.3 billion of that is pure subsidy. It amounts to a tax on Americans.

And while they're collecting this premium to complete calls from America, many countries use discriminatory rates to charge carriers from other parts of the world substantially less for similar access.

High and discriminatory settlement rates are symptoms of uncompetitive markets. They represent toll booths on the Global Information Superhighway, and the tolls are still too high.

It's time for strong action by the U.S. government to demonstrate that comparable market access is no longer an abstract hope. It's a principle, a standard for telecommunications trade between the U.S. and other countries, and a necessity for giving customers the level of services they want.

Specifically, we are asking the Federal government to take action now.

We are requesting that the FCC act on the filing we made a year ago and develop uniform rules that would make comparable market access a standard for foreign carriers to enter the U.S. telecom services market. And we're asking the FCC to review the France Telecom/Deutsche Bundespost Telekom/Sprint deal in the context of that standard.

We're calling on the commission to use its statutory authority to require foreign carriers looking to do business in the U.S. to first demonstrate that their home markets are open to competition in basic services, and provide the kind of network interconnections that go with true competition.

And, of course, we want the commission to insist that any foreign carrier looking to compete in this market offer cost-based, non-discriminatory accounting rates to all U.S. carriers.

The Department of Justice is already reviewing the antitrust issues raised by the France Telecom/Deutsche Bundespost Telekom investment in Sprint. But I can't imagine any set of conditions imposed here that would be more effective than the establishment of real competition in France and Germany.

With that in mind, we're requesting that the U.S. Trade representative begin negotiations to achieve comparable access in France and Germany, and we're asking the U.S. Congress to examine the larger issue of comparable market access globally.

This kind of attention to the market for services would be entirely consistent with the support already provided by the Clinton Administration for the rising trend in American exports of telecommunications equipment. The freedom of American carriers to provide their customers with end-to-end global services should not be impeded by political boundaries.

We're not asking the U.S. government to create a draconian set of market entry conditions here. The bottom line is simply this: We want U.S. carriers to have the practical opportunity to compete in the home markets of other carriers on a comparable basis with the opportunity those carriers have in the U.S.

I have great respect for France Telecom/Deutsche Bundespost Telekom and Sprint. AT&T has known them individually as customers, competitors and suppliers. I don't even fault the French and German companies for trying to take advantage of the lop-sided market access policies in America.

But I would find fault with American public policy if it continues to allow this kind of market imbalance on a case by case basis. American policy-makers should be leaders in seeing that national boundaries don't stand between customers and competitive choices.

We appreciate the progressive forces at work in Europe. They recognize the value and the necessity of competition in delivering the benefits of the Information Superhighway.

We applaud their efforts to open up their markets to competition. And we sincerely hope that the U.S. government will support those efforts by setting policies that encourage full and fair competition in basic communications services.

If our government is successful in that, America will earn the gratitude of all future travelers on the Global Information Superhighway, whatever their starting points, and whatever their destinations.

Thank you very much.

MATTHEW J. BRAUN, A YOUNG SCHOLAR

Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, yesterday's Chicago Tribune carried splendid news indeed about the scholastic achievements of Mr. Matthew J. Braun, the son of our distinguished colleague from Illinois, Senator CAROL MOSELEY-BRAUN. Matthew Braun, who is a senior at St. Ignatius College Preparatory School in Chicago, has been named a semifinalist in the National Achievement Scholarship Program for Outstanding Negro Students, which is conducted by the National Merit Scholarship Corp. Fewer than 90 high school students in the State of Illinois, and just 1,500 nationally, have earned this distinction. As a semifinalist, Matthew is now eligible to be awarded one of 800 achievement scholarships.

This is a fine accomplishment and one in which Matthew and his family should take great pride. I know all Senators join me in congratulating Matthew Braun and his mother, Senator MOSELEY-BRAUN, in whose footsteps Matthew already seems to be following—withal he is leery of politics and determined not to become a lawyer. I ask unanimous consent that the article from the Chicago Tribune of September 29, 1994, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BLACK SCHOLARSHIP SEMIFINALISTS ANNOUNCED

More than 80 Illinois high school students—including 16 from Chicago's Whitney Young Magnet High School—are among the approximately 1,500 semifinalists competing in a national scholarship program for African-American students.

The seniors are eligible for about 800 achievement scholarships, worth about $3 million, from the National Achievement Scholarship Program for Outstanding Negro Students. The privately financed program is being conducted by the National Merit Scholarship Corp.

This year's Illinois semifinalists include: