

That can be accomplished through deregulation. History shows us that deregulation of industry benefits the consumer. We should be working to pass legislation that deregulates.

S. 652 contains a prescription for a larger and more intrusive Government in Washington.

The bill mandates over 80 new regulatory proceedings that the Congressional Budget Office estimates will cost over \$81 million to implement. Moreover, it is squarely at odds with nearly a quarter century of well-considered, soundly crafted, and broadly successful regulatory reform initiatives which commanded strong bipartisan support and, in the final analysis, yielded substantial consumer dividends for the American public. Back in 1970, the Senate Commerce Committee began work to deregulate a number of key, infrastructure industries. Airline, truck and rail, broadcast, maritime, cable, and freight regulatory reforms were initiated and successfully carried forward. These reforms paralleled changes which were occurring in the world at large, as the notion of pervasive, central economic planning by Government—embodied in the now-bankrupt Communist teaching and doctrine—faltered and competitive free enterprise concepts were adopted and embraced.

Senator PACKWOOD and I offered a series of amendments to S. 652 to make the bill more deregulatory. One amendment would have eliminated from the bill provisions which give the FCC excessive and unnecessary policymaking power. Another would have struck the community users provisions in the bill. A third amendment would have replaced the bill's universal service scheme with a voucher system that would have truly empowered consumers.

Unfortunately, all of those amendments were defeated.

I do want to thank the Commerce Committee chairman and ranking member for accepting some other amendments. I had sought to change the definition of the universal service contained in the bill. The universal service definition was far too broad and would have potentially cost consumers and companies hundreds of millions of dollars. The committee adopted the definition of universal service that I proposed as part of the manager's package of amendments.

Also included in the manager's package was an amendment I intended to offer to strike the DBS tax provisions in the bill. The legislation contained language that would have authorized the States to order DBS television providers to act as State tax collectors. This was an ill-conceived concept and I am very pleased that it was struck from the bill.

I was also very pleased that the committee accepted my amendment mandating that the FCC report any increases in the fees charged to communications companies as part of their

universal service obligation and another amendment to means test the community users section of the bill. Both improved the bill.

Last, although I could not support this legislation, I want to thank Chairman PRESSLER. He did a masterful job of shepherding this bill through the Senate. He deserves specific praise for his efforts.

I also want to thank ranking Member HOLLINGS, Senator ROCKEFELLER, Senator SNOWE, and Senator PACKWOOD.

Their staff also deserve considerable praise for their efforts and hard work. I also want to thank Adam Thier of the Heritage Foundation, Bob Corn-Revere of Hogan & Hartson, and Jeffrey Blumenfeld and Christy Kunin of Blumenfeld & Cohen for their input and advocacy regarding the telecommunications voucher program.

I appreciate their help, and I thank them for their efforts.

HOUSTON ROCKETS WIN NBA CHAMPIONSHIP

Mrs. HUTCHISON. Mr. President, on Wednesday a team from my home State, the Houston Rockets, won their second consecutive NBA Championship, defeating the Orlando Magic four games to none. The Rockets overcame everything from injuries to midseason trade to, finally, one of the toughest playoff schedules over.

To understand the full significance of Wednesday night's victory, Mr. President, you must understand the history of Houston's two star players, Hakeem Olajuwon and Clyde Drexler. Both attended the University of Houston in the first part of the 1980's. In 1983 and 1984, Olajuwon and Drexler took their University of Houston team to the NCAA National Championship game. Soon after, they both went their separate ways. But this past Valentine's Day, in a trade many sports critics called unnecessary, the Rockets put Drexler back with his old college teammate Olajuwon. Wednesday night, the critics were proven wrong.

The Houston Rockets set an NBA playoff record by winning seven road games in a row. On their way to the NBA title, they won 11 out of their last 13 games. In the Western Conference Finals, they defeated the team with the best record in the regular season, another treasured Texas gem the San Antonio Spurs. As a team that never got the respect that it deserved when it won the title last year, Houston can now celebrate a title that will long be remembered. For most of the team, the second one is so much sweeter; but to Clyde Drexler, after 12 years in the NBA, this is the sweetest.

Mr. President, to repeat as champions with a four-game sweep is unprecedented. Five times the Rockets faced elimination and five times—with poise, determination, and character—they prevailed. The championship was a total team effort and everyone contributed.

Mr. President, I am sure that my colleagues will be glad to join me in congratulating the 1995 NBA World Champion Houston Rockets. For a team that started the playoffs with the sixth seed in the tournament, they are the lowest seed ever to win a World Championship. The Rockets showed their most adamant critics that they were not about to give up. In the words of head coach Rudy Tomjanovich, "Never underestimate the heart of a champion."

Mr. President, I just wanted to make sure that we recognized this great team effort, and the heart of these champions. And I am very proud of the Houston Rockets today, as last year, for their repeat world championship in basketball Wednesday.

I yield the floor, and I thank you, Mr. President.

THE SURGEON GENERAL

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, we have been without a Surgeon General now for 6 months. I was very pleased when Senator DOLE mentioned he was going to meet with Dr. Foster. I hope that meeting can take place. I think the vote in our committee clearly illustrated there is a will on the part of this body to confirm Dr. Foster. I notice even those who voted against Dr. Foster had praise for his dedication and sincerity. I hope we can move soon on this Foster nomination. I think we have delayed enough.

If he is going to be voted down, let us vote him down. But I think we will approve him. I think he should be approved. I think those of us who were on the committee who heard him testify were very impressed by what he had to say.

NOMINATION OF DR. HENRY FOSTER TO BE SURGEON GENERAL

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, I wish to address the Senate on the situation facing the President's nomination submitted to the Senate for the office of Surgeon General.

Mr. President, it is now nearly 4 months since President Clinton sent to the Senate the nomination of Dr. Henry Foster to be Surgeon General of the United States. On May 2 and 3, the Labor Committee held hearings on the nomination and on May 26 the committee voted to approve the nomination and sent it to the full Senate for final action.

Already 3 weeks have passed and nothing further has happened. It is time for a vote.

Dr. Foster has demonstrated his impressive qualifications, his character, and his vision for the future of health care in this country. During the committee hearings, he successfully put to rest the charges attacking his character and his ability. He earned the admiration and respect of the committee and the American public. Even some who opposed the nomination have expressed the belief that the Senate

should vote. Other opponents have threatened to filibuster to prevent a final vote.

It is time for the Senate to act. By now it is obvious that Dr. Foster is a highly principled physician and educator who has devoted his life and his career to the service of others. His record is outstanding. He has been widely praised for his contributions to the quality of health care for his patients, for his service to his community, and for his research and teaching and medicine. We do a disservice to Dr. Foster, the Senate and the Nation as a whole by prolonging this process.

The Nation has now been without a Surgeon General for 6 months, and there is no justification for further delay. Only one issue is holding up this nomination. Many other issues have been raised as a smokescreen, but they are easily dispelled. The real issue delaying this nomination is the issue of abortion. The diehard opponents of a woman's right to choose are doing all they can to block this nomination because Dr. Foster participated in a small number of abortions during his 38-year career. But Dr. Foster is a baby doctor, not an abortion doctor. He has delivered thousands of healthy babies, often in the most difficult circumstances of poverty and neglect. As one commentator has observed, "Dr. Foster has saved more babies than Operation Rescue."

In any event, abortion is a legal medical procedure and a constitutionally protected right. It is not a disqualification for the office of Surgeon General of the United States. And there is no justification for some of our Republican colleagues to try to make it one.

Dr. Foster is an obstetrician and a gynecologist, and it is no surprise to anyone that he has participated in abortions. Those who have heard Dr. Foster describe his vision for health care and have examined his record know about the lives he has saved, the hundreds of young doctors he has trained, his outstanding research on sickle-cell anemia and infant mortality, his model program on maternal and infant care, and his groundbreaking work to combat teenage pregnancy. President George Bush thought so highly of Dr. Foster's "I Have a Future Program" in Nashville that he honored it with the designation as one of his thousand points of light.

With this nomination, the Nation has an unprecedented opportunity to deal more effectively with some of the more difficult challenges facing us in health care today and to do it under the leadership of an outstanding physician and an outstanding human being who has devoted his life to providing health care and for opportunity to those who need the help most.

As Dr. Foster has stated, his first priority will be to deal with the Nation's overwhelming problem of teenage pregnancy, and he is just what the doctor ordered to lead this important battle.

Teenage pregnancy is a crisis of devastating proportions. The United States has the highest rate of teenage pregnancy in the industrial world. More than a million U.S. teenagers become pregnant every year, and every day the problem gets worse. Dr. Foster can be the national spokesman we need on this issue to educate teenagers about the risks of pregnancy.

Every day, every week, every month, every year, the number of teenagers lost to this epidemic grows further out of control. With Dr. Foster's leadership, we have an unparalleled opportunity to deal more effectively with this cruel cycle of teenage pregnancy, dependency and hopelessness.

Dr. Foster's "I Have a Future Program" has been a beacon of hope to inner-city teenagers. His program provides the guidance they need to make responsible, sensible decisions about their health and their future and to put themselves on the road to self-sufficiency and productivity and away from dependency, violence and poverty. He has taught them to say no to early sex and yes to their futures and to their education and to their dreams.

Dr. Foster has devoted his life to giving people a chance, giving women the chance for healthy babies, giving babies a healthy childhood, giving teenagers a chance for successful futures.

Now Dr. Foster deserves a chance of his own, a chance to be voted on by the entire Senate. I urge the majority leader to do the right thing and bring this nomination up before the Senate and a vote by the entire Senate.

Mr. President, I heard earlier during the debate and discussion that we have legislation before us that is going to be necessary to pass by October. I daresay that every day that we delay in terms of approving Dr. Foster is a day when this Nation is lacking in the leadership of this extraordinary human being who can do something about today's problems, not problems and challenges that the States are going to face in the fall, but today's problems, tomorrow's problems, on the problems of teenage pregnancy and the problems of child and maternal care, and all the range of public health problems that are across this country.

That individual ought to be approved. We ought to have a debate. If the majority leader was looking for something to do on a Friday, we ought to be debating that today and voting on it today, instead of debating the issue that is going to deny working families income to put bread on the table.

We can ask what our priorities are. The majority has selected to debate Davis-Bacon, not to debate the qualifications of Dr. Foster. As much as I am sympathetic to where we might be in the fall, I am concerned about the public health conditions of the American public today. There is no excuse—no excuse whatsoever—not to bring him up, other than the power of those who have expressed their views about

the issues on abortion. That is what is behind this delay, and it is wrong.

Dr. Foster has appeared before the committee, answered the questions, has been reported out, and he is entitled to a vote. Even two members of our committee who voted in opposition indicated that they believe the Senate ought to vote on this.

We have to ask ourselves, how much longer do we have to wait? This is a timely, important, sensitive position, and this country is being denied the leadership of Dr. Foster, and we have no adequate explanation about why that is the case. The nominees are entitled to be debated and to be reported out and, once reported out, they are entitled to be voted on in the U.S. Senate.

So, Mr. President, I hope that we will have an opportunity the next time the majority is looking around for something because we are not ready to deal with the welfare reform issues, and we are not prepared to deal with some other issue, that we can move ahead on the Dr. Foster nomination. We are ready to debate it. The committee is ready to debate it. We are entitled, he is entitled, and the country is entitled to have a vote on that nomination, and I hope that it will be very soon.

TELECOMMUNICATIONS COMPETITION AND DEREGULATION ACT

SECTION 252(a)(2)(A)

Mr. PACKWOOD. Section 252(a)(2)(A) requires a separate subsidiary for all information services except those that were being offered before July 24, 1991. Since that date literally hundreds of information services have been initiated and offered, because July 24, 1991, is the day before the information services line of business restriction was lifted by the MFJ court. This means that all of those services have to be shifted to a separate subsidiary on the date of enactment of this act.

Are there not two problems in your view: First, the bill does not grandfather all existing information services. Second, it will be impractical for Bell operating companies to transfer existing information services to a separate subsidiary prior to the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. PRESSLER. Yes; I agree. It is my intention to address these problems in conference.

ROTARY PEACE PROGRAM ON POPULATION AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr. NUNN. Mr. President, I have recently been contacted by Mr. David Stovall, a constituent from Cornelia, GA. In addition to his professional work at Habersham Bank and his community service with the chamber of commerce and the Georgia Mountains Private Industry and Local Coordinating Committee, Mr. Stovall serves in the Habersham County Rotary Club and as governor of Rotary District 6910.