

the wetlands regulatory program, and for other purposes.

S. 1316

At the request of Mr. CHAFEE, the names of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. LEAHY] and the Senator from Maine [Mr. COHEN] were added as cosponsors of S. 1316, a bill to reauthorize and amend title XIV of the Public Health Service Act (commonly known as the "Safe Drinking Water Act"), and for other purposes.

S. 1344

At the request of Mr. HEFLIN, the name of the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. LOTT] was added as a cosponsor of S. 1344, a bill to repeal the requirement relating to specific statutory authorization for increases in judicial salaries, to provide for automatic annual increases for judicial salaries, and for other purposes.

S. 1360

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1360, a bill to ensure personal privacy with respect to medical records and health care-related information, and for other purposes.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 32—PROVIDING FOR A CONITIONAL RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DOLE submitted the following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to.

S. CON. RES. 32

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Monday, November 20, 1995, pursuant to a motion made by the Majority Leader or his designee, in accordance with this resolution, it stand recessed or adjourned until a time to be determined by the Majority Leader on Monday, November 27, 1995, or until one hour after the House has voted on H.J. Res. 122, unless the House agrees to the Senate amendment.

SEC. 2. The two houses shall convene at 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the House of Representatives adjourns on the legislative day of Monday, November 20, 1995, or the legislative day of Tuesday, November 21, 1995, it stand adjourned until 12:30 p.m. on Tuesday, November 28, 1995, or until 12:00 noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 3 of this resolution, whichever occurs first.

SEC. 3. The Majority Leader of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the Senate and the Minority Leader of the House, shall notify the Members of the Senate and the House, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 33—RELATIVE TO THE RETIREMENT OF THE ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

Mr. MOYNIHAN (for himself, Mr. WARNER, and Mr. PELL) submitted the

following concurrent resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. CON. RES. 33

Whereas at its inception, the Capitol of the United States of America was blessed to rise under the hand of some of this Nation's greatest architects, including Dr. William Thornton, Benjamin Henry Latrobe, and Charles Bullfinch;

Whereas prior to the Honorable George Malcolm White, FAIA, being appointed by President Nixon on January 27, 1971, it had been 106 years since a professional architect had been named to the post of Architect of the Capitol;

Whereas Mr. White has served the Congress through an unprecedented period of growth and modernization, using to advantage his professional accreditation in architecture, engineering, law, and business;

Whereas Mr. White has prepared the Capitol Complex for the next century by developing the "Master Plan for the Future Development of the Capitol Grounds and Related Areas";

Whereas Mr. White has added new buildings to the Capitol grounds as authorized by Congress, including the Thurgood Marshall Federal Judiciary Building, the Philip A. Hart Senate Office Building, and the Library of Congress James Madison Memorial Building, and through acquisition and renovation, the Thomas P. O'Neill and Gerald R. Ford House Office Buildings, the Webster Hall Senate Page Dormitory, and the Capitol Police Headquarters Building;

Whereas Mr. White has preserved for future generations the existing historic fabric of the Capitol Complex by faithfully restoring the Old Senate Chamber, the Old Supreme Court Chamber, National Statuary Hall, the Brumidi corridors, the Rotunda canopy and frieze, the West Central Front and Terraces of the Capitol, the House Monumental Stairs, the Library of Congress Thomas Jefferson and John Adams Buildings, and the Statue of Freedom atop the Capitol Dome;

Whereas Mr. White has greatly contributed to the preservation and enhancement of the design of the District of Columbia through his place on the District of Columbia Zoning Commission, the Commission of Fine Arts, the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation, and other civic organizations and commissions; and

Whereas upon Mr. White's retirement on November 21, 1995, he leaves a legacy of tremendous accomplishment, having made the Capitol his life's work and brought to this century the erudition and polymath's capacity of our first Architects: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That the thanks and good wishes of the American people are hereby tendered to the Honorable George M. White, FAIA, on the occasion of his retirement from the Office of the Architect of the Capitol after nearly a quarter-century of outstanding service to this nation.

NOTICES OF HEARINGS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOREST AND PUBLIC LAND MANAGEMENT

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate and the public, the Subcommittee on Forests and Public Land Management has scheduled an oversight hearing on the administration's implementation of section 2001 of the Funding Rescissions Act of 1995.

The hearing will be held on Wednesday, November 29, 1995, at 9:30 a.m., in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Of-

fice Building in Washington, DC. The hearing will be conducted jointly with the forest salvage task group of the House Resources Committee.

The only witnesses will be the administration and the General Accounting Office. Those who wish to submit written statements should write to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510. For further information, contact Mark Rey at (202) 224-6170.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the public that a hearing has been scheduled before the full Committee on Energy and Natural Resources to receive testimony regarding S. 1271, the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1995.

The hearing will be held on Thursday, December 14, 1995, it will begin at 9:30 a.m., and will take place in room SD-366 of the Dirksen Senate Office Building in Washington, DC.

For further information, please call Karen Hunsicker or Betty Nevitt at (202) 224-0765.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

THE BALANCED BUDGET ACT OF 1995

• Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, last week I had submitted for the RECORD a statement regarding the Balanced Budget Act of 1995 that appears to not have been printed. Therefore, Mr. President, I would ask that my statement appear in the RECORD today.

Mr. President, I want to commend the hard work of all my colleagues in producing this legislation. Although there are parts that do concern me, in general I strongly support this bill and the goal of balancing the budget in 7 years.

As one of the Senate Commerce Committee members who drafted title IV of the Senate bill and served as a conferee for this section of this legislation, I want to clarify for the record what I believe is intended by this bill regarding spectrum auctions.

Under the bill, the Federal Communications Commission [FCC] is mandated to identify and make available for public auction 100 Mhz of spectrum. I believe that auctioning this and other spectrum is the fairest, most equitable manner in which to allocate spectrum. I would hope that the Commission would understand this fact and become spectrum auction proponents. The auctioning of spectrum in an orderly manner—done so that the public interest is served both by maximizing revenue to the Treasury and ensuring that services that use the spectrum continue in a manner that benefits the public—should be a goal of all FCC proceedings regarding the spectrum.

The bill before the Senate contains several criteria that the FCC should use in selecting which blocks of spectrum to auction. I want to emphasize

for the record that the inclusion of any particular criteria for the FCC to consider should not be viewed as limiting the Commission's authority to make a determination under its overall public interest standard of what existing spectrum uses may need to be continued, or from considering in making its decision the impact on any existing users of having to move to other frequencies or from requiring, as a condition of any move, that the costs of relocation be paid by new users.

Most importantly, I urge the Commission to examine all the spectrum referenced in this act and make determinations as to its allocation that are fair, equitable, and that do not unduly hurt or burden any one group or industry.

Mr. President, I hope this clarification helps guide the FCC as it moves toward auctions as mandated by this bill. I yield the floor.●

AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION AS COSTLY AS THE CURE

Mr. SIMON. Mr. President, Henry Aaron, a respected economist at the Brookings Institution, and Prof. William B. Schwartz who teaches medicine at the University of Southern California, had an op-ed piece in the Washington Post commenting about what is driving up health care costs.

It is a solid piece of information when too often we are looking for superficial answers that may temporarily help the budget situation.

I have said for many years that the Federal Government has to look to additional revenue sources if we are to provide the fundamental services that our people want and deserve.

Nothing that I have seen has changed my mind on that.

Our inattention to our revenue problems has caused an escalation of the deficit in this country; and it has caused expenditures of huge amounts of money for interest, in addition to discouraging industrial investment.

The Henry Aaron-William Schwartz article talks about realities in the medical field, realities we seem reluctant to face but I hope will.

I ask that their op-ed piece be printed in the RECORD.

The material follows:

[FROM THE WASHINGTON POST, NOV. 16, 1995]
AN OUNCE OF PREVENTION AS COSTLY AS THE CURE

(By Henry J. Aaron and William B. Schwartz)

On the op-ed page of Oct. 25, Joseph Califano and Robert Samuelson independently comment on solutions to the excessive level and growth of health care spending. Califano invokes prevention as the long-term solution. Samuelson points to managed care, although he prudently warns of possible abuse by profit-hungry managers. Both miss the simple truth—that any sustained slowdown in the growth of health care spending will require health care rationing.

Contrary to popular belief, the principal causes of rising health care spending are not waste, fraud and abuse, an aging population

or increasingly unhealthful behavior. Waste, fraud and abuse can account at most for about one-tenth of the increase in spending over the past two decades. Aging has been an even smaller factor, although its importance will grow. And people have been eating more healthfully, exercising more and smoking less than in the past.

The primary force driving up health care spending is the proliferation of new health care technology. Scientific advance accounts for at least half and probably more of the 120 percent growth in real per capita health spending that has occurred since 1975. There is no indication that the pace of scientific advance is slowing or will slow. It may be accelerating. And population aging will not stop for decades.

It would be nice if investing in preventive care could significantly slow the growth of health spending. Alas, it cannot, for two related reasons. First, with few exceptions (vaccinations stand out), most preventive health measures must be applied to large populations to prevent a relatively small amount of illness.

Take screening for colon cancer, which kills about 50,000 people annually at a treatment cost of about \$1 billion. Deaths from colon cancer could be cut by 20,000 annually if all people age 50 and over were tested annually for blood in their feces and all those who tested positive underwent a colonoscopy. That sounds like a strong case for preventive colonoscopies. And indeed it is—on grounds of public health. But the added cost of the preventive tests would run \$4 billion to \$6 billion annually, depending on how aggressively patients with benign polyps were treated subsequently. This example illustrates a more general point: Some preventive health measures are good for health, but they seldom cut costs.

The same is true of substance abuse. Califano would like to reduce it. So would most of the rest of us. But measures to reduce substance abuse are costly and have few short-run effects on behavior. They may eventually induce less abuse or better diet, but these changes do not come quickly.

Meanwhile, the second reason prevention does not save money comes into play. It may be possible, at a price, to reduce particular forms of illness. But all of us who survive life's other hazards will one day sicken and die. Smokers spared coronaries and alcoholics spared cirrhosis will eventually get sick and consume health care. The ghoulish fact is that many people who are spared cheap death from a tobacco-induced coronary will eventually succumb to costly debility from Alzheimer's.

Treatment for degenerative diseases such as Alzheimer's, arthritis and miscellaneous organ failures will eat up much of the savings achieved through preventive measures and could end up costing more than any direct savings achieved through prevention campaigns. The offset will not be exact. Some money may be saved. Stopping smoking does cut health costs, but only modestly. In other cases, some net costs may be incurred. But the idea that prevention will materially divert the health cost juggernaut is fantasy.

Samuelson is right to remark on the importance of the managed care revolution. He is properly worried about the effects of an infusion of profit-oriented managed care plans on the quality of care. But he is too credulous about the achievements of managed care in slowing the growth of health care spending.

Yes, health care spending slowed in California during the 1980s as managed care plans spread. But education spending also slowed as California fell from 22nd in the nation in 1979-80 to 33rd in 1991-92. California

experienced a protracted recession during the 1980s. Recessions produce unemployment and reduce incomes. Both cause growth of spending of all kinds to slow.

Samuelson is right that some companies have stopped growth of health insurance premiums by shifting to managed care. But that slowdown could come from reductions in benefits, increased cost-sharing and cost-shifting to other payers through negotiated discounts, as well as from genuine increases in efficiency. Despite the vaunted achievements of managed care, inflation-adjusted health care spending grew 5 percent in the past year, the same as the average for the past four decades.

Maybe managed care will do better in the future than it has in the past. But if 70 percent of all those privately insured already have managed care, as Samuelson reports, one should hesitate before cracking open the champagne in celebration of victory over rising health costs.

Managed care may eventually succeed in saving money by squeezing out waste, but it will have to save enough to pay for the extra administrative costs it generates. Much waste has been squeezed out already. Hospital days have fallen by one-third since 1984. And waste can only be squeezed out once. After it is gone, the same forces that have been driving up health care costs—technology and aging—will reassert themselves.

A sustained slowdown in health care spending can be achieved in only one way: by denying some beneficial services to some people. People have been reluctant to repose such power in government bureaucrats, who have nothing personal to gain from the decisions they make. One wonders whether they will be more willing to cede such sensitive authority to well-paid managed care executives who make larger profits every time they decide some procedure is not worth what it costs them.●

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, more than 3 years ago I began these daily reports to the Senate to make a matter of record the exact Federal debt as of close of business the previous day.

As of the close of business Friday, November 17, the Federal debt stood at exactly \$4,989,662,795,523.25. On a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,940.85 as his or her share of the Federal debt.

It is important to recall, Mr. President, that the Senate this year missed an opportunity to implement a balanced budget amendment to the U.S. Constitution. Regrettably, the Senate failed by one vote in that first attempt to bring the Federal debt under control.

There will be another opportunity in the months ahead to approve such a constitutional amendment.

ADDRESSING THE CONCERNS OF ATOMIC VETERANS

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, last month, President Clinton at a White House ceremony accepted the final report of the Advisory Committee on Human Radiation Experiments. Following Energy Secretary Hazel O'Leary's announcement early in 1994 about secret human radiation experiments carried out or sponsored by the