

core mission of fighting child morbidity and promoting child health. In that regard, I welcome the declaration on family planning that UNICEF makes in its 1995 report called *The Progress of Nations*. That declaration makes clear that under the division of labor that characterizes U.N. agencies, UNICEF's mission of improving the well-being of children and women is different from that of the agencies that promote family planning.

The core mission of UNICEF, and other important child survival activities, will be helped greatly by the child survival and disease program fund set up by this bill. This fund is foreign aid as it was meant to be. This Congress is making cuts, but it is not making them blindly or callously. It is cutting waste and extravagance, while preserving the heart of foreign aid. I commend the appropriators for their work, and I urge a "yes" vote on the foreign operations appropriations bill.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to respond to the gentleman from New Jersey, and give him a lot of credit, because he, along with the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. WOLF] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. HALL] came and suggested that we do something to ensure that as we dramatically downsize foreign aid, that we do not preclude the ability of the administration to have a sufficient amount of money to feed starving children, and to provide the immunizations programs that will help eradicate polio. So I compliment the gentleman.

Mrs. MALONEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the foreign operations funding bill.

I do so with the view that this is not a perfect bill. In many respects, it represents a step backward in U.S. commitment to promoting development and democracy around the world.

I am concerned about the 34-percent cut in African aid. This is bad public policy on humanitarian grounds. These cuts also make no fiscal sense. Investing a small amount in African development today will save many more tax dollars in emergency intervention in the future.

I am also concerned that the bill contains language allowing for continued United States aid to Azerbaijan, despite that nation's unconscionable blockade of Armenia. Allowing our allies to block U.S. humanitarian assistance represents a complete undermining of our foreign policy objectives.

Despite these problems, the bill contains many important provisions, and I want to thank Chairman CALLAHAN and my good friend DAVE OBEY for their work.

I strongly support the inclusion of \$3 billion in economic and military assistance for Israel. As our only democratic ally in the Middle East continues to travel down the historic—and often dangerous—road toward peace, it is imperative that our country ensure Israel's economic viability and military advantage in the region.

I am pleased that the bill maintains \$15 million for Cyprus. It has been two decades since the brutal Turkish invasion of this beautiful island nation. This relatively small amount of money goes a long way toward helping the Cypriot people with critical economic development and peace-enhancing activities.

I also want to convey my strong support for the funding for the International Fund for Ireland. President Clinton and the Congress have much to be proud of with respect to the profound and peaceful changes in Ireland. We therefore must renew our commitment to the heroic Irish people.

I ask my colleagues to support this bill. It is not perfection, but it is very important nevertheless.

Mr. ROTH. Mr. Chairman, this legislation poses a dilemma. Some of its provisions, such as the funding for export-related functions, are vitally necessary for our economic growth and job creation.

The bill continues current levels of funding of the Export-Import Bank, which helps finance U.S. exports.

The bill also provides \$100 million for the Exim Warchest, which is used to counteract unfair trade practices by foreign governments. This, too, is essential for our competitive position in global markets. Further, the bill provides a substantial increase in the operating levels for the Overseas Private Investment Corporation [OPIC].

This is consistent with our authorizing bill last year, in which we tripled OPIC's authorizing levels to \$9.5 billion. Let me point out that OPIC does not use any taxpayer funds—it pays for itself and even makes money for the Government—last year earning \$167 million. OPIC also maintains reserves to cover its liabilities, with \$2.3 billion currently on deposit in the Treasury.

None of these funds come from the taxpayer. Everything was earned through OPIC's business activities. The truth is, this appropriations bill simply allows OPIC to use the money that it has already earned on its own.

The bill also provides funds for the Trade and Development Agency, which generates U.S. exports by funding the engineering and feasibility studies for major construction projects overseas.

Our subcommittee's oversight hearings have shown that TDA generates \$25 in exports for every \$1 it spends. That is an excellent return on our investment. Therefore, I am concerned that this bill cuts TDA by \$5 million. I hope this provision can be revisited later.

The importance of each of these export programs is underscored by the latest trade data, which came out yesterday. The overall deficit in April was \$11 billion, the worst month in 3 years. The deficit in goods was \$16 billion. That is \$1.7 billion worse than in March.

In April, our exports actually went down by nearly a billion dollars, while imports went up by \$700 million.

In other words, our trade deficit, which last year was the worst in our history, is getting even worse. The bottom line is, if our exports do not recover, we will certainly fall into a recession.

In recent years, exports have provided most of our economic growth, as much as 80 percent. Clearly, we need the export programs in this bill.

Therefore, I commend the Gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CALLAHAN] and the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON] for these vital job-creating provisions. Unfortunately, other parts of the bill represent business as usual in doling out foreign aid.

The bill makes some cuts in foreign aid, but not enough, in my judgment. AID still gets \$5.7 billion, including \$530 million in operating

expenses. Why does it cost a half a billion dollars to run a \$5 billion program? Over the past 10 years, AID's programs have gone down 23 percent, but its operating costs have gone up 40 percent.

It makes no sense that operating costs go up when the overall program is going down. In particular, I oppose the \$29 million which is provided for AID downsizing. What sense does it make to appropriate more money to shut down missions and reduce the Agency? That represents the triumph of bureaucratic thinking over common sense.

Yes, we absolutely should cut down AID, but let us not give the bureaucrats even more money to carry this out. Many amendments will be offered to this bill.

Some will propose further reductions in foreign aid. Some will propose ill-considered reductions in support for our exporters. And some would actually increase foreign aid spending. The fate of this bill hangs in the outcome of these amendments.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the export-related provisions and in making further reductions in foreign aid.

Mr. WILSON. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McKEON] having assumed the Chair, Mr. BOEHNER, Chairman pro tempore of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill, (H.R. 1868), making appropriations for foreign operations export financing, and related programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 483, MEDICARE SELECT POLICIES

Mr. BILIRAKIS submitted the following conference report and statement on the bill (H.R. 483) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes:

CONFERENCE REPORT (H. REPT. 104-157)

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 483), to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate and agree to the same with an amendment as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. PERMITTING MEDICARE SELECT POLICIES TO BE OFFERED IN ALL STATES FOR AN EXTENDED PERIOD.

Section 4358(c) of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1990, as amended by section 172(a) of the Social Security Act Amendments of 1994, is amended to read as follows:

“(c) **EFFECTIVE DATE.**—(1) The amendments made by this section shall only apply—

“(A) in 15 States (as determined by the Secretary of Health and Human Services) and such other States as elect such amendments to apply to them, and

“(B) subject to paragraph (2), during the 6½-year period beginning with 1992.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘State’ has the meaning given such term by section 210(h) of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 410(h)).

“(2)(A) The Secretary of Health and Human Services shall conduct a study that compares the health care costs, quality of care, and access to services under medicare select policies with that under other medicare supplemental policies. The study shall be based on surveys of appropriate age-adjusted sample populations. The study shall be completed by June 30, 1997.

“(B) Not later than December 31, 1997, the Secretary shall determine, based on the results of the study under subparagraph (A), if any of the following findings are true:

“(i) The amendments made by this section have not resulted in savings of premium costs to those enrolled in medicare select policies (in comparison to their enrollment in medicare supplemental policies that are not medicare select policies and that provide comparable coverage).

“(ii) There have been significant additional expenditures under the medicare program as a result of such amendments.

“(iii) Access to and quality of care has been significantly diminished as a result of such amendments.

“(C) The amendments made by this section shall remain in effect beyond the 6½-year period described in paragraph (1)(B) unless the Secretary determines that any of the findings described in clause (i), (ii), or (iii) of subparagraph (B) are true.

“(3) The Comptroller General shall conduct a study to determine the extent to which individuals who are continuously covered under a medicare supplemental policy are subject to medical underwriting if they change the policy under which they are covered, and to identify options, if necessary, for modifying the medicare supplemental insurance market to make sure that continuously insured beneficiaries are able to switch plans without medical underwriting. By not later than June 30, 1996, the Comptroller General shall submit to the Congress as report on the study. The report shall include a description of the potential impact on the cost and availability of medicare supplemental policies of each option identified in the study.”.

And the Senate agree to the same.

TOM BLILEY,
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS,
DENNIS HASTERT,
BILL ARCHER,
WILLIAM THOMAS,
NANCY L. JOHNSON,

Managers on the Part of the House.

BOB PACKWOOD,
BOB DOLE,
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,

Managers on the Part of the Senate.

JOINT EXPLANATORY STATEMENT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONFERENCE

The managers on the part of the House and the Senate at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 483) to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to permit Medicare select policies to be offered in all States, and for other purposes,

submit the following joint statement to the House and the Senate in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon by the managers and recommended in the accompanying conference report:

The Senate amendment struck all of the House bill after the enacting clause and inserted a substitute text.

The House recedes from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate with an amendment that is a substitute for the House bill and the Senate amendment. The differences between the House bill, the Senate amendment, and the substitute agreed to in conference are noted below, except for clerical corrections, conforming changes made necessary by agreements reached by the conferees, and minor drafting and clerical changes.

**EXTEND MEDICARE SELECT TO ALL STATES FOR THREE YEARS
PRESENT LAW**

The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1990 (P.L. 101-508) established a demonstration project called Medicare Select under which insurers can market Medicare supplemental policies (called “Medigap” policies) that are the same as other Medigap policies except that supplemental benefits are paid only if services are provided through designated providers. The demonstration was limited to 15 states and expired December 31, 1994. The demonstration was extended to June 30, 1995, in the Social Security Act Amendments of 1994 (P.L. 103-432).

HOUSE BILL

Medicare Select authority is extended to all states which wish to participate until June 30, 2000. The Secretary of Health and Human Services is to conduct a study of Medicare Select prior to 1998 to study cost, quality and access for Medicare Select compared to other Medigap policies. Medicare Select remains in effect unless the Secretary finds that Medicare Select has: (1) not resulted in savings of premium costs to beneficiaries compared to non-select Medigap policies; (2) resulted in significant additional expenditures for the Medicare program; or (3) resulted in diminished access and quality of care.

SENATE AMENDMENT

Same as the House bill except the extension is until December 31, 1996. The Secretary is to complete the study by June 30, 1996. The General Accounting Office (GAO) is to conduct a study on Medigap insurance and report to Congress by June 10, 1996. The report is to include: (1) an analysis of whether there are problems in the current Medigap system for beneficiaries who wish to switch Medigap policies without medical underwriting or pre-existing condition exclusions; (2) options for modifying the Medigap market to address any problems identified; and (3) an analysis of the impact of each option on the cost and availability of Medigap insurance, with particular reference to problems with Medicare Select policies.

CONFERENCE AGREEMENT

The conference agreement adopts the Senate amendment with the following changes: (1) Medicare Select is extended to all States for three years (until June 30, 1998); and (2) the GAO study is clarified to require analysis of all types of Medigap insurance by removing specific reference to Medicare Select. Reference to pre-existing condition exclusions is also removed as they are already prohibited under current law for Medigap replacement policies.

TOM BLILEY,
MICHAEL BILIRAKIS,
DENNIS HASTERT,
BILL ARCHER,

WILLIAM THOMAS,
NANCY L. JOHNSON,
Managers on the Part of the House.

BOB PACKWOOD,
BOB DOLE,
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN,
Managers on the Part of the Senate.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, JUNE 26, 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at noon on Monday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

DISPENSING WITH CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS ON WEDNESDAY NEXT

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order under the Calendar Wednesday rule be dispensed with on Wednesday next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

□ 1815

HOOR OF MEETING ON TUESDAY, JUNE 27, 1995

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns on Monday, June 26, 1995, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. on Tuesday, June 27, 1995, for morning hour debates.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCKEON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Edwin Thomas, one of his secretaries.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. CLINGER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. CLINGER addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] is recognized for 5 minutes.