

citizens and disabled persons with respiratory illnesses at serious risk. My legislation is very simple. It restores Medicare coverage for ultrasonic nebulizers to the same terms and conditions that existed prior to this change.

The device in question uses ultrasonic sound waves to turn medicine into a fine mist that is inhaled by the patient into the lungs. Ultrasonic nebulizers are extremely efficient at delivering medication where it is needed—the lungs—and in the optimum particle sizes.

Without any clinical justification and without any public notice or comment, the DMERC's have either eliminated Medicare coverage for ultrasonic nebulizers entirely, or reduced reimbursement rates so drastically that suppliers will no longer provide them.

The DMERC's decision was made despite the fact that ultrasonic nebulizers have been considered safe, effective, and medically necessary for years, and notwithstanding a large body of evidence that ultrasonic nebulizers are more efficient at delivering medication than the most similar alternative, the jet nebulizer or pneumatic compressor.

Furthermore, beneficiaries are being forced to switch to a metered-dose inhaler [MDI], which is not covered by Medicare. This has led to a significant increase in the out-of-pocket-costs of Medicare beneficiaries. I am particularly concerned that the additional costs borne by senior citizens may cause some to forego needed treatments—an outcome which could put their lives in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the increased costs to seniors, the lack of openness and public accountability, the new "one-size fits all" Medicare respiratory care policy is downright dangerous. While metered-dose inhalers [MDI's] are wonderful devices, they are not the appropriate therapy for every person.

Indeed, a number of well-controlled studies suggests that up to 50 percent of senior citizens do not use MDI's properly—even after repeated instruction. What these studies imply is that if HCFA does not reverse the decision of the DMERC's and restore Medicare coverage for ultrasonic nebulizers, there will be seniors, forced to switch to MDI's, who could require hospitalization because they cannot use their MDI properly.

Asthma and cystic fibrosis are not diseases to be taken lightly—if a person does not have the proper medicine, they can die. It is that simple. In fact, of the nearly 5,000 people who die every year from asthma, most deaths resulted from patients who failed to take their medication.

For those with severe arthritis or poor hand-eye coordination, they cannot use an MDI at all. They will be the real victims of the new HCFA/DMERC policy on ultrasonic nebulizers. The HCFA/DMERC decision to deny ultrasonic nebulizer coverage is a clear case of a policy that is "penny wise and pound foolish." If a single inpatient hospital admission results from improper MDI usage, it will cost Medicare tens of thousands of dollars in increased costs.

Lastly, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the impact on seniors if the Food and Drug Administration [FDA] is allowed to begin banning metered-dose inhalers that contain chlorofluorocarbons [CFC's], as they proposed on March 6, 1997. If HCFA removes coverage for ultrasonic nebulizers, forcing seniors to use metered-dose inhalers, and FDA in turn removes most metered-dose inhalers from the market, seniors will be left with a dramatically

reduced range of therapeutic options at significantly higher prices.

This outcome is completely unacceptable, and that is why my good friend and colleague from Florida, Mr. CLIFF STEARNS, and I have joined in introducing the Senior Citizen Respiratory Care Act of 1997. Congress must act soon to reverse HCFA's "stealth" coverage change, and restore Medicare reimbursement to devices which are safe and effective therapeutic options for seniors with serious respiratory illnesses.

#### TRIBUTE TO JUDGE MANUEL REAL

#### HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1997

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, California's 43d Congressional District has been extremely fortunate to have many dedicated citizens who have been willing to contribute their time and talents to help make our community an exceptionally good place in which to live and work. One of the most dedicated and active of these citizens has been Judge Manuel Real.

Manuel Real is a U.S. district judge for the Central District of California, a position he has held since being appointed by then-President Lyndon Johnson in 1966. On Friday, October 10, 1997, I will be honored to participate in the opening of a new elementary school in Mead Valley, CA named in honor of Judge Real for its many years of service to the great State of California.

Judge Real first began his distinguished legal career as an assistant U.S. attorney. He left for a short time to enter into private practice before rejoining U.S. Attorney's office until he was appointed a U.S. district judge. During his tenure with the central district court, Judge Real served as the chief judge of the court from 1982–1993.

The students of the new Manuel Real Elementary School should strive to emulate the accomplishments of their school's namesake as well as his dedication to improving the community and its overall quality of life. On behalf of the citizens of the 43d Congressional District, I want to add to this tribute my congratulations, and to wish Manuel, his wife Stella, and their four children best wishes for a happy and productive future.

#### TRIBUTE TO IRWIN ROSENBERG

#### HON. BRAD SHERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1997

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the spirit of volunteerism and community involvement and to honor Irwin Rosenberg as the recipient of the 1997 Nelle Reagan Award for Distinguished Community Service. This honor is bestowed upon Irwin for his extensive support for the Olive View-UCLA Medical Center Foundation and his long history of outstanding philanthropic and volunteer leadership in our community.

This prestigious award, named for President Ronald Reagan's mother, Nelle, was devel-

oped with the assistance of the Reagan family to honor dedicated community service. Long-term dedication has been a characteristic of Irwin Rosenberg's long volunteer career, which began at age 14 as a police explorer. By the age 17, he had received 22 commendations, including 1 for bravery.

Throughout his life, Irwin has developed relations with countless volunteer associations in our community. Some of these associations include the City Council for the Disabled, California Association of Physically Handicapped, and the Fair Housing Council of the San Fernando Valley. Irwin has also served as a board member for the United Way, Southern California Association of Governments, Granada Hills Little League and many other organizations. Currently, he serves as the vice-president and commissioner of the Los Angeles City Commission on Children, Youth and Their Families, commissioner of the Los Angeles County Private Industry Council, chairman-elect of New Directions for Youth, and vice-chair/board of managers of North Valley YMCA in addition to various other board memberships. This service represent a mere sampling of Irwin's involvement in our community and his commitment to all facets of helping people.

A former Nelle Reagan Award winner, Tim McBride, said "Irwin brought himself up to be somebody to be admired. He is a mentor and an example of someone who gives unselfishly of himself to help so many." It is this unselfish dedication that has earned Irwin the respect of our community and this award.

Mr. Speaker, distinguished colleagues, please join me in recognizing Irwin Rosenberg for his dedication to our community and in congratulating him on receipt of the 1997 Nelle Reagan Award for Distinguished Community Service. His service stands for all to admire.

#### IN RECOGNITION OF ST. LOUIS CARDINAL MARK MCGWIRE

#### HON. RICHARD A. GEPHARDT

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 9, 1997

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, the city of St. Louis and its baseball Cardinals have been blessed with great teams and great players over the years. Generations of baseball legends wearing the St. Louis Cardinals uniform—Dizzy Dean, Stan Musial, Bob Gibson, Lou Brock, and Ozzie Smith—all played before adoring crowds of St. Louis fans. This past year, we witnessed a legend-in-the-making when slugger Mark McGwire joined the Cardinals and chased baseball immortality. After hitting 58 home runs this season, Mark McGwire's name now joins the record books behind only Roger Maris and the legendary Babe Ruth on the all-time single season home run list.

Mark McGwire was embraced in St. Louis like few sports figures have in the city's history. But it was not only his tremendous feats on the baseball field that attracted fans but also his generous actions off the field. Mark McGwire stands as a role model for our children, teaching them that there are more important things in life than money and fame. His actions off the field show us the importance he places in the values we hold dear—

responsibility, community involvement, and family.

The city of St. Louis recently celebrated Mark McGwire's decision to sign a long-term contract to remain a Cardinal. McGwire demonstrated his generosity and commitment to the St. Louis community by pledging to donate \$1 million of his salary every year to his foundation for sexually and physically abused children. Mark McGwire's baseball statistics show his excellence on the baseball field but his decision to give \$1 million of his salary demonstrates what makes up his character.

I'm proud to be a St. Louis Cardinals fan—the greatest fans in all of baseball. Mark McGwire is the best home run hitter in the game today and someone in which the entire city can take pride. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Mark McGwire on his outstanding baseball achievements and his decision to stay in St. Louis. I join the entire city in welcoming Mark McGwire and I look forward to admiring his work—both on and off the field—in the years to come.

#### A BILL TO END THE U.S. TRADE DEFICIT

#### HON. PETER A. DeFAZIO

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 9, 1997*

Mr. DeFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, trade deficits matter. They represent millions of lost jobs—mostly in high wage manufacturing industries. They help keep U.S. interest rates at abnormally high levels, depressing economic growth. And large, persistent trade deficits with low wage nations inevitably depress wages in the United States and contribute to one of America's most vexing problems: the growing disparities in the wealth and incomes of our citizens.

The United States has not had a positive trade balance since 1975. The 1996 total trade deficit—including services—was \$111 billion. The merchandise-only trade deficit was \$192 billion—a new record. It's true that exports create jobs. But when imports—especially imports of goods that were once produced in U.S. factories—exceed exports by nearly \$200 billion a year, the result is a net loss of some of the best jobs our economy has to offer. That's exactly what this Nation's trade policies have delivered to the American people.

Today I am introducing a bill to establish the emergency commission to end the trade deficit. My bill would establish a commission to develop a comprehensive trade policy plan by examining the economic policies, trade, tax, investment laws, and other legal incentives and restrictions that are relevant to reducing the U.S. trade deficit. The commission would be composed of members with expertise in economics, international trade, manufacturing, labor, environment, and business. Senators DORGAN and BYRD have introduced companion legislation in the Senate.

Trade policy developed on a fast track has been disastrous for our people and our economy. It is time to slow down and carefully develop a trade policy whose principle objective is the generation of decent jobs and rising wages for the majority of our people.

#### TRIBUTE TO DALLAS LIGHTHOUSE FOR THE BLIND

#### HON. PETE SESSIONS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 9, 1997*

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend a great American and a great organization. The Dallas Lighthouse for the Blind has a long history in Dallas of providing blind individuals with work opportunities. The six decades of work improve and enhance the job opportunities for sight-disabled Dallas residents. I am proud to have this modern industrial center in the Fifth Congressional District of Texas.

This year the fifth district has been doubly blessed. One of my constituents, Jeddie Alexander, has been named the Dallas Lighthouse for the Blind's Ronald Pearce Blind Employee of the Year. Jeddie is a machine operator in the molding department of the lighthouse. In addition, he helped produce eyeglass cases and binders. Jeddie is completely blind, but his uncommon ability has allowed him to run a sewing machine.

Jeddie's story vividly shows that we should focus on abilities, not disabilities. In 1985, Jeddie was shot. He lost the use of both eyes and has no light perception. As he recounts, "When I lost my sight, I had the impression that that was the end of myself. I would have to wait on other people to do things for me. After about a month and a half, I realized I didn't have to do that."

I applaud Jeddie's commitment to improving his life and the lives of the people around him. He has truly taken advantage of the opportunities the Lighthouse has given him. As a father of a young Down's syndrome boy, I understand the desperate need for organizations like the Dallas Lighthouse for the Blind. Organizations like this give the greatest gift in all of the world—freedom, independence, and self-reliance to individuals that need an extra boost on the road of life.

#### WHY I SUPPORT "FAST TRACK"

#### HON. DONALD A. MANZULLO

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 9, 1997*

Mr. MANZULLO. Mr. Speaker, many people have diverse opinions on the issue of fast track and its potential impact in a wide range of areas. I wanted to take this opportunity to define fast track and explain what it is intended to do and what it is not designed to do.

Fast track is simply the process by which Congress provides limited authority to the President to enter into more trade negotiations in order to lower barriers to our U.S. exports. All fast track does is allow the President the ability to negotiate these trade agreements and then present the agreement to Congress for a final "yes" or "no" vote on the entire package without adding or taking away specific words or sections from the agreement. During the negotiations and the drafting of the final agreement, fast track mandates that there is sufficient consultation with Congress so that the President will not present an agreement that does not have the support of a majority in

Congress. That, simply, is fast track, nothing more, nothing less.

Fast track is not a new concept. It has been a common practice for over 60 years, in some form, for every President since Franklin Roosevelt as tariffs became less and less a source of revenue for the U.S. Government and foreign trade policy grew in complexity and importance to the U.S. economy. The Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act of 1934 was the first time Congress delegated to the President the broad authority to set, within specific limits and for a limited time, tariff and other foreign trade policy.

Up until 1945, 32 bilateral tariff-reducing agreements were reached. In 1947, the United States became a founding member of the multilateral General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade [GATT], whose aim is a mutual reduction of barriers to trade among all the free market nations of the world. During this time, Congress extended the 1934 act 11 times to open up more markets to U.S. products by lowering tariffs.

Then, in 1962, Congress gave President Kennedy a 5-year authority to participate in the first major GATT round or negotiation to not just lower tariffs but eliminate duties on specific products. These global trade talks became more commonly known as the Kennedy round, named after his untimely death.

The Kennedy round concluded in 1967 when agreements were reached to reduce not only tariffs but, for the first time, non-tariff or redtape barriers. But more controversial, the executive branch, under President Johnson, also negotiated an international antidumping agreement that was not contained within the authority Congress originally gave President Kennedy. Congress subsequently enacted a law in 1968 nullifying any provision of this antidumping agreement that was not consistent with U.S. law.

Because of this dispute between the executive and legislative branch, a compromise was reached after a 7-year period when there were no significant global trade barrier reduction negotiations. Thus, the fast track procedures were formally adopted for the first time as part of the Trade Act of 1974. This legislation granted then President Ford another 5-year time period to negotiate a further reduction in trade barriers. These talks became more commonly known as the Tokyo round of the GATT. This round eventually produced a package of 14 international trade agreements that eventually became part of the Trade Agreements Act of 1979, negotiated by President Carter.

As part of this renewed fast-track authority, the executive branch agreed to more closely consult with Congress, even to the point of accrediting 10 Members of Congress to serve as advisors to trade negotiating teams. But, in return, Congress agreed not to amend or change the final agreement. Countries will not negotiate with the United States until they are assured that the final agreement will not be changed. However, the legislative branch established an informal process with the executive branch, from the beginning of the negotiating process to crafting the implementing legislation, that the final agreement reflects the will of a majority of Congress.

Fast track was further extended again to President Reagan as part of the Trade and Tariff Act of 1984. Thus, the U.S.-Israel Free