

IN RECOGNITION OF THE PORT
WASHINGTON YOUTH ACTIVITIES
8TH ANNUAL HALL OF FAME
DINNER

HON. GARY L. ACKERMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1998

Mr. ACKERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize three individuals who will be honored on Friday, June 19th, 1998, for their dedication and support of youth activities in the town of Port Washington, New York. Julius Picardi, Frank Giordano and Jack Sommerville will be so honored by induction into the Port Washington Youth Activities Hall of Fame at the PYA's eighth annual affair. They will join a select group of twenty others who have been previously recognized by the PYA.

Mr. Picardi has been a dynamic force in the growth of the PYA during the 1980s serving as coach, organization treasurer, officer and director for over fifteen years. Mr. Giordano is cited for his athletic achievements including collegiate lacrosse at the United States Military Academy in the early 1980s. Many of his skills and his dedication to excellence were developed in his active days as a youth in the PYA programs. Finally, Mr. Sommerville is remembered for his tireless dedication as coach and supporter of PYA baseball programs for more than ten years.

All three of these gentlemen are recognized for their individual and collective contributions to youth sports and all they embody. They are an excellent reflection upon themselves, their families, their community and the volunteer spirit of American organizations, such as PYA. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join with me in recognizing these individuals who are most deserving of this honor, with special appreciation from their neighbors and friends.

THE ASSISTIVE AND UNIVER-
SALLY DESIGNED TECHNOLOGY
IMPROVEMENT ACT FOR INDIV-
IDUALS WITH DISABILITIES

HON. CONSTANCE A. MORELLA

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1998

Mrs. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased today to introduce H.R. XX, the Assistive and Universally Designed Technology Improvement Act for Individuals with Disabilities. H.R. XX is the House companion bill to S. 2173 offered by my distinguished Senate colleague from Missouri, Mr. BOND.

Last July, my Technology Subcommittee held a hearing focusing on the transfer of federal technologies to meet the needs of those with disabled conditions. We learned from the hearing that these technologies, known as "assistive technologies" are being used to increase, maintain, and improve the functional capabilities of individuals with disabilities.

Assistive technologies is a device, whether acquired commercially, off-the-shelf, modified, or customized, that is used to increase, maintain, or improve the functional capabilities of individuals with disabilities. Examples of assistive technologies, which provide for more independent, productive, and enjoyable living,

can be simple or complex. It ranges from: Velcro, adapted clothing and toys, computers, seating systems, powered mobility, augmentative communication devices, special switches, assisted listening devices, visual aids, memory prosthetics, to thousands of other commercially available or adapted items. As examples, it can be: a computer that can be used by an individual with Cerebral Palsy, a motor scooter, a hearing aid for an individual who is aging, or enhanced voice recognition for someone with Multiple Sclerosis.

Assistive technologies provide a disabled individual the means to function better in the workplace or the home. This technology, which aids Americans with physical or mental disabilities, improves the end users' quality of life and provides a means for acquiring a job. For the 49 million people in the United States who have disabilities, as well as for Americans who are able bodied, assistive technologies have yielded a tremendous number of quality of life enhancements.

These technology solutions improve an individual's ability to learn, compete, work and interact with family and friends. People use assistive technology to achieve greater independence and to enhance the quality of their lives.

A preliminary study on the impact and benefits of assistive technologies was conducted by the National Council on Disability in 1993. Surveyed were 136 individuals with disabilities to evaluate the costs and benefits associated with the use of different kinds of technology-related assistance. The individuals were from four age groups and the results indicate a significant impact of assistive technologies on many aspects of the respondents lives, including: the majority of infants with disabilities benefited by having fewer health problems; nearly 75% of school age children were able to remain in a regular classroom, and 45% were able to reduce their use of school-related services; 65% of working-age persons were able to reduce dependence on family members, 58% were able to reduce dependence on paid assistance, and 37% were able to increase earnings. Among elderly persons, 80% were able to reduce dependence on others, half were able to reduce dependency on paid persons, and half were able to avoid entering a nursing home.

As a result of our July hearing, the Technology Subcommittee was impressed with the need for a greater emphasis to develop assistive technologies. Yet, the area of assistive technology is greatly overlooked by the Federal Government and the private sector. While the importance of assistive technologies spans age and disability classifications, assistive technology does not maintain the recognition in the Federal Government necessary to provide important assistance for research and development programs or to individuals with disabilities.

The private sector generally lacks adequate incentives to produce assistive technologies and end-users lack adequate resources to acquire assistive technology. It is also believed that there are insufficient links between federally funded assistive technology research and development programs and the private sector entities responsible for translating research and development into significant new products in the marketplace for end-users.

H.R. — provides federally supported incentives in all areas of assistive and universally

designed technology, including need identification, research and development, product evaluation, technology transfer, and commercialization. These incentives achieve the goal of improving the quality, functional capability, distribution, and affordability of this essential technology. The legislation seeks to:

Improve the peer review process at the National Institute on Disability Research and Rehabilitation (NIDRR) at the Department of Education. These improvements would provide greater assistive and universally designed technology products to the marketplace, increase small business involvement in research and development, and assure research and development efforts would cover all disability groups including persons with physical and mental disabilities, as well as the aging and rural technology users.

Augment technology transfer by improving the role of the Interagency Committee on Disability Research (ICDR) to increase its authority, accountability and ability to coordinate. Provisions are included for the increased usage of the Federal labs to improve coordination with all Federal agencies involved in assistive and universally designed technology research and development and for providing public and private sector partnerships for assistive and universally designed technology research and development.

Increase the market for assistive technology by clarifying Title III of the Tech Act for the Microloan program. This microloan program assists disabled persons in obtaining assistive and universally designed technology.

Authorizes funding for the Interagency Committee on Disability Research to hire staff and for operating costs associated with issuing surveys and reports and to the National Institute on Disability Research and Rehabilitation to provide for assistive and universally designed technology research and development.

Increase access to assistive and universally designed technology by creating tax incentives to provide businesses a tax credit for the development of assistive technology, to expand the architectural and transportation barrier removal deduction to include communication barriers, and to expand the work opportunity credit to include expenses incurred in the acquisition of technology to facilitate the employment of any individual with a disability.

I am pleased that H.R. — already has the support of the United Cerebral Palsy Association, the Rehabilitation Engineering and Assistive Technology Society of North America, the National Easter Seal Society, and The Association of Tech Act Projects.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this important bill and I will work towards enactment of this worthy legislation.

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL GREGORY
G. BEAN

HON. HAROLD E. FORD, JR.

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1998

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that my colleagues in the House of Representatives pay tribute to Colonel Gregory G. Bean. Since 1995, Colonel Bean has served with distinction as the District Engineer of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Memphis District in Tennessee's Ninth Congressional District.

As a result of his outstanding leadership, technical competence and commitment to excellence, the Memphis District has effectively and efficiently executed its flood control, navigation and environmental missions. During his tenure, Colonel Bean managed a number of projects that will have lasting benefits for the people of Tennessee's Ninth Congressional District and the nation. These projects include the Nonconnah Creek Flood Control project, the Wolf River environmental restoration and flood control study, and flood control and navigation maintenance on the Mississippi River, the Wolf River Harbor and the McKellar Lake Harbor.

In addition to his accomplishments as an engineer, Colonel Bean also possesses considerable management-employee relations skills. After assuming his post, he worked hard to cultivate a relationship of mutual trust and respect among the employees and management of the Memphis District. As a result, Local 259 of the National Federation of Federal Employees nominated Colonel Bean for a Society of Federal Labor Relations Professionals award for having the most improved labor/management relationship. In May, Colonel Bean was selected from a large number of nominees for the award.

Although Colonel Bean will be missed by all who had the privilege to work or be associated with him, I am confident that his legacy will continue. In July, Colonel Bean will assume the post of Deputy Director of the Maneuver Support Battle Lab in Ft. Leonard Wood, Missouri. I ask my colleagues to join me in honoring an individual who has throughout his career demonstrated through deed, courage and strong leadership that he is a professional soldier and an outstanding engineer.

AID FOR AMERICA'S NEEDIEST FAMILIES

HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1998

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation that would protect poor mothers and their children who have been victims of the so-called family cap-child exclusion provision used by 23 states including my own state of New Jersey.

Three years ago, I supported efforts to reform our nation's federal welfare system. However, I had grave concerns at the time about a provision in the House's version of welfare reform legislation that would have cut off cash assistance for any additional children born to a woman while she was on welfare, known as the family cap. I objected to this provision because I believed that it would encourage women to have abortions in their hour of greatest need or drive families farther into poverty.

The bill I am introducing today no longer allows states to implement their own version of a family cap if they desire to continue to receive their Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) block grant. My bill is very simple: a state will receive its TANF dollars as long as it does not impose a family cap upon America's neediest families.

In 1995, I tried to ban the family cap but failed. I admitted at the time that the family

cap-child exclusion proposal had enormous surface appeal, since people were fed up with abuse of the welfare system. As a result, I introduced an amendment which gave states the option to use a voucher system if they chose to do away with cash benefits as part of a larger family cap policy. My amendment passed overwhelmingly by a vote of 352 to 80.

The two most predictable outcomes of the family cap-child exclusion policy as implemented by twenty-three states are the likely increase in the number of babies aborted by indigent women—many of whom will feel financially trapped and abandoned—and the further impoverishment of children born to women on welfare.

Recently, my worst fears regarding abortion and the family cap were confirmed by a Rutgers University draft study prepared for the state of New Jersey which estimated that New Jersey's abortion rate increased by 240 abortions per year as a result of the state's family cap. As a result, since 1993, nearly 900 abortions have occurred in New Jersey due to the family cap. Thousands of other children have also been left to fend for themselves because their parents are not allowed to receive assistance on their behalf. I led a broad-based coalition of groups opposing the state's original request for a waiver in 1992 to implement a family cap policy because we knew that the family cap would only drive women into greater depths of poverty and despair and consequently increase the likelihood that they would abort their child. Sadly, our concerns were confirmed by the Rutgers study.

We knew at the time that money—or more precisely the lack of it—heavily influences a woman's decision to abort her child. A major study by the Alan Guttmacher Institute, a research organization associated with Planned Parenthood, found that 68% of women having abortions said they did so because "they could not afford to have a child now." Among 21% of the total sample this was the most important reason for the abortion; no other factor was cited more frequently as "most important."

Demographers have pointed out that "young, poor, and minority women are more likely to have abortions than older, more affluent, and white women," even though "these same groups are also more likely to oppose the right to abortion . . . Seven in ten (70 percent) women with incomes of less than \$25,000 disapprove of abortion, compared with 52 percent of more affluent women. [Yet] poorer women account for two-thirds (67 percent) of abortions." One expert observes: "Few would say an abortion is a good thing, but many women who believe that abortion is wrong find themselves unable to support a child when they become pregnant."

The family cap is likely to tip the balance for each poor woman who feels that society has no real interest in the survival of her baby. She will get a powerfully negative message—that her child has no value—especially from those states where Medicaid abortion is readily available.

Then one of two things will happen. The woman will have an abortion, or the family will descend further into poverty.

Mr. Speaker, the family cap/child exclusion might present a close question if the incremental payment for a new baby were really so high that it might encourage women and girls to get pregnant and have babies just to get

welfare. But this concern simply evaporates when we look at the facts.

The additional assistance per child varies from state to state, but the median is \$57 per month—fifty-seven dollars. Out of this the mother must pay for the child's clothing, shoes, diapers and other baby supplies, laundry, and bus fare for medical checkups. According to statistics compiled by Catholic Charities in 1994, the low-end costs for these items total \$88.50 per month. So the mother is \$31.50 in the hole even before she begins paying for the child's other expenses. We simply mislead ourselves when we assume that this constitutes an incentive to have more babies.

Mr. Speaker, there was much about the welfare system that needed changing in 1995—people were trapped in the cycle of poverty and despair. They needed a new program. They needed help and the bulk of our new provisions have been beneficial. But letting states pay to terminate the life of a child while the same state refuses to pay a mere \$64 a month for food and clothing for that child is unconscionable. Instead, if we want welfare to be temporary and to be a true safety net—a safety net against abortion under duress, a safety net against descent into deeper poverty, then we must ban the family cap.

One abortion is one too many. It is wrong for the government, whether it be federal, state, or local to embrace policies that would promote abortion and financial impoverishment. The family cap does just that. I encourage my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring my legislation.

TRIBUTE TO DR. EVELYN G. LEWIS

HON. DONALD M. PAYNE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 16, 1998

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, today I would like my colleagues here in the United States House of Representatives to join me in honoring a dedicated public servant, and a very special person, Dr. Evelyn G. Lewis, who is retiring after 35 years in Education with her most recent tenure as principal of University High School in Newark.

We in Essex County have been very fortunate to have a person of Dr. Lewis's talent and outstanding abilities, working on behalf of our children. In addition to her many achievements at University High School, Dr. Lewis also distinguished herself as a hardworking individual. She has served as Originator and Coordinator of the "Newark Business Skills Olympics". Organizer and Chairperson of Newark's Business Advisory Committee and Chair of the Curriculum Committees and the Textbook Review Committee.

On Friday, June 12, 1998 family, friends and colleagues of Dr. Lewis will gather to honor her for her many contributions to the youth of Essex County. Mr. Speaker, let us join in congratulating Dr. Lewis and wishing her all the best as she leaves public service and pursues new challenges.