

such deaths in 1997. Methamphetamine use among incarcerated adults increased from 30 percent in 1991–1992 to 49 percent in 1996–1997.

Children are the most victimized. There were 629 juvenile arrests for drug offenses in 1991, and 2,392 in 1997. The number of juveniles treated in drug treatment centers increased from 1,742 in 1991 to 4,028 in 1996. The Oregon Public School Drug Use Survey Key Findings Report states that since 1990, marijuana use by eighth graders—eighth graders—mind you!, has tripled, while marijuana use by eleventh graders has increased 68 percent. General illicit drug use by eighth graders has doubled since 1992, and over the same time period increased in eleventh graders by 21 percent.

I have given this problem much thought in the past few months. While I am confident that a HIDTA designation is vital to our ability to deter drug trafficking and production, this problem has been further exacerbated by the current Administration's failure to focus and its diminished emphasis on the international component to the war on drugs. That is why I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the Western Hemisphere Drug Elimination Act of 1998 (S. 2522) which calls for an additional \$2.6 billion investment in international counter narcotics efforts over the next three years. This bi-partisan legislation restores funding to international interdiction and eradication efforts that were all but abandoned in 1993. Without decreasing domestic funding or effort, this legislation re-commits the nation to fighting drugs with a comprehensive international approach.

We, Oregonians, are committed to the welfare of our State. We will drive the criminal elements from our borders. Finally, Mr. President, we have no choice but to fight. We have no alternative but to win. I thank the chair.●

TRIBUTE TO JOSEPH MORGART

● Mr. LAUTENBERG. Mr. President, I rise today to pay tribute to a very special young man, one who is close to my heart and certainly close to my daughter's. He is my son-in-law Joe Morgart.

I rise to congratulate him not simply for being a terrific husband to my daughter Nan and a loving father to my grandsons, Alexander and Jonathan, but also to recognize some of his personal achievements. Today, I commend him for becoming a leader in the Jewish community in Boston. He was honored there recently with the 1998 Young Leadership Award given by the Combined Jewish Philanthropies (CJP) of Greater Boston.

CJP now raises nearly \$25 million annually to support educational, humanitarian and cultural causes, as well as providing funding for health care and social service programs in Israel and other Jewish communities around the world. The Young Leadership Division

of CJP gives young Jewish people in the Boston area the opportunity to get involved in community service, as well as to participate in discussions about Jewish issues from religious, ethical, social, political and economic perspectives.

For Joe to receive this award is especially noteworthy, coming from one of the oldest philanthropies in the country and one so dedicated to educating others about Jewish issues. That is so, Mr. President, because Joe has not always been a member of the Jewish faith.

Maybe Joe was attracted to Judaism to impress Nan when they were dating. Maybe he was attracted to Judaism to impress me! Or, knowing Joe and his thirst for knowledge when learning about Judaism, he found that the Jewish religion fulfilled him spiritually and invited him into the community. Joe then decided to convert, and he has become a most valuable participant in the community.

Joe Morgart has served on CJP's Board of Directors, has been an active fundraising campaigner and started a successful outreach and educational services program that drew in many new members for CJP. He has participated in CJP's leadership development program, and has been deeply involved in community service programs for the organization. Beyond his involvement in CJP, Joe is a leader of the Jewish Big Brother & Big Sister Association, part of the American Israel Public Affairs Committee, and is a member of the United Jewish Appeal's Young Leadership Cabinet.

Mr. President, I am proud that a well-regarded organization like CJP recognized Joe Morgart's ability and contributions by honoring him with this award. I know that his entire family is proud as well of his accomplishments and the love and respect that he has earned from all of those who know him.●

ASSISTIVE TECHNOLOGY ACT OF 1998

● Mr. JEFFORDS. Mr. President, I am very pleased that last night we passed S. 2432, the Assistive Technology Act of 1998, the ATA. In the spring of 1988, I made a commitment to individuals with disabilities. I said that I would, with their help, and that of my colleagues, develop and pass legislation that would provide greater access to assistive technology for people with disabilities. Between April and August of that year, we did just that. The Technology-Related Assistance for Individuals with Disabilities, commonly referred to as the Tech Act, became P. L. 100-407 and received its first appropriation. That legislation has had a successful 10 year run. It sunsets on September 30, 1998.

This spring I made another commitment. I said I would, with the help of my friends in the disability community, my partners Senators HARKIN and

BOND, develop new technology legislation that would promote greater access to technology for people with disabilities, promote greater interest in and investment by the Federal Government and public and private entities in addressing the unmet technology needs of individuals with disabilities, and create expanded means by which individuals with disabilities could purchase assistive technology. We were joined in our efforts by Senators KERRY, MCCONNELL, COLLINS, KENNEDY, REED, FRIST, DEWINE, BINGAMAN, WELLSTONE, WARNER, DODD, FAIRCLOTH, FORD, MIKULSKI, SARBANES, D'AMATO, REID, COCHRAN, and JOHNSON. This legislation will equip individuals with disabilities through technology, to sustain their functioning, to expand their range of abilities, to be more independent, and to contribute at home, in school, at work, and in the community.

S. 2432 builds on the success of the Tech Act. In recognition of the accomplishments of State Tech Projects, State protection and advocacy systems, and technical assistance provided by the Rehabilitation Engineering and Assistive Technology Society of North America (RESNA) and United Cerebral Palsy Associations, Inc., the bill continues federal support for activities proven to be effective in promoting access to assistive technology. It also sets policies and authorizes federal support for new challenges related to technology and its impact on individuals with disabilities. It encourages states, the Federal Government, public and private entities, individuals with disabilities and their families and advocates, to form new partnerships, to stretch expectations and to build consensus through common goals, to promote and to endorse meaningful accountability by measuring progress on common goals, and generally work together to make the environments and the technology of tomorrow accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities.

The specific purposes of the bill are to: support states in sustaining and strengthening their capacity to address the assistive technology needs of individuals with disabilities; focus the federal investment in technology that could benefit individuals with disabilities; and support micro-loan programs to provide assistance to individuals who desire to purchase assistive technology devices or services.

S. 2432 reaffirms the federal role of promoting access to assistive technology devices and services for individuals with disabilities. The bill allows states flexibility in responding to the assistive technology needs of their citizens with disabilities, and does not disrupt the accomplishments of states over the last decade through the state assistive technology programs funded under the Tech Act.

Title I of the ATA authorizes funding for multiple grant programs from fiscal years 1999 through 2004: continuity grants, challenge grants, millennium

grants, and grants to protection and advocacy systems, as well as funding for a technical assistance program. The bill streamlines and clarifies expectations, including expectations related to accountability, associated with continuing federal support for state assistive technology programs. The bill targets specific, proven activities, as priorities, referred to as "mandatory activities". All State grantees must set measurable goals in connection to their use of ATA funds, and both the goals and the approach to measuring the goals must be based on input from individuals with disabilities in the State.

If a State has received less than 10 years of Federal funding under the Tech Act for its assistive technology program, title I of S. 2432 allows a State, which submits a supplement (a continuity grant) to its current grant for Federal funds, to use ATA funds for mandatory activities related to a public awareness program, policy development and interagency coordination, technical assistance and training, and outreach, especially to elderly and rural populations with disabilities. Such a State also may use ATA funds for optional grant activities: alternative State-financed systems for assistance technology devices and services, technology demonstrations, distribution of information about how to finance assistive technology devices and services, and operation of a technology-related information system, or participation in interstate activities or public-private partnerships pertaining to assistive technology.

If a state has had 10 years of funding for its assistive technology program, the State may submit an application for a noncompetitive challenge grant. Grant funds must be spent on specific activities—interagency coordination, an assistive technology information system, a public awareness program, technical assistance and training, and outreach activities.

In fiscal year 2000 through 2004, if funding for title I exceeds \$40 million, States operating under challenge grants may apply for additional ATA funding, provided through competitive millennium grants. These grants are to focus on specific statewide or local level capacity building activities in an area or areas related to access to technology for individuals with disabilities.

Title I of the bill also authorizes funding for protection and advocacy systems in each State to assist individuals with disabilities to access assistive technology devices and services, and funding for a technical assistance program, and specifies administrative procedures with regard to monitoring of entities funded under title I of the bill. The bill contains an authorization for a National Public Internet Site on assistive technology as part of the technical assistance program. This site will have two distinct functions. First, once developed and operating, the site will have the capacity, through inter-

action with an individual, both to identify a profile of the individual's specific assistive technology needs and to recommend alternatives for addressing those needs. Second, once information is identified and links established, the site will be a location on the Internet through which individuals may access information about assistive technology devices and services and be linked to state Tech Projects and other sites to access additional information.

S. 2432 treats year 1999 as a transition year for current grantees of federal funds for assistive technology. The bill provides the Secretary of Education with discretion to treat grantees who have completed 10 years of Federal funding in that year as if those states were in their tenth year of federal funding. In addition, grantees who have received less than 10 years of funding for assistive technology programs may elect in fiscal year 2000 only to transition from continuity grant status to challenge grant status by submitting a grant application for a challenge grant.

The authorization level for title I of the bill is \$36 million for fiscal year 1999, and such sums for fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

Title II of S. 2432 provides for increased coordination of Federal efforts related to assistive technology and universal design, and authorizes funding for multiple grant programs from fiscal years 1999 through 2004. Title II strengthens the mandate of the Interagency Committee on Disability Research (ICDR) to include assistive technology and universal design research, and authorizes funding the joint research projects by ICDR members. Title II also provides for increased cooperation between the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR), which oversees the State Tech Projects, and the Federal Laboratories Consortium.

Title II of the bill also authorizes increased funding for Small Business Innovative Research grants (an existing program under the Small Business Act) related to assistive technology and funding to commercial or other organizations for research and development related to how to incorporate the principles of universal design into the design of products and buildings so they can be used without alteration by all people. This title also authorizes funding for grants or other mechanisms to address the unique assistive technology needs of urban and rural areas, of children and the elderly, and to improve training of rehabilitation engineers and technicians.

Finally, title II of S. 2432 authorizes funding for the President's Commission on the Employment of People with Disabilities to work with the private sector to promote the development of accessible information technologies.

The authorization of appropriations for title II is \$15 million for fiscal year 1999, and such sums for fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

Title II of the bill provides for alternative financing mechanisms for peo-

ple with disabilities to purchase assistive technology devices and services from fiscal years 1999 through 2004. These funds are to be used to establish specified types of loan programs for individuals with disabilities, and not to be used simply to purchase assistive technology for individuals with disabilities. The authorization of appropriations for title III of S. 2432 is \$25 million for fiscal year 1999, and such sums for fiscal years 2000 through 2004.

We would not have been successful in passing S. 2432 without the technical assistance and cooperation from the U.S. Department of Education, the state Tech Projects, particularly, Lynne Cleveland, Director of the Vermont state Tech Project, the National Association of Protection and Advocacy Systems, and the Technology Task Force of the Consortium for Individuals with Disabilities, especially Jennifer Dexter, Jim Gelecka, Glen Sutcliffe, Sally Rhodes, and Ellin Nolan. I would also like to recognize the efforts of Senate staff, Lloyd Horwich with Senator HARKIN, Dreama Towe with Senator BOND, and Pat Morrissey, Heidi Mohlman, and Carolyn Dupree of my staff.

In addition to being supported by the disability community, S. 2432 has been endorsed by the Administration and the Chamber of Commerce and supported by the Administration. Moreover, the National Governors Association, and individual governors have urged the passage of assistive technology legislation this year.

Everyone has worked especially hard to help us meet our ambitious, compressed time table. Along the way, every Senate office now has a better understanding and appreciation of assistive technology—what it means to an individual with a disability who has it and what it means to an individual with a disability who needs it, but can't get it.

Technology has become commonplace and thus, is often taken for granted. Yet, the power of technology is, in many ways, our last frontier. As we push technology to do more for us, S. 2432 offers us the tools to ensure that individuals with disabilities also benefit.

I appreciate the support of my colleagues in passing S. 2432.●

EUGENE L. MCCABE

● Mr. MOYNIHAN. Mr. President, many years ago Eugene L. McCabe came to Washington seeking financial support for his new North General Hospital in Harlem. By then people living in Harlem, like many in our cities, suffered from hospital cutbacks and closings. They were in desperate need of affordable and reliable medical care. The AIDS and crack epidemics overburdened what few local facilities there were. But where others saw despair, Eugene saw hope and opportunity. He founded North General as a community hospital specializing in the treatment