

laptop not being able to be exported because of the 2,000 MTOPS limit that we place on exportation.

I think that there is a false argument that has been set up in this debate, and that is that this is a choice between national security and commerce. And I could spew off a whole bunch of statistics about how important technology is to the growth of our economy and how important access to foreign markets is to that growth of our technology sector of our economy. And all of that is true.

But a lot of people look at that and say, well, you are just arguing put commerce ahead of national security. We are not arguing that. National security, as well as commerce, demands that we change the export control policies that we place on technology.

SAFETY IN AMERICA'S SCHOOLS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to rise tonight and talk for a second about a subject that only a few months ago was on everybody's lips but fast wanes away, and that is school safety and the problem with violence in our schools.

In the next few days, or next week, we will consider gun legislation. We will hear a lot of rhetoric. We will talk about a lot of things. But somehow, with time and space, we forget about the great tragedy that has happened in America in the past 2 years.

This year, when graduation takes place, many students will commence to higher education. But in Colorado, 13 students will never go to class again. In Georgia, only by the grace of God, our students were injured and not killed.

Does Congress have a role in this? Is there something that we can do? Yes, I think there is. But first I think we need to be honest about the blame game.

There is appropriate responsibility in the gun industry, and they should accept it. There is appropriate responsibility in the motion picture industry, and they should accept it. There is appropriate responsibility in the music industry, and they should accept it. And every parent in America should understand today that parental responsibility must be restored in America if we are ever to solve school violence.

But Congress has a role, too. It is our fault, as well. We stand here today in the people's House and appropriate money for the education of our children, the defense of our country, exports of our materials and facilitating our businesses. Yet our greatest natural resource is the generation now being educated in the schools of America.

Should we run them? No, they should not be federalized. I was a school board chairman in Georgia. I know local control is important. But I know resources are equally important.

□ 2045

Next week, I will introduce in the Congress a bill that really does address school violence. It does not play the blame game by attacking an inanimate object, a motion picture or music, all of which have some responsibility, but instead it talks about us being a facilitator for resources at the local level through a block grant program that institutionalizes in this country an expectation of safety, discipline and student assistance.

When you read behind the sensationalism of the last few instances in America, you will find students who were troubled, students who were reported by teachers or other parents to have demonstrated tendencies that would be violent, and you will find gaps between that report and any follow-up. And unfortunately in each and every case, whether it be Paducah or Jonesboro or Conyers or Littleton, tragedy ensued and the lives of American children were lost.

This bill would do the following things. It would create a block grant program for any system in the country that wishes to apply for us to assist in the funding of a director of school safety in every public school in America. It would not allow the funds to supplant State or local funds. The individual employed would not necessarily have to be a certified teacher but could be at the discretion of that system, somebody that most importantly met the needs of the demographics of those children. If accepted, it would require a school safety plan. And further it would exempt from existing law the prohibitions we now place on many teachers and administrators from direct referrals of students who demonstrated violent tendencies to the appropriate law enforcement, mental health or other agency that we fund in our local governments around this country.

Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that children rise to the expectations that we set for them. Unfortunately, we have created an environment where our expectations in our schools in terms of discipline, in terms of zero tolerance for violence, are not as high as they should be. And the children, the vast majority, almost 100 percent who are good kids, who obey the rules, who go to school, they should not be punished and their life should never be taken, because we did not do what we could do to facilitate an environment in our schools of safety and discipline and, probably most importantly, direct assistance when a child is in trouble, to see to it they receive what they need at the most critical time in their lives.

I want to conclude by making a point. I am a parent. Since I have been in politics I probably got more credit for raising our three than I deserve, but my wife and I raised three wonderful children. We sent them all to public schools. I think that is the real world. I think that is the world my kids will grow up in. We sent them there and we tried our best to be involved in their education, to raise their expectations, to do the right thing and to obey the law. There are lots of other parents like that. But the biggest problem in America today is probably parental deficit disorder, not attention deficit disorder. We cannot expect our system to educate our kids and to raise them.

I urge my colleagues to support this legislation and let us do something concrete for the children of America.

INTRODUCTION OF LEGISLATION REGARDING ALIENS FROM ALBANIA, MACEDONIA AND MONTENEGRO

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TANCREDO). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. BIGGERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. BIGGERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill that will lighten the heavy burden placed on our allies in the Balkans. Over the past 9 weeks, over 780,000 refugees have flooded into Albania, Macedonia and Montenegro, putting overwhelming pressures on already strained humanitarian services. I recently visited these countries and saw firsthand the growing number of refugees and the demands on social services, government workers and relief agencies attempting to feed, clothe and house refugees with nowhere else to turn. As a Nation, we have appealed to these countries to keep their borders open to the Kosovar refugees. We have increased our humanitarian aid, pledged to admit 20,000 refugees into the United States, and already welcomed 3,000 of them into our country. In fact, volunteers for a relief agency in my district, World Relief in Wheaton, have welcomed 54 refugees into their homes. Yet as we are opening our homes to refugees from camps in Macedonia, Albania and Montenegro, we are preparing to send back to them aliens who have been residing peacefully in the United States. Indeed, the U.S. Immigration and Naturalization Service continues to detain for deportation aliens from these countries. One of my constituents in Illinois has been interned for purposes of deportation since last March.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this policy should be revised to reflect the current realities of the situation in the Balkans. Clearly there are extraordinary conditions that prevent aliens from returning to these republics at

this time. My legislation, cosponsored by seven of my colleagues from both sides of the aisle, will designate temporary protected status for aliens from the Republics of Albania and Montenegro and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia. The U.S. has already extended such protection to aliens from Kosovo. I believe that it must also be extended to these other hard-pressed republics.

In my view, this would not only serve the best interests of the United States, it would also signal to our friends in the region our firm commitment to easing the overwhelming humanitarian challenges that face them.

Mr. Speaker, I wrote to the Attorney General and the Secretary of State urging that TPS be designated for aliens from these countries. The administration has yet to take action on my recommendation. As the stability of our friends in the Balkans is of paramount importance to the success of our Nation's mission, I believe Congress must act.

I thank my colleagues who join with me today in support of this bill. I urge the House to act quickly on this legislation to show our strong commitment to the continued well-being of our friends in the Balkans.

IN SUPPORT OF SECURITY AND FREEDOM THROUGH ENCRYPTION (SAFE) ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MALONEY) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to speak in support of the Security and Freedom through Encryption, or SAFE, Act, which has been introduced in this session of the Congress and has been done so in support of the high technology industry which is so important to our economy and, therefore, to our country. Indeed, the high technology industry has already created and employs nearly 5 million people across this great land. But the statistics do not show the whole story, for as much as the high tech industry directly adds to our economy, it adds even more indirectly. Advances in technology impact every other sector of our economy, be it retail sales or farming or manufacturing or whatever. The productivity increases that high tech has brought to us allow us to work better and faster, creating higher incomes and prosperity for all Americans. I think it is safe to say that high technology has been the most important development in our economy in the last 50 years. We need to continue to promote high technology. Part of the problem we face is that currently government imposes strict regulations on technology imports, such as encryption technology. The rationale behind these policies is

that we should limit potential adversaries from acquiring top-notch technology, whether those adversaries be in the foreign affairs field or in criminal enterprises. In regard to encryption, this policy is outdated and needs rethinking. It is as a practical matter impossible to limit access to some of those technologies, especially when it is possible to purchase top of the line encryption technology through the Internet or from a foreign vendor. U.S. export controls on U.S.-created encryption do not restrict anyone's access to technology or to encryption devices, and instead cripples the U.S. technology industry's ability to grow, invest in research and development and continue to create the best technology in the world. That is a far bigger threat to our national security. Our national security fundamentally relies on the strength and competitiveness of our economy. Reforming encryption controls and passage of the Security and Freedom through Encryption, or SAFE, Act which I have cosponsored is a common-sense approach that levels the playing field for our industry in the world, without compromising America's national security interest. I urge its passage.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE FOR H.R. 1000, AVIATION INVESTMENT AND REFORM ACT FOR THE 21ST CENTURY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SHUSTER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting for the RECORD the official Congressional Budget Office Cost Estimate for H.R. 1000, unanimously reported by the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure on May 27, 1999. As part of an agreement, the committee had received unanimous consent to file its report by 6 p.m. on May 28, 1999. Unfortunately, CBO was unable to complete the official cost estimate by 6 p.m., and the committee had to include a committee cost estimate in its report. That estimate is superseded by the CBO estimate.

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, DC, May 28, 1999.

Hon. BUD SHUSTER,
Chairman, Committee on Transportation
and Infrastructure, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Congressional Budget Office has prepared the enclosed cost estimate for H.R. 1000, the Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 12th Century.

If you wish further details on this estimate, we will be pleased to provide them. The principal CBO staff contact for federal costs is Victoria Heid Hall, who can be reached at 226-2860. The staff contact for the private-sector impact is Jean Wooster, who can be reached at 226-2940, and the contact for the state and local impact is Lisa Cash Driskill, who can be reached at 225-3220.

Sincerely,

BARRY B. ANDERSON,
(For Dan L. Crippen, Director).

Enclosure.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE H.R. 1000—Aviation Investment and Reform Act for the 21st century

Summary: H.R. 1000 would authorize funding for programs of the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) primarily for fiscal years 2000 through 2004. CBO estimates that implementing H.R. 1000 would result in additional outlays totaling about \$56 billion over the 2000-2004 period. That total assumes appropriation action consistent with the bill's authorizations and the levels of new contract authority it provides for aviation programs. Outlays for the programs authorized by the bill would grow from an estimated \$9.2 billion in 1999 to \$14.8 billion in 2004. We also estimate that enacting the bill would increase direct spending outlays by about \$46 million over the same period. Revenues would decline by \$35 million over the five-year period. Because H.R. 1000 would affect both direct spending and receipts, pay-as-you-go procedures would apply to the bill.

The bill would provide an additional \$7.1 billion in contract authority for the airport improvement program (AIP) over the 2000-2004 period (above the \$2.4 billion a year assumed in the baseline), but providing this contract authority would not affect outlays from direct spending because AIP outlays are subject to appropriation action. (The increase in estimated AIP outlays is included in the discretionary total cited above.) H.R. 1000 also would increase direct spending authority for the Essential Air Service (EAS) program by \$10 million each year. We estimate that enacting that change would increase outlays by \$46 million over the 2000-2004 period. Furthermore, the bill would allow the Secretary of Transportation to authorize certain airports to charge higher passenger facility fees and would expand a pilot program that provides for the innovative use of airport improvement grants to finance airport projects. The Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) expects that these provisions would result in an increase in tax-exempt financing and a subsequent loss of federal revenue. JCT estimates that the revenue loss would be \$35 million over the 2000-2004 period and \$142 million over the 2000-2009 period.

H.R. 1000 would take the Airport and Airway Trust Fund (AATF) off-budget and exempt AATF spending from the discretionary spending caps, pay-as-you-go procedures, and Congressional budget controls (including the budget resolution, committee spending allocations, and reconciliation process). Title X would provide for adjusting AIP contract authority upward based on the difference between the amounts appropriated and the amount authorized for FAA operations, facilities and equipment, and research and development. Any adjustments would begin in fiscal year 2001.

H.R. 1000 contains intergovernmental mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA), but CBO estimates that the costs would be significant and would not meet the threshold established by that act (\$50 million in 1996, adjusted annually for inflation). Overall, the bill would provide significant benefits to airports operated by state and local governments. Section 4 of UMRA excludes from the application of that act any legislative provisions that would establish or enforce certain statutory rights prohibiting discrimination. CBO has determined that section 706 fits within that exclusion. Section 4 also excludes from the application of that act any legislative provisions that are necessary for the ratification or implementation of international treaty obligations. CBO has determined that section 710,