from raising in revenues'' are also included in the definition of ''direct costs.'' In this way, the act allows for consideration of the impact of federal legislation on the revenue-raising capabilities of these governments.

The CBO statement must also include an assessment of whether the bill authorizes or otherwise provides funding to cover the costs of the mandates. For intergovernmental mandates, the cost statement must estimate the appropriations needed to fund such authorizations for up to 10 years after the mandate is effective.

CBO must ''to the greatest extent practicable'' prepare statements for conference agreements if they contain mandates not previously considered by either House or if they impose greater direct costs than the previously considered versions of the bill. If an individual Senator requests it, CBO must prepare estimates of the costs of intergovernmental mandates contained in an amendment the Senator may wish to offer.

The Congress may also call on CBO to do analyses at other stages of the legislative process. If asked by the chair or ranking minority member of a committee, and to the extent practicable, CBO will: conduct special studies on legislative proposals; compare an agency's estimate of the costs of proposed regulations implementing a federal mandate with CBO's estimate prepared when the law was enacted; and conduct continuing studies to enhance comparisons of budget outlays, credit authority, and tax expenditures. CBO's ability to carry out those additional activities will depend on available resources.

Although the act does not specifically require CBO to analyze the cost of mandates in appropriation bills, a point of order would lie against legislative provisions in such bills—or amendments to such bills—that increase the direct costs of intergovernmental mandates but do not have the appropriate CBO statement. CBO will also be required, when requested, to assist committees by preparing studies of legislative proposals containing federal mandates. For intergovernmental mandates, CBO is directed to solicit information or comments from elected officials and to consider establishing advisory panels.

Enforcement and Implementation Mechanisms Related to CBO's Work. A point of order will now lie against any reported bill unless the committee has published a CBO statement about mandate costs. A point of order will also lie against any bill, amendment, motion, or conference report that would increase the direct costs of federal intergovernmental mandates by more than $50 million, unless it provides spending authority or authorizes appropriations sufficient to cover those costs. Such authorizations would have to be specified for each year up to 10 years after the effective date, and—in the Senate—would have to be consistent with the estimated costs of the bill, amendment, motion, or conference report as determined by the Budget Committee. Finally, a point of order will lie against any bill, amendment, motion, or conference report that would increase the direct costs of federal intergovernmental mandates by more than $50 million, unless it provides a procedure for terminating or scaling back mandates if agencies determine that funds are not sufficient to cover those costs.

How CBO Is Responding. Although CBO has been preparing estimates of the impacts of federal legislation on state and local governments since 1982, the passage of the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act has signaled Congressional interest in having more and better information on the costs of mandates. This heightened interest on the part of the Congress makes it clear that CBO must devote more time and resources to providing the Congress with high quality and timely estimates.

CBO has done several things to enhance our state and local government cost-estimating efforts. Most important, we have established a new unit in the Budget Analysis Division—the State and Local Government Cost Estimates Unit. In addition to preparing cost estimates, the unit will do special studies related to mandates and their budgetary impacts and will provide ongoing support to Congressional committees as they address the issues of intergovernmental mandates. The new unit is currently staffed with a unit chief and four analysts who have begun developing those capabilities.

For private-sector analyses, CBO has hired additional staff in our program divisions to prepare cost estimates and to conduct special studies when requested. The policy divisions also will provide ongoing support to congressional committees as they address the issues of private-sector mandates.

New Responsibilities of Congressional Committees. The Unfunded Mandates Reform Act also contains a number of new requirements for committees. In general, when an authorizing committee reports a bill or joint resolution that includes a federal mandate, the report must identify and describe those mandates and include a statement from the Director of the Congressional Budget Office on their estimated costs. If that statement cannot be published with the report, the committee is responsible for ensuring that it is published in the Congressional Record in advance of floor consideration. The committee is responsible for promptly providing CBO with a copy of the bill and for identifying mandates contained in the bill.

In addition, the report must contain a qualitative and, if practical, a quantitative assessment of costs and benefits anticipated from the mandates (including the effects on health and safety and the protection of the natural environment). Finally, the committee must state the degree to which a federal mandate affects both the public and private sectors, and the effect on the competitive balance between those sectors if federal payments are made to compensate for costs imposed on the public sector.

If the bill imposes intergovernmental mandates, the committee report shall contain a statement of how those mandates are to be funded by the federal government; whether the committee intends for the mandate to be partially or fully funded; how the funding mechanism relates to the expected direct costs to the respective levels of state, local, and tribal governments; and any existing source of funds in addition to those already identified that would assist governments in meeting the direct costs of the mandate.

Bills must also provide for agencies to determine whether funds are sufficient to cover the costs of new intergovernmental mandates. If funding is insufficient, the agency must notify the authorizing committee within 30 days of the beginning of the fiscal year. The agency can submit a reestimate of the costs or recommend a less costly approach. If the Congress takes no action within 60 days, the mandate becomes ineffective.

For amended bills, joint resolutions and conference reports, the committee of conference shall ensure, to the greatest extent possible, that the Director of CBO prepare a statement if the amended form contains a federal mandate not previously considered by either House, or contains an increase in the direct costs of a previously considered mandate.

Finally, the committees are required to identify in their annual views and estimates reports to the Budget Committees, issues that they will consider that will have costs for state, local, or tribal governments or for the private sector.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE—INTERGOVERNMENTAL MANDATE STATEMENT FOR BILLS ON THE HOUSE CALENDAR

(AS OF JANUARY 23, 1996)

Committee: Resources.

Bills that do not contain mandates: H.R. 260—National Park System Reform Act of 1995; H.R. 1077—BLM Reauthorization Act of 1995; H.R. 1122—Alaska Power Administration Sale Act; H.R. 1175—Marine Resources Revitalization Act of 1995; H.R. 1675—National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995; H.R. 1745—Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995; H.R. 1815—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1995; H.R. 2402—Snowbasin Land Exchange Act of 1995; H.R. 2726—A bill to make certain technical corrections in laws relating to Native Americans; and S. 1341—Saddleback Mountain-Arizona Settlement Act of 1995.

Bills that contain mandates, but aggregate net costs are below $50 million: None.

Bills that require further review: None.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE—PRIVATE SECTOR MANDATE STATEMENT FOR BILLS ON THE HOUSE CALENDAR

(AS OF JANUARY 23, 1996)

Committee: Resources.

Bills that do not contain mandates: H.R. 1077—BLM Reauthorization Act of 1995; H.R. 1122—Alaska Power Administration Sale Act; H.R. 1175—Marine Resources Revitalization Act of 1995; H.R. 1815—National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Authorization Act of 1995; H.R. 2402—Snowbasin Land Exchange Act of 1995; H.R. 2726—A bill to make certain technical corrections in laws relating to Native Americans.

Bills that require further review: H.R. 260—National Park System Reform Act of 1995; H.R. 1675—National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1995; H.R. 1745—Utah Public Lands Management Act of 1995; and S. 1341—Saddleback Mountain-Arizona Settlement Act of 1995.

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.

TRADE DEFICITS

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

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential campaigns, particularly the Republican primary campaign, is in the full swing right now, and there has been a lot of derogatory comments made by one candidate or another about their opponents.

I think we have a good field of Republican candidates, and I wish they would quit the terrible rhetoric about one another and really stick to the facts. I think if they do that, the American people will find them to be the kind of people they want to elect President and will elect the nominee we can all live with and be happy with and can elect in November to the Presidency of the United States.

One of the problems that I have is that there has been a lot of misinformation about one of the candidates, and I am not taking sides in this Presidential campaign at this point, but I would like to point out some of the inaccurate remarks that have been made in what I believe to be untrue statements.

First of all, they say Pat Buchanan, one of the leading candidates for President, has been one who wants to put a wall around the United States and be a protectionist, and they say the manifestation of this is because he opposed NAFTA and a lot of the jobs going to Mexico and other parts of the world, and they have said that this is the wrong approach and that we should not be worrying about that.

The fact of the matter is NAFTA has been a disaster, and Mr. Buchanan is not wrong.

Let me give you some figures: In 1995, the U.S. trade deficit with the world was about $120 billion. That included a deficit of about $671 billion with Japan, $40 billion with China, and the deficit with Mexico is now $16 billion. Two years ago, when we signed NAFTA, we had a $6 billion trade surplus with Mexico. Now we have a $16 billion trade deficit. That means we have lost $22 billion in trade with Mexico in the last 2 years, and each one of those billions of dollars costs the people of this country 19,000 jobs.

And so since NAFTA was passed, we have had a net loss of over 300,000 jobs going to Mexico. A net loss of 300,000 jobs. I think that it is not inaccurate to say it is not in the best interests of the people of this country to have businesses and industries relocate in Mexico to the detriment of American workers because of an unfair trade agreement.

Now, people say why do we have an unfair trade agreement? ''Why do you say that, DAN?'' The reason I say that is there are several problems with the NAFTA bill. Mr. Buchanan has talked about those. One of the problems is the tariffs on the Mexican side of the border come down over 15 years. On the American side of it's border, in many cases, those tariffs come down in 5 years. That gives the Mexican entrepreneur or business person a 10-year advantage, because they are still going to have tariffs on their side of the border for American products while we do not have them here.

Now, the wage rates down there in some parts of Mexico are very, very low. You can employ people in the Yucatan, including fringe benefits, for a dollar an hour, and their counterpart in the United States is being paid anywhere from $10 to $20 an hour. That labor disparity is one reason to go down there.

In addition to that, the tariffs not coming down as quickly on the Mexican side also is an inducement for American industry to leave here and go down there. Why would a small labor-intensive industry, let us say, that manufactures microwave ovens want to stay here when their competition is in Mexico at much lower wage rates, selling into the United States with no tariffs while they are paying much higher wage rates here in the United States and they cannot sell into Mexico without an import tariff? And so there is a real disadvantage for American industries staying here instead of going south of the border. Mr. Buchanan talks about that, and it is something that has cost us, as I said, over 300,000 jobs.

Let me give you some figures: Imports from Mexico have increased 51 percent; that is, products coming from there to here. United States exports going to Mexico have increased by only 8 percent. So they have got a 33 percent advantage there. The $5.7 billion trade surplus I talked about in 1992 is now a $16 billion trade deficit, costing 300,000 jobs. The companies along the border are relocating in Mexico because of these advantages. More workers, in 90 percent of the cases, let me just read this to you, at this rate, taking Japan and China, for example, excuse me, while large corporations made sweeping predictions that NAFTA would enable them to hire more workers, in 90 percent of the cases these companies who said they would be able to hire more workers because of NAFTA have made no significant steps toward fulfilling these promises. In fact, according to the Department of Labor estimates, many of these leading NAFTA promoters have laid off workers, including GE, Procter & Gamble, Mattelle, and Xerox. For example, Wrangler has closed three manufacturing plants, lost 700 jobs to Mexico. United Technologies automotive plant in St. Mathews, SC, laid off 400 workers to plants in Mexico. Cleveland Mills, owned by Fruit of the Loom, folded in December, eliminating 400 jobs. This is part of the Fruit of the Loom plans to cut 3,200 jobs, close six plants and move those operations to other parts of the world, including Mexico. Eleven El Paso apparel factories closed down in the first year alone because of NAFTA, and recently the Hershey Co., an all-American company, everybody loves those Hershey Kisses, they moved one of their major Hershey Kisses plants to Mexico, and this is just another reason why facts need to be laid out very clearly in this campaign, and we should not be denigrating any one candidate to the advantage of another, because of misinformation.

Mr. Buchanan is right on the money on this issue. We are losing jobs. There needs to be free trade, but there needs to be fair trade as well, and so I hope my colleagues that are running for President will keep this in mind.

ATROCITY COMMITTED 90 MILES FROM U.S. SHORE

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

Mr. DEUTSCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues in the fastest possible time and the quickest possible moment to pass the Helms-Burton bill to bring the end of the Castro dictatorship in Cuba.

Just this weekend, we witnessed less than 90 miles from our shore, actually about 85 miles from our shore, 85 miles from my district, an incident that will be remembered throughout American history as one of the most brazen, really cruel, vicious, evil acts in the 20th century.

Two aircraft, civilian aircraft, unarmed civilian aircraft, irrefutably over international waters, and again the evidence is irrefutable at this time of where they were, and regardless of where they were, over international waters, shot down by military fighter jets, and all passengers perished. A rogue state, not a country, but the leadership of that country, that just recently in the so-called 13th of March incident of last year killed 40 innocent Cubans, men, women, and children trying to escape persecution. A country and a leader, not a people, but a leader, Castro, who just really immediately before this incident, February 15 of this year, began a nationwide roundup of members of an opposition group called Concilio Cubano, over 100 members of Concilio Cubano were arrested and over 20 members are still missing and presumed in jail.

The Clinton administration has offered on the table some things that will be helpful. But what this country needs to do, what we need to do as Americans, is bring the last and only dictator, the last and only Communist ruler in our hemisphere, to an end. We have the power to do that within this building, within this Hall, within this Chamber, with the help of the Chamber on the other side and the support of the President.

I point to several of my colleagues who really are still thinking of or fixated in Castro the liberator, Castro the reformist, to think of what he is doing to his own people.

I am glad that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BURTON], the chairman of the committee dealing with this issue and the author of this bill is here. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BURTON of Indiana. Let me say to my colleague from Florida that we really appreciate his leadership on this bill. He has been very, very helpful in getting the Burton-Helms bill through the U.S. House of Representatives with a veto-proof majority.

This horrible act that took place this weekend to which the gentleman referred should eliminate any doubt in anybody's mind about the necessity for passing this bill and cutting off Castro's ability to get hard currency by selling confiscated United States property that was owned by Americans in Cuba. I cannot stress strongly enough the support that the gentleman has given and how much I appreciate that.

The President has now come on board, a little late, but we are very happy he is on board, and he said he is