

immigration status of such individuals with the INS. Existing law requires that state and local governments provide these services and, under current matching requirements, pay approximately half of the costs. While no reliable totals are available of the amounts currently spent to provide the services, areas with large alien populations claim that this requirement results in a substantial drain on their budgets. For example, California, with almost half the country's illegal alien population, estimates it spends over \$350 million each year on these federally mandated services. Full federal reimbursement of emergency medical costs would result in significant savings to state and local governments.

Practical issues surrounding the verification requirement, however, call into question the ability of states and localities to collect the additional funds. Emergency patients often show up with no insurance and little other identification; therefore, if the INS drafted stringent rules for verification, we expect that few providers could qualify for full reimbursement. On the other hand, if the INS required only minimal identification, state and local governments could realize significant savings.

10. Previous CBO estimate: CBO provided a preliminary analysis of mandate costs to state and local governments as part of the federal cost estimate dated March 4, 1996. The initial conclusions presented in that estimate have not changed.

11. Estimate prepared by: Leo Lex and Karen McVey.

12. Estimate approved by: Robert A. Sunshine for Paul N. Van de Water, Assistant Director for Budget Analysis.

#### CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ESTIMATE OF COSTS OF PRIVATE SECTOR MANDATES

1. Bill number: H.R. 2202.  
2. Bill title: Immigration in the National Interest Act of 1995.

3. Bill status: As ordered reported by the House Committee on Judiciary on October 24, 1995.

4. Bill purpose: H.R. 2202 would make many changes and additions to federal laws relating to immigration.

5. Private sector mandates contained in the bill: The bill would impose new requirements on the private sector in several titles. Generally speaking, the private sector mandates in H.R. 2202 lie in four areas: (1) provisions that affect aliens within the borders of the United States, (2) provisions that affect individuals who sponsor aliens and execute affidavits of support, (3) provisions that affect the transportation industry, and (4) provisions that affect employers of aliens. In addition, a few provisions would reduce existing mandates on employers and offset marginally some of the costs imposed by new mandates.

6. Estimated direct cost to the private sector: Assuming H.R. 2202 were enacted this summer, CBO estimates that the direct costs of private sector mandates identified in this bill would be minimal through 1999. However, the direct costs associated with new private sector mandates would exceed \$100 million in 2000, \$300 million in 2001, and \$600 million in 2002. The lion's share of those costs would be imposed on sponsors of aliens who execute affidavits of support; such costs are now borne by the federal government and state and local governments for the provision of benefits under public assistance programs.

#### Title III—Inspection, apprehension, detention, adjudication, and removal of inadmissible and deportable aliens

Title III (new section 241) of the bill would impose new mandates on the transportation industry, in particular, those carriers arriv-

ing in the U.S. from overseas. Agents that transport stowaways to the U.S., even unknowingly, would be responsible for removing them and for the costs associated with their removal. In addition, carriers of stowaways would be responsible for any personal care required by illegal aliens because of a mental or physical condition.

This mandate is not expected to impose large costs on the transportation industry. Over the last two years, only about 2000 stowaways have been detained in total.

#### Title VI—Restrictions on benefits for aliens

Title VI would impose new requirements on citizens and permanent residents who execute affidavits of support for legal immigrants. At present, immigrants who are expected to become public charges must obtain a financial sponsor who signs an affidavit of support. A portion of the sponsor's income is then "deemed" to the immigrant for use in the means-test for several federal welfare programs. Affidavits of support, however, are not legally binding documents. H.R. 2202 would make affidavits of support legally binding, expand the responsibilities of financial sponsors, and place an enforceable duty on sponsors to reimburse the federal government or states for benefits provided in certain circumstances.

Supporting aliens to prevent them from becoming public charges would impose considerable cost on sponsors, who are included in the private sector under the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act of 1995. Assuming this bill were enacted this summer, sponsors of immigrants would face over \$20 million in additional costs in 1998. Costs would grow quickly, however. Over the period from 1998 to 2002, assuming that affidavits of support would be enforced, the costs to sponsors would exceed \$100 million annually and would total \$1 billion during the first five years that the mandate is effective.

#### Title VIII—Miscellaneous provisions

Title VIII would impose new private sector mandates on employers who hire temporary non-immigrant workers. Under section 806, if an employer within a certain period following or preceding the laying-off of American workers files an application for an H-1B non-immigrant worker, that employer would be required to pay a wage to the non-immigrant that is at least 110 percent of the average of the last wage earned by all such laid-off workers. The costs associated with that mandate are dependent on how often H-1B workers are used to replace laid-off workers. In addition, section 806 contains provisions that would reduce mandates imposed on employers that are classified as non-H-1B dependent employers that would offset somewhat the costs of new mandates in that section.

Although no specific information exists on the extent of this practice, available data suggests that the new mandate to pay 110 percent of the average wage would not be particularly costly. About 65,000 H-1B visas are awarded each year. H-1B workers can stay in the U.S. for three years (or six years if awarded a one-time extension). Therefore, at most 390,000 H-1B workers are in the country at any one time, although the total number is probably less than that. The exact number is difficult to determine for several reasons:

Canadians are not required to obtain H-1B visas to become non-immigrant workers (although they do require approval from the federal government) and are thus not counted.

Some H-1B workers return home for temporary visits and must therefore obtain an additional H-1B visa. This means that on average, there is more than one H-1B visa issued per each non-Canadian non-immigrant worker.

No record is kept of when H-1B workers leave the United States.

According to a survey conducted in 1992 by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, close to 70 percent of H-1B workers are professionals—mainly health professionals, engineers, and computer scientists. Data from the Department of Labor in 1994 suggests an even greater concentration in the health professions.

Because the occupations of most H-1B workers are not subject to widespread layoffs, and given the total number of H-1B workers probably extant in the United States, CBO concludes that the total cost of this mandate would not be substantial.

#### Other provisions

Several other provisions in H.R. 2202 would impose new mandates on citizens and aliens but would result in little or no monetary cost. For example, Title IV would require aliens to provide additional information to the Attorney General or the Immigration and Naturalization Service. Title VI contains a new mandate that sponsors would be required to notify the federal government and states of any change of address.

7. Previous CBO estimate: CBO provided a preliminary analysis of mandate costs to the private sector as part of the federal cost estimate dated March 4, 1996. The initial conclusions presented in that estimate have not changed.

8. Estimate prepared by: Dan Mont and Matt Eyles.

9. Estimate approved by: Joseph R. Antos, Assistant Director for Health and Human Resources.

#### ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair declares the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 19, 1996, at 12:30 p.m. for morning hour debates.

There was no objection.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, March 19, 1996, at 12:30 p.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2254. A letter from the Chief of Legislative Affairs, Department of the Navy, transmitting notification that the Department of the Navy intends to renew the lease of *Manitowoc* to the Taipei Economic and Cultural Representative, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 7307(b)(2); to the Committee on National Security.

2255. A letter from the Acting President and Chairman, Export-Import Bank of the United States, transmitting a report involving United States exports to the Republic of Korea, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 635(b)(3)(i); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

2256. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting a copy of D.C. Act 11-222, "Clean Hands Before Receiving a License or Permit Act of 1996," pursuant to D.C. Code, section 1-233(c)(1); to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

2257. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Assistance Agency, transmitting informing Congress of the delivery of articles, services and training to Laos, as directed by Presidential Determination 93-45,

pursuant to Public Law 102-391, section 575A(c) (106 Stat. 1684); jointly, to the Committees on International Relations and Appropriations.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. SMITH of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 2937. A bill for the reimbursement of legal expenses and related fees incurred by former employees of the White House Travel Office with respect to the termination of their employment in that Office on May 19, 1993; with amendments (Rept. 104-484). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HYDE: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 129. Resolution granting the consent of Congress to the Vermont-New Hampshire Interstate Public Water Supply Compact (Rept. 104-485). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 5 of rule X the following action was taken by the Speaker:

*[The following action occurred on Mar. 15, 1996]*

H.R. 2130. The Committee on Banking and Financial Services discharged from further

consideration. Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of rule X and clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ARCHER (for himself and Mr. THOMAS):

H.R. 3103. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to improve portability and continuity of health insurance coverage in the group and individual markets, to combat waste, fraud, and abuse in health insurance and health care delivery, to promote the use of medical savings accounts, to improve access to long-term care services and coverage, to simplify the administration of health insurance, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Economic and Educational Opportunities, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. VUCANOVICH:

H.R. 3104. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide special rules relating to veteran's reemployment rights under the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act of 1994; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WOLF:

H.R. 3105. A bill to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensa-

tion, and Liability Act of 1980 to exempt certain state and local redevelopment boards or commissions, and fresh start users of facilities purchased from those boards or commissions, from the liability under that act; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WYNN:

H.R. 3106. A bill to improve rail transportation safety, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 324: Ms. NORTON, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. FRAZER.

H.R. 835: Mr. PAYNE of New Jersey and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1619: Mr. FORD.

H.R. 2270: Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2286: Mr. COOLEY, Mr. BREWSTER, and Mr. ROHRABACHER.

H.R. 2665: Ms. PRYCE.

H.R. 2856: Mr. ABERCROMBIE.

H. Con. Res. 151: Mr. JACKSON, Mr. TEJEDA, and Mr. BISHOP.