

needed flood relief for the communities of Hobart and Lake Station, IN. Additionally, the development of a comprehensive plan could alleviate the need for a costly dredging of Lake George in the future.

It is my hope that this bill will enhance our ongoing efforts to develop and implement sound, reasonable, and long-term solutions to the watershed management problems faced by the Lake George area, as well as the rest of northwest Indiana. I would hope to have your support, and the support of my other colleagues in the House of Representatives, in advancing this important legislation.

#### COUNTRY OF ORIGIN MARKING REQUIREMENT FOR SEMICONDUCTORS

##### HON. BILL ARCHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. ARCHER. Mr. Speaker, on February 15, I introduced H.R. 947, a bill which would exclude semiconductors and their containers from the country of origin marking requirements under existing trade law. Semiconductors, as classified under headings 8541 and 8542 of the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States, include diodes, transistors, integrated circuits, and microassemblies.

Country of origin markings for semiconductors present both cost and compliance problems for U.S. industry. While the cost of marking semiconductors is not great when amortized over a production run, the cost is significant in absolute terms. In addition, most of these components are small and therefore, difficult to legibly mark with the requisite producer identification, grade, quality, electrical values, and other symbols, making compliance with these marking requirements very arduous.

One of the original intents of country of origin marking was as a consumer protection measure. However, only a tiny fraction of semiconductors are sold at retail. In general, semiconductor customers are unconcerned about semiconductor origin marking, since they are usually manufacturers who incorporate them into other products without reference to such marking. These customers are concerned about the semiconductor's quality, which is more a function of its producer than its origin.

U.S. marking requirements create difficulties for manufacturers trying to serve both U.S. and European Union [EU] markets. The basis for determining the country of origin for semiconductors differs between the United States and the EU for those semiconductors that are not wholly produced within one country. Therefore, these producers may violate the EU law when shipping semiconductors to the EU that are marked according to U.S. standards. The reason is that EU member states, while not requiring marking, do require that a product not be mislabelled.

For example, the producer may diffuse circuit patterns on a wafer in one country, mount and encapsulate the chips in a second country, and import the semiconductors to the United States for final testing. These products may then be sold to domestic manufacturers or foreign purchasers. In this case, the United

States considers the semiconductor the origin of the second country, and under current law, it must be marked accordingly. The EU, on the other hand, considers the country of origin to be the first country. In order not to violate EU law, the producer would have to remove the U.S. required marking before export from the United States, which is a possible violation of U.S. law.

The Semiconductor Industry Association and the American Electronics Association, trade associations which represent the users and producers of semiconductors, support the exemption of semiconductors from country of origin marking requirements not only because of the cost savings, but also because of conflicting rules among our major trading partners. To answer concerns about government's need to know the country of origin for the purposes of administering its national laws, these semiconductor purchasers and users are committed to the development of a uniform coding system to satisfy international origin requirements. Therefore, the effective date of this legislation will be January 1, 1996 to allow for the development of this system.

For all the aforementioned reasons, existing country of origin requirements serve no useful purpose and simply add to the cost of producing and selling semiconductors in the international market. Elimination of these requirements is a simple, effective solution to these problems.

#### CHERRY HILL COMMUNITY SERVICE AND INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

##### HON. ROBERT E. ANDREWS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share with you a unique program that will encourage the youth of my district to give something back to their community. I am proud to introduce the Cherry Hill Community Service and Involvement Program.

Designed exclusively by students, this program is about helping people. Students will go into the community and work 53 hours of service with various organizations earning 2.5 credits, the equivalent of a semester elective. They will also participate in 12 hours of public policy forums. The program is designed to teach students the skills needed to participate in their community. It also introduces the students to the world of public policy so that they may make informed decisions as a member of the community.

The uniqueness of the program lies within its structure. It is the first service program in New Jersey that was written, researched and implemented by the students at Cherry Hill West High School. This allows the students to have a say in public policy, participate in and take responsibility for their community as they emerge into adulthood. The goal is to make young people productive and active in their community as adults.

I congratulate the students of Cherry Hill West High School on their courage and dedication to embark on such an endeavor. I know that the talents of the students will come through and benefit the entire Camden County area. I encourage other members of this body to endorse similar programs in their districts.

#### REAL REGULATORY RELIEF

##### HON. RON PACKARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, Republicans continue to move forward with an agenda that strives for less spending, less regulation, and less taxes. We must work to roll back costly and burdensome Federal regulations that suffocate American taxpayers and small businesses. Our Republican Contract With America favors a common sense approach to our regulatory system.

Big Government one-size-fits-all regulations hit at the very heart of our economy impeding growth and job opportunity. Regulations act as hidden taxes on employment. Employers wasting time and money complying with excessive regulation cannot hire new employees or invest in machinery and equipment to make workers more productive. Instead, burdensome regulations create jobs for lawyers and destroy jobs for manufacturers.

Regulations cost the economy an estimated \$600 billion in 1994. That amounts to a \$6,000 tab for every household in the country. Frankly Mr. Speaker, Americans just do not think they are getting their money's worth.

The Regulatory Reform and Relief Act, H.R. 926, introduces rationality to an out of control regulatory system. Republicans have designed a regulatory system that makes sense and requires regulatory agencies to estimate the cost to businesses of regulatory compliance.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to add a level of accountability to the regulatory system. The Regulatory Reform and Relief Act will ensure that bureaucrats consider the burdens they impose on American taxpayers and workers, and ultimately the economy. Once bureaucrats are forced to open their eyes to the real world we live in, the regulations they impose will make sense and cost less.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

##### HON. ANDREA H. SEASTRAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mrs. SEASTRAND. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 23, I was unavoidably detained due to illness during the votes on rollcall vote No. 158 and rollcall No. 159. Had I been present for these votes, I would have voted "aye" to both.

#### AMENDMENTS TO THE GENERATION-SKIPPING TRANSFER TAX

##### HON. AMO HOUGHTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, March 1, 1995*

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I am joined today by several of my colleagues, including Mr. BREWSTER, Mr. SHAW, and Mr. JACOBS, in