

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

VIRGINIA NATIONAL PARKS ACT

HON. THOMAS J. BLILEY, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1995

Mr. BLILEY. Mr. Speaker, today I am pleased to introduce legislation that responds to the concerns of Virginians regarding national parks in the Commonwealth. The Virginia national parks bill confronts a number of Virginia's pressing park issues, addressing Shenandoah National Park, Richmond National Battlefield Park, Shenandoah Valley National Battlefields, and Colonial Parkway.

First, my bill addresses constituent concerns about the expansion of Shenandoah National Park and Richmond National Battlefield Park. These two parks share an unusual status in that they are each a relatively small park with a much larger authorized boundary. The result of this situation is that, unlike the vast majority of national parks, these parks can expand whenever they want, without congressional approval or proper representation of local communities' interests.

While Shenandoah National Park includes 196,000 acres of land, its enormous 1926 authorized boundary includes 521,000 acres, enveloping parts of many surrounding communities. Similarly, while Richmond National Battlefield is composed of several small sites surrounding Richmond, its sprawling 1936 authorized boundary includes about 250 square miles of the metropolitan area.

Many citizens and local governments within the authorized boundaries of both the Shenandoah and Richmond parks fear that there is a cloud hanging over local property titles and that the parks could expand without a fair consideration of the local communities' concerns. My bill would put to rest these fears by amending the two parks' authorized boundaries to conform to the land that the National Park Service currently owns. This legislation doesn't preclude future expansion of these parks. It simply gives the people most affected by park expansion a proper voice in the decision. I believe that these provisions will relieve the longstanding tensions between these parks and their neighbors and promote more cooperative and fruitful relationships.

Another provision of my bill responds to a Virginia General Assembly resolution asking for legislation to allow for the maintenance of secondary roads inside Shenandoah National Park. Since the park's inception in 1935, Virginia has maintained and operated secondary roads in the park under a series of temporary-use permits. These permits have recently expired and the National Park Service has not renewed them, leaving the State without permission to maintain the roads. Many of these secondary highways are regularly traveled by school buses and are badly in need of repairs and safety improvements. My bill returns these roads to the State so that they can be properly maintained.

The legislation I introduce today also incorporates the provisions of the Shenandoah Valley National Battlefields Partnership Act, legislation sponsored by Congressman WOLF, which passed the other body last year. This legislation conserves for future generations 10 Civil War battlefields of the Shenandoah Valley. Importantly, the act accomplishes these goals without infringing on the rights of private property owners. This legislation establishes partnerships between Federal, State, and local governments and the private sector to conserve and interpret the legacy of some of the most vital battlefields of the Civil War.

Another provision of my bill authorizes the National Park Service to buy a small plot of land for the Colonial Parkway near James-town.

The Virginia national parks bill addresses the concerns of Virginians on a variety of issues pertaining to national parks and I welcome the support of my colleagues in cosponsoring this legislation.

REGULATORY TRANSITION ACT OF 1995

SPEECH OF

HON. HAROLD ROGERS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1995

The House in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union had under consideration the bill (H.R. 450), to ensure economy and efficiency of Federal Government operations by establishing a moratorium on regulatory rulemaking actions, and for other purposes:

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 450, the Regulatory Transition Act of 1995, but I would like to make clear what this bill does and does not do.

First, what the bill does do. This legislation will place a temporary hold on regulations which are currently under promulgation by Federal agencies. These regulations—which number more than 65,000 pages per year—are literally choking the economic growth of the Nation and must be looked at.

Again, this is a temporary hold. We are simply saying that the redtape machine needs to stop for a few months so we can see if these regulations are helping or hurting the American people. I would bet that many homebuilders, roadbuilders, and oil and gas entrepreneurs in my district would say that the redtape of regulation is definitely hurting.

However, there are clear limits to what this bill applies to. For instance, the bill explicitly states that no regulations "which would prevent an imminent threat to health or safety" would be affected by this legislation. In fact, I spoke to the chairman of the committee that wrote this bill, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. CLINGER, to ensure that these provisions were part of the final package.

But in order to ensure that critical safety regulations pending at the Mine Safety and

Health Administration [MSHA] would not be affected, I will vote for an amendment during floor debate which will exempt such actions from the bill. These include important rules requiring better ventilation to avoid buildup of methane gas and restricting the use of diesel equipment to avoid coal mine fires. I simply feel that protecting the health and safety of our miners requires this added protection.

Again, Mr. Chairman, I am supportive of efforts to put a hold on the regulation steamroller known as the Federal Government. I only wanted to clarify for my colleagues that important rules regarding health and safety would not be impacted.

LAKE GEORGE, IN, WATERSHED MANAGEMENT PLAN

HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 1, 1995

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, today, I am introducing legislation to authorize the development of a comprehensive watershed management plan for northwest Indiana's Deep River Basin, which includes Deep River, Lake George, Turkey Creek, and other related tributaries. The communities of Hobart, Lake Station, and Merrillville, IN, would greatly benefit from the implementation of this plan.

The sediment cleanup of Lake George was first authorized in the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Public Law 99-662, and the project has received Federal funding since 1990. The project includes flood control, environmental enhancement, and recreational development for an area that comprises the 282-acre Lake George, Turkey Creek, and Deep River in the vicinities of Hobart and Lake Station, IN.

However, the successful completion of the Lake George project is dependent upon a detailed, comprehensive investigation of the watershed, beyond the scope of the existing Lake George study authority. The legislation I am introducing today would facilitate the evaluation of how to sufficiently control the current and long-term sediment quality and quantity, address chronic flooding problems and the safety of Lake George Dam, and ensure the proper management of endangered wetlands.

In addition, a comprehensive watershed management plan is essential to determine the placement of sediment traps for the authorized Lake George project. Taxpayer dollars would be saved by instituting effective land use management techniques and trapping sediments before they reach Lake George. It is possible that sediment flow could be relieved in the unauthorized tributaries. In sum, future costs could be drastically reduced by developing and implementing a comprehensive management plan, which would result in less costly sediment traps and much

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

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