

The Directors Guild of America noted at the time that “globalization, rising costs, foreign wage, tax and financing incentives, and technological advances, combined are causing a substantial transformation of what used to be a quintessentially American industry into an increasingly dispersed global industry.”

Section 181 of the Internal Revenue Code, allows production companies to deduct the cost of qualified U.S. productions immediately rather than capitalizing the costs and deducting them slowly over time. The incentive accelerates the timing of deduction but it does not change the amount of the deduction. In order to qualify, at least 75 percent of the total compensation paid for the production must be for services performed in the U.S. by actors, directors, producers, and other production staff personnel. Further, the incentive is not available for films that cost more than \$15 million to produce—or \$20 million if the film is made in certain distressed, low-income or Delta Regional Authority designated communities.

I believe that this was an appropriately targeted provision, designed to encourage television and film producers to stay here in the United States and keep those jobs in our communities. In the last decades, New York City and in particular my home borough of Queens have seen a resurgent television and film production sector bring new jobs and revenue into the community. This bill will help to ensure that those jobs stay here in the U.S.

The Center for Entertainment Industry Data and Research’s Year 2005 Production Report concluded that section 181 “is having a positive effect on television production in the U.S.” Since 2004, it reported that made-for-television movie production in the U.S. increased by 42 percent, while it fell in Canada by 15 percent.

Along with my Republican sponsor, Congressman HERGER from California and myself who hails from Queens, New York, the television and film industries are both major employers and major tax providers to our local, State, and national economies. This legislation works to protect these industries and stem the flood of production to non-U.S. locations.

Section 181 will expire in 2008. It ought to be made a permanent provision of our Tax Code in order to keep television and film production jobs in the United States.

CHILDREN’S HEALTH AND MEDICARE PROTECTION ACT OF 2007

SPEECH OF

HON. LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, August 1, 2007

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the millions of children without health insurance, and the millions of seniors who need the added Medicare benefits in this bill, I rise in support of HR 3162, the Children’s Health and Medicare Protection Act of 2007.

Because the CHAMP Act will have such a huge impact on improving the health and well-being of millions of America’s children and seniors, it is without doubt one of the most important pieces of legislation this Congress will pass.

As a mother and grandmother, I believe one of our country’s greatest responsibilities is to

ensure the health and well-being of our children. The CHAMP Act honors that responsibility by providing states with \$50 billion in new funds to provide an additional 5.1 million children with health care coverage.

The bill also provides comprehensive Early and Periodic Screening, Diagnostic, and Treatment health services to all infants, children, and adolescents enrolled in Medicaid. These services, weakened by a Republican-controlled Congress in the Deficit Reduction Act of 2006, will help ensure vulnerable children have health problems diagnosed early and avoid more complex and costly treatment.

In addition, the CHAMP Act establishes a pediatric health care quality measurement program which will provide a long-overdue federal investment in quality and performance measurements. The grants made available to States will improve the delivery of health care services to children under Medicaid and SCHIP.

As a daughter, I have watched with concern the health challenges my parents have faced as they aged. Luckily, they have had the resources to receive the care and medication they have needed.

Sadly, this is not the case for a vast majority of seniors such as those in my congressional district. While they face many of the same health challenges that my parents experienced, they struggle every day to make ends meet, often unable to afford their costly medications.

The CHAMP Act helps these seniors by extending the solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund, and simplifying and expanding the existing programs designed to help low-income Medicare beneficiaries pay for Medicare premiums and prescription drugs.

Of great importance is also the fact that this bill encourages wellness by extending badly needed preventive and therapeutic services. The CHAMP Act eliminates co-payments and deductibles for current and future evidence-based preventive benefits, gives parity to mental health services by reducing the 50 percent co-payment on outpatient mental health treatment, and ensures our seniors have access to physical, occupational, and speech therapies.

The CHAMP Act also extends agreements with the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services to allow states, including my home state of California, to continue providing services to our most vulnerable seniors through adult day care health programs.

As a Latina and a Member of Congress who represents a large multicultural constituency, I am also concerned about the barriers that prevent minorities from enrolling in Medicaid and SCHIP. For example in the Latino community, barriers such as the lack of culturally sensitive outreach efforts have resulted in keeping more than 70 percent of eligible Latino children uninsured.

The CHAMP Act addresses this deficiency by encouraging culturally appropriate enrollment and retention practices. The bill funds translation and interpretation services for families where English is not the primary language and authorizes community health workers to provide outreach services.

Finally, the CHAMP Act restores the states’ option to cover legal immigrant children and legal immigrant pregnant women in SCHIP or Medicaid. It also amends the requirements for documentation of citizenship to allow a reasonable amount of time for families to gather the necessary papers and information.

As a proud American who cherishes the values upon which our country was founded, I believe this bill takes a giant step forward in honoring our moral imperative to ensure that age, race and income do not determine the health status of our children, seniors, and citizens with disabilities.

With the expansion of SCHIP coverage to millions of children, and the additional benefits made available to Medicare beneficiaries, the CHAMP Act may well be the most important pro-life bill the 110th Congress will pass in 2007.

I commend Chairman DINGELL from the Energy and Commerce Committee, and Chairman RANGEL from the Ways and Means Committee, as well as the dedicated staff members who have invested so much time and effort to craft this very important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to vote for its passage today, to honor our commitment to our children, our seniors and our citizens with disabilities, and to offer them the promise of a healthier tomorrow.

LEGISLATION TO UPDATE TITLE 46

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, August 3, 2007

Mr. CONYERS. Madam Speaker, I am introducing a bill to update and improve the codification of title 46 of the United States Code. Last year, Congress enacted H.R. 1442, which became Public Law 109–304. This legislation formally codified the various statutes in title 46 as positive law. As is typical with the codification process, a number of non-substantive revisions were made, including the reorganization of sections into a more coherent logical structure.

As with all codification legislation, that law restated and replaced existing law as in effect on a particular date. While Congress was considering H.R. 1442, it was also considering four other pieces of legislation affecting title 46. These other bills were drafted in conformance with then-existing title 46, rather than title 46 as it would be revised. These four bills were enacted after the date specified in H.R. 1442, and thus were not reflected in P.L. 109–304.

The Office of the Law Revision Counsel prepared this bill as part of its functions under 2 U.S.C. 285(b). It incorporates the four new laws into the codified title 46. It also makes other minor, non-substantive revisions and technical corrections to the codified title 46 to reflect subsequent public comments that were submitted too late to be reflected in P.L. 109–304.

It is important to emphasize that this bill is not intended to make any substantive changes in the law. It is intended simply to update the codified title 46.

The Committee on the Judiciary plans to act on this bill in the very near future, after providing an additional brief opportunity for public review and comment.