

might know in what high esteem he is held by all fortunate enough to call him friend.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

**HON. JIM KOLBE**

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 19, 2000*

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, on October 18, 2000 the House debated and voted on H. Res. 631, "Honoring the Members of the Crew of the Guided Missile Destroyer U.S.S. *Cole* Who Were killed or Wounded in the Terrorist Attack on that Vessel in Aden, Yemen, on October 12, 2000", H. Con. Res. 415, National Children's Memorial Day, and H.R. 3218, the Social Security Number Confidentiality Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on H. Res. 631, (rollcall vote No. 531), "yea" on H. Con. Res. 415 (rollcall vote No. 532), and "yea" on H.R. 3218 (rollcall vote No. 533).

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE NOTIFICATION AND FEDERAL EMPLOYEE ANTI-DISCRIMINATION AND RETALIATION ACT

**HON. F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR.**

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 19, 2000*

Mr. SENSENBRENNER. Mr. Speaker, as the Chairman of the Committee on Science, I believe open discourse at federal agencies is necessary for sound science. Intolerance inhibits, if not prevents, thorough scientific investigation.

Accordingly, I was very disturbed by allegations that EPA practices intolerance and discrimination against its scientists and employees. For the past year, the Committee on Science has investigated numerous charges of retaliation and discrimination at EPA, and unfortunately they were found to have merit.

The Committee held a hearing in March 2000, over allegations that agency officials were intimidating EPA scientists and even harassing private citizens who publicly voiced concerns about agency policies and science. While investigating the complaints of several scientists, a number of African-American and disabled employees came to the Committee expressing similar concerns. One of those employees, Dr. Marsha Coleman-Adebayo, won a \$600,000 jury decision against EPA for discrimination.

It further appears EPA has gone so far as to retaliate against some of the employees and scientists that assisted the Science Committee during our investigation. In one case, the Department of Labor found EPA retaliated against a female scientist for, among other things, her assistance with the Science Committee's work. The EPA reassigned this scientist from her position as lab director at the Athens, Georgia regional office effective November 5, 2000—a position she held for 16 years—to a position handling grants at EPA headquarters. In the October 3 decision, the Department of Labor directed EPA to cancel the transfer because it was based on retaliation.

EPA's response to these problems has been to claim that they have a great diversity

program. Apparently, EPA believes that if it hires the right makeup of people, it does not matter if its managers discriminate and harass those individuals.

Diversity is great, but in and of itself, it is not the answer. Enforcing the laws protecting employees from harassment, discrimination and retaliation is the answer. EPA, however, does not appear to do this. EPA managers have not been held accountable when charges of intolerance and discrimination are found to be true. Such unresponsiveness by Administrator Browner and the Agency legitimizes this indefensible behavior.

To assure accountability, I have introduced the Notification and Federal Employee Anti-discrimination and Retaliation Act (No FEAR Act) of 2000, H.R. . Federal employees with diverse backgrounds and ideas should have no fear of being harassed because of their ideas or the color of their skin. This bill would ensure accountability throughout the entire Federal Government—not just EPA. Under current law, agencies are held harmless when they lose judgments, awards or compromise settlements in whistleblower and discrimination cases.

The Federal Government pays such awards out of a government wide fund. The No FEAR Act would require agencies to pay for their misdeeds and mismanagement out of their own budgets. The bill would also require Federal agencies to notify employees about any applicable discrimination and whistleblower protection laws and report to Congress on the number of discrimination and whistleblower cases within each agency. Additionally, each agency would have to report on the total cost of all whistleblower and discrimination judgments or settlements involving the agency.

Federal employees and Federal scientists should have no fear that they will be discriminated against because of their diverse views and backgrounds. H.R. is a significant step towards achieving this goal.

#### INTRODUCTION OF THE 'CELLULAR TELECOMMUNICATIONS DEPRECIATION CLARIFICATION ACT'

**HON. PHILIP M. CRANE**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Thursday, October 19, 2000*

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to join with Rep. NEAL and Ms. JOHNSON, Ms. DUNN, and Mr. JOHNSON of the Committee on Ways and Means in introducing the "Cellular Telecommunications Depreciation Clarification Act." This legislation will amend the Internal Revenue Code to clarify that cellular telecommunications equipment is "qualified technological equipment" as defined in section 168(i)(2).

When an asset used in a trade or business or for the production of income has a useful life that extends beyond the taxable year, the costs of acquiring or producing the asset generally must be capitalized and recovered through depreciation or amortization deductions over the expected useful life of the property. The cost of most tangible depreciable property placed in service after 1986 is recovered on an accelerated basis using the modified accelerated cost recovery system, or MACRS. Under MACRS, assets are grouped

into classes of personal property and real property, and each class is assigned a recovery period and depreciation method.

For MACRS property, the class lives and recovery periods for various assets are prescribed by a table published by the Internal Revenue Service found in Rev. Proc. 87-56, 1987-2 C.B. 674. This table lists various Asset Classes, along with their respective class lives and recovery periods. Rev. Proc. 87-56 does not specifically address the treatment of cellular assets, but rather addresses assets used in traditional wireline telephone communications.

These wireline class lives were created in 1977 and have remained basically unchanged since that time. In 1986, Congress added a category for computer-based telephone switching equipment, but there are no asset classes specifically for cellular communications equipment in Rev. Proc. 87-56. This is largely due to the fact that the commercial cellular industry was in its infancy in 1986 and 1987. Since the cellular industry was not specifically addressed in Rev. Proc. 87-56, the cellular industry has no clear, definitive guidance regarding the class lives and recovery periods of cellular assets. Therefore, the Internal Revenue Service and cellular companies have been left to resolve depreciation treatment on an ad hoc basis for these assets as the industry has rapidly progressed.

The result is that both cellular telecommunications companies and the Internal Revenue Service are expending significant resources in auditing and settling disputes involving the depreciation of cellular telecommunications equipment. This process is obviously costly and inefficient for taxpayers and the Service, but it also leaves affected companies with a great deal of uncertainty as to the tax treatment, and therefore expected after-tax return, they can expect on their telecommunications investments. A standardized depreciation system for cellular telecommunications equipment would eliminate the excessive costs incurred by both industry and government through the audit and appeals process, and would eliminate an unnecessary degree of uncertainty that is slowing the expansion of our national telecommunications systems.

The Treasury Department's recently released "Report to the Congress on Depreciation Recovery Periods and Methods" tacitly acknowledges this point. In its discussion about how to treat assets used in newly-emerging industries, such as the cellular telecommunications industry, the report states:

[t]he IRS normally will attempt to identify those characteristics of the new activity that most nearly match the characteristics of existing asset classes. However, this practice may eventually become questionable in a system where asset classes are seldom, if ever, reviewed and revised. The cellular phone industry, which did not exist when the current asset classes were defined, is a case in point. This industry's assets differ in many respects from those used by wired telephone service, and may not fit well into the existing definitions for telephony-related classes.

Rather than force cellular telecommunications equipment into wireline telephony "transmission" or "distribution" classes, a better solution would clarify that cellular telecommunications equipment is "qualified technological equipment." The Internal Revenue