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Mr. Foley. Mr. Speaker, Congressman Becerra and I introduced legislation today to clarify the income forecast method.

As Chairman of the House Entertainment Industry Task Force, it is important to understand that changes made in the Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996 that modified depreciation under the income forecast method have had unintended consequences for the movie industry. Our legislation corrects those consequences.

The “income forecast” method is a method for calculating depreciation under section 167 for certain property, including films. Under the income forecast method, the depreciation deduction for a taxable year for a property is determined by multiplying the cost of the property by a fraction, the numerator of which is the income generated by the property during the year and the denominator of which is the total forecasted or estimated income to be derived from a property with the income produced by such property. These under the income forecast method in the Small Business Job Protection Act of 1996 amendments to section 167 (that are, films placed in service after the effective date of the 1996 amendments to section 167 (that is, films placed in service after September 13, 1995).

Second, the look-back regime is tightened in two ways: (i) a third recomputation year is added; and (ii) the 10 percent de minimis rule is applied on an annual basis not on a cumulative basis in the recoupment year. Thus, if the taxpayer initially estimates that the film’s ultimate income will be $1,000 and the estimated ultimate income in year two is increased or decreased by more than 15 percent, then the look-back computation is required for that year. The 10 percent threshold then applies to the new estimated ultimate income.

This legislation was the result of consultation with the staff of the Committee on Ways and Means and the Joint Committee on Taxation. An analysis was done of the legislation for films in the following three situations: (1) where the film falls short of expectations; (2) where the film exceeds expectations. For each scenario, calculations were done using escalating income-contingent costs, and provided calculations on both an annual basis and a cumulative basis. The conclusion confirmed that the legislative changes would not create distortion under the income forecast method.

We look forward to working with the Committee on Ways and Means to find the appropriate legislative vehicle to address this technical correction that will reiterate Congressional intent on changes made to the income forecast method in the Small Business Job Protection Act.
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Mr. Bilirakis. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to discuss the importance of community health centers.

Projected participations—such as percentages of the gross receipts due an actor—have been included and adjusted to the cost of a film ever since studios have been forced to forecast the total revenues of a film under the income forecast method. But the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) has indicated that it will disallow participations as part of a film. Participations were not an issue addressed by modification to the income forecast method. Studies have negotiated their complex transactions based on the clear and well-established principle that the cost of a film includes participations.

The legislation that we have introduced today will ensure that participations are a part of the total cost of a film. First, the legislation would guarantee that income-contingent costs are includible in basis, thereby accepting the conclusion of Transameric Corp. v. U.S. The legislation provides that the depreciation allowance, as so determined, will apply notwithstanding section 404 or section 419. These would be “no inference” clause with regard to films placed in service after the effective date of the 1996 amendments to section 167 (that is, films placed in service after September 13, 1995).

Community health centers serve those who are hardest to reach. They are located in America’s inner cities, isolated rural areas, and migrant farm-worker communities—areas with few or no physicians and other health and social services. Community health centers are not-for-profit health care providers and are required by law to make their services accessible to everyone, regardless of their ability to pay.

There are more than 1,000 community health centers located in every state, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Collectively, these centers serve as a health care safety net for more than 11 million patients, over 4 million of whom are uninsured.

Health centers foster growth and development in their communities. Over $14 billion in annual economic activity is generated by health centers in many of America’s most economically depressed communities, and they employ over 50,000 people and train thousands of health professionals and volunteers.

Community health centers offer a wide range of preventative and primary medical and dental care, as well as health education, community outreach, transportation, and support programs. Health centers focus on wellness and early prevention—the keys to cost savings in health care. Through innovative programs in outreach, education and prevention, health centers reach out and energize communities to meet urgent health needs and promote greater personal responsibility for good health.

For less than $350 per person served (less than $350 annually), health centers provide quality primary and preventative care to low-income, uninsured and under-insured individuals, and families. Through reductions in hospital admissions and less frequent use of costly emergency room visits for routine services, health centers save the American health care system almost billions each year.

Health centers provide quality care to millions of Americans who lack health coverage. However, they cannot continue to support the growing number of uninsured patients who seek assistance without a significant increase in their appropriations.

President Bush recognized the importance of health centers with his recent proposal to double the number of patients health centers serve over the next five years. I strongly support this proposal, and an increase in funding this year is the first step needed to reach this goal.

Today, America’s health centers are the family doctor and health care provider for over 10 million people. Expanding the role of community health centers is a proven, viable, and cost-effective way to bring quality health care to uninsured patients and medically underserved communities.