Iran, Rwanda, Tanzania, and the United States.

To support independent broadcast media, Intemews has done the following (as of 12/31/00):

Since 1992, Internews has trained over 16,000 media professionals in the former Soviet Union, the Balkans, the Middle East, and Indonesia in broadcast journalism and station management.

The organization has worked with over 1500 non-governmental TV and radio stations since 1992.

Internews has also supported the development of 16 independent national television networks linking nongovernmental TV stations in the former Soviet Union, the former Yugoslavia, and the West Bank and Gaza.

Internews has formed or helped support 19 national media associations around the world.

In 2000 Internews, working with local producers, created approximately 740 hours of television and radio programming. Internews' original programs reach a potential audience of 308 million viewers and listeners worldwide.

In addition, since 1994 Internews' Open Skies program has selected, acquired, versioned and distributed over 1000 hours of high-quality international documentary programming to independent television broadcasters in the former Soviet Union and the former Yugoslavia.

Just since 1995, the company has provided over $2 million in television and radio production equipment to nongovernmental media, in the form of grants or no-cost equipment loans.

Internews is primarily supported by grants. Funders include the US Agency for International Development, the Open Society Institute, the Government of the Netherlands, the European Commission, the United States Information Agency, the National Endowment for Democracy, the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, the Ford Foundation, Rockefeller Financial Services, the W. Alton Jones Foundation, the Joyce Mertz-Gilmore Foundation, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, the Miriam and Ira D. Wallach Foundation, the W.K. Kellogg Foundation, and many others. The organization had a budget of $15 million in 2000.

INTRODUCTION OF TRIBAL ENERGY SELF-SUFFICIENCY ACT

HON. NICK J. RAHALL II

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 2001

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, in my role as the Ranking Democrat on the Resources Committee, today I am proud to be introducing the ''Tribal Energy Self-Sufficiency Act'' and am pleased to note that joining me as original cosponsors are our colleagues DON YOUNG of Alaska, GEORGE MILLER of California, DALE KILDEE of Michigan, ENI FALEOMAVAEGA of American Samoa, NEIL ABERCROMBIE of Hawaii, FRANK PALLONE, Jr. of New Jersey, ADAM SMITH of Washington, MARK UDALL of Colorado, BETTY MCCOLLUM of Minnesota, and PATRICK KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

Native Americans have, by far, the highest percentage of homes without electricity. Many homes on Indian reservations have either no electricity or unreliable electricity. I find this appalling and unacceptable especially in light of the fact that at least ten percent of the energy resources in the United States are located on Indian lands. In a community which often receives lower than average wages, Native Americans pay a larger percentage of their income on energy needs than the rest of us.

In numerous instances Indian lands are criss-crossed with electricity transmission and distribution lines yet the Indian homes on those lands remain dark. Tribes often have no access to these lines and little authority over what energy they do receive. As we all know, this is not the case with the various local governments in the rest of the country.

As the House of Representatives prepares to consider legislation to further advance a national energy policy, we must not forsake the sovereign tribes to which the United States has a trust responsibility. In this regard, the fundamental purpose of this legislation is to provide Indian Country with the tools it needs to achieve energy self-sufficiency.

When enacted, this legislation will go a long way to promote energy development of Indian lands where it is wanted and badly needed. The ''Tribal Energy Self-Sufficiency Act'' contains a multitude of provisions relating to the production of energy resources on Indian lands, the development of renewable sources of energy, and access by tribes to transmission facilities largely by building upon programs that are already in place.

Mr. Speaker, I have worked to draft this comprehensive energy bill with the Council of Energy Resource Tribes, the Intertribal Energy Network and numerous energy and tribal experts representing well over 100 Indian tribes. While this legislation was developed with a great deal of input from Indian Country, it does not purport to include every single proposal or idea that was advanced. Rather, this measure is intended to reflect those areas where interested tribes are largely in agreement with refinements made as it is considered by the committees of jurisdiction during the legislative process.

MOTION PICTURE PRODUCTION: TO RUN OR STAY MADE IN THE USA

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 2001

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I submit that the following article from the Entertainment Law Review, by Pamela Conley Ulich and Lance Simmons, be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

MOTION PICTURE PRODUCTION: TO RUN OR STAY MADE IN THE U.S.A.

(Pamela Conley Ulich and Lance Simmens)

''Bye, Bye Miss American pie, drove in my Daimler to the movies to see a foreign-made flic; And good old actors were drinking whiskey and beer, singing this is the day, we're unemployed here, this will be the day we're unemployed here.''

I. INTRODUCTION

Globalization profoundly impacts traditional ways of conducting business, and the entertainment industry is not immune from the new economics drastically changing the world. Could Hollywood become ''Hollyhasbeen''? Will television and theatrical motion pictures shot in the United States go the way of the American car and American-made clothing?

Runaway production has caused serious labor issues, including the dislocation of thousands of workers and jobs. In 1998, twenty-seven percent of films released in the United States were produced abroad, and an estimated 20,000 jobs were lost to foreign countries. Lower exchange rates, direct government subsidies and lower labor wages enticed American production companies to film in foreign locales. In 1998, the direct economic loss of runaway production was $2.8 billion. When coupled with the loss of ancillary business, the losses likely totaled $10.3 billion for 1998 alone. These loses juxtapose with the issues of free trade versus fair trade in an uneasy balance.

This Article considers why many television and theatrical motion pictures targeted primarily at U.S. audiences are not made in America. It also examines the economic impact resulting from the flight of such productions. Finally, it considers possible solutions in an effort to reverse the trend.

II. THE HISTORY OF ''RUNAWAY PRODUCTION''

Runaway production is not a new phenomenon, In December 1957, the Hollywood American Federation of Labor (''AFL'') Film Council, an organization of twenty-eight AFL–CIO unions, prepared a report entitled ''Hollywood at the Crossroads: An Economic Study of the Motion Picture'' This report addressed runaway production and indicated that prior to 1949, there were an ''insignificant'' number of American-interest features made abroad. However, the report indicated a drastic increase in productions shot abroad between 1949 and 1957. At that time four major studios—Columbia Pictures, Inc. (''Columbia''), Twentieth-Century Fox, Inc. (''Fox''), Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer (''MGM'') and United Artists, Inc. (''United Artists'')—produced 314 films. Of these films, 159, or 50.6 percent, were shot outside the United States. It also revealed runaway films were shot primarily in the United Kingdom, Italy, Mexico, France and Germany. The report further identified factors that led producers to shoot abroad: (1) authentic locale; (2) lower labor costs; (3) blocked currencies; (4) tax advantages and (5) easy money and/or subsidies.

On December 1, 1961, H. O'Neil Shanks, John Lehners and Robert Gilbert of the Hollywood AFL Film Council testified regarding runaway productions before the Education and Labor Subcommittee on the Impact of Imports and Exports on American Employment. Shanks explained to the subcommittee:

''Apart from the fact that thousands of job opportunities for motion picture technicians, musicians, and players are being 'exported' to other countries at the expense of American citizens residing in the State of California, the State of New York, and in other States because of runaway production this unfortunate trend . . . threatens to destroy a valuable national asset in the field of world-wide mass communications, which is vital to our national interest and security. If Hollywood is thus permitted to become 'obsolete as a production center' and the United States voluntarily surrenders its position of world leadership in the field of theatrical motion pictures, the chance to present a more favorable American image on the movie screens of non-Communist countries in reply to the cold war attacks of our Soviet adversaries will be lost forever.''

John ''Jack'' L. Dales, Executive Secretary of the Screen Actors Guild (''SAG''), and actor Charlton Heston also testified before this subcommittee. Dales stated:

''We examined and laid out, without evasion, all the causes [of runaway production]

we knew. Included as impelling foreign production were foreign financial subsidies, tax avoidance, lower production costs, popularity of authentic locale, frozen funds—all complex reasons. We urged Congressional action in two primary areas: (1) fight subsidy with subsidy. Use the present 10 percent admissions tax to create a domestic subsidy; (2) taxes. . . . [W]e proposed consideration of a spread of five or seven years over which tax would be paid on the average, not on the highest, income for those years.''

Despite these impassioned pleas, runaway production has continued to grow in importance, scope and visibility. Today it ranks among the most critical issues confronting the entertainment industry. The issue received increased attention in June 1999, when SAG and the Directors Guild of America (''DGA'') commissioned a Monitor Company report, ''The Economic Impact of U.S. Film and Television Runaway Production'' (''Monitor Report''), that analyzed the quantity of motion pictures shot abroad and resulting losses to the American economy. In January 2001, concerns over runaway production were addressed in a report prepared by the United States Department of Commerce. The eighty-eight page document (''Department of Commerce Report'') was produced at the request of a bipartisan congressional group. Like the Monitor Report, the Department of Commerce Report acknowledged the ''flight of U.S. television and cinematic film production to foreign shores. Both reports quantify the nature and depth of the problem and warn of further proliferation if left unchecked.

Additionally, the media is bringing the issue of runaway production to the attention of the general public. Numerous newspaper articles have focused on the concerns cited in the Monitor Report. For example, in The Washington Post, Lorenzo di Bonaventura, Warner Bros. president of production, explained the runaway production issue as follows:

''For studios, the economics of moving production overseas are tempting. The 'Matrix' cost us 30 percent less than it would have if we shot in the United States. . . . The rate of exchange is 62 cents on the dollar. Labor costs, construction materials are all lower. And they want us more. They are very embracing when we come to them.''

Di Bonaventura indicated Warner Bros. received $12 million in tax incentives for filming ''The Matrix'' in Australia. This is a significant savings for a film that cost approximately $62 million to produce.

III. CAUSES OF RUNAWAY PRODUCTION

In the Department of Commerce Report, the government delineated factors leading to runaway film and television production. These factors have contributed to the ''substantial transformation of what used to be a traditional and quintessentially American industry into an increasingly dispersed global industry.''

A. Vertical Integration: Globalization

Vertical integration is defined by the International Monetary Fund as ''the increasing integration of economies around the world, particularly through trade and financial flows.'' The term may also refer to ''the movement of people (labor) and knowledge (technology) across international borders.''

Consequently, companies must now be productive and international in order to profit. Because companies are generally more interested in profits than in people, companies are often not loyal to communities in which they have flourished. Instead, they solely consider the bottom line in the process of making business decisions.

Columbia is an excellent example of the conversion from a traditional U.S.-based company to a global enterprise. Columbia began in 1918 when independent producer Harry Cohn, his brother Jack and their associate Joe Brandt, started the company with a $100,000 loan. In 1926, Columbia purchased a small lot on Gower Street in Hollywood, California, with just two sound stages and a small office building. In 1929, Columbia's success began when it produced its first ''talkie'' feature, ''The Donovan Affair,'' directed by Frank Capra, who would become an important asset to Columbia. Capra went on to produce other box office successes for Columbia such as ''You Can't Take It With You'' and ''Mr. Smith Goes to Washington.''

In 1966, Columbia faced a takeover attempt by the Banque de Paris et Pays-Bas, owner of twenty percent of Columbia, and Maurice Clairmont, a well-known corporate raider. The Communications Act of 1934 prohibited foreign ownership of more than one-fifth of an American company with broadcast holdings. The Banque de Paris could not legally take over Columbia because one of Columbia's subsidiaries, Screen Gems, held a number of television stations. In 1982, the Coca-Cola Company purchased Columbia.

In 1988, Columbia's share of domestic box office receipts fell to 3.5 percent and Columbia registered a $104 million loss. In late 1989, Columbia entered into an agreement with Sony USA, Inc., a subsidiary of Japan's Sony Corporation, for the purchase of all of Columbia's outstanding stock. This acquisition apparently did not violate the amended Communications Act.

Following in Columbia's footsteps, other studios have globalized through foreign ownership. Universal Studios, Inc. (''Universal''), previously the Music Corporation of America, was acquired by the additional Japanese electronics company Matsushita in 1991, and four years later was purchased by Seagram, a Canadian company headquartered in Montreal. In 1985, Australian media mogul Rupert Murdoch acquired a controlling interest in Fox, and Time, Inc., a publishing and cable television giant, acquired Warner Bros. in 1989.

As studios become multinational, their loyalty to the community or country in which they were born wanes. The international corporations are no longer concerned with the ramifications of moving production outside uses for of their community or country; they are instead concerned only with bottom-line profits. Columbia exemplifies, globalization. Columbia no longer owns a studio lot, let alone its humble beginnings on Gower Street. The Studio simply rents office space in a building in Culver City, California. Not surprisingly, global corporations think globally, not locally. Shooting abroad is not only acceptable, but preferable to companies who are not loyal to any one country.

B. Rising Production and Distribution Costs and Decreasing Profits

By the end of the 1990s, studio executives began to alter their business methods. Despite aggressive cost-cutting, layoffs, strategic joint ventures and movement of production to foreign shores, rising production and distribution costs have consumed profits over the last decade. Production costs rose from an average of $26.8 million to $51.5 million. Distribution costs for new feature films more than doubled. In 1990, the average motion picture cost $11.97 million to distribute, and by 1999, the costs rose to $24.53 million. At the same time, profit margins dropped. For example, Disney Studio's profits decreased from 25 percent in 1987 to 19 percent in 1997, and Viacom's profits dropped from 13 percent in 1987 to less than 6.5 percent in 1997. Additionally, both Time Warner and News Corporation, parent of Fox, showed declining profits as well.

C. Technological Advances

According to the Department of Commerce Report, ''[N]ew technologies and tools may well be contributing to the increase in the amount of foreign production of U.S. entertainment programming.'' Ten years ago, even if a foreign country had lower labor costs, it would have been prohibitively expensive to transport equipment and qualified technicians to produce a quality picture abroad. However, new technology is defeating that obstacle. Scenes shot on film must be transferred or scanned into a videotape format; this process creates what is referred to as dailies. However, many foreign production centers are unable to instantaneously produce dailies from film. Nevertheless, technological advancement has led to the creation of high definition video, which, like dailies, offers immediate viewing capabilities approximating the visual quality of film. As the quality of high definition video continues to improve, producers will be free to shoot abroad regardless of whether the country offers film processing centers.

D. Government Sweeteners

Canada is extremely aggressive in its application of both Federal and provincial subsidies to entice production north of the border: ''At the federal level, the Canadian government offers tax credits to compensate for salary and wages, provides funding for equity investment, and provides working capital loans. At the provincial level, similar tax credits are offered, as well as incentives through the waiving of fees for parking, permits, location, and other local Costs.''

These enticements equal a sizable economic benefit. According to the Monitor Report, ''U.S.-developed productions located in Canada have been able to realize total savings, including incentives and other cost reducing characteristics of producing in Canada, of up to twenty-six percent.'' The Department of Commerce Report carefully delineates a plethora of incentives employed by a host of countries. It concludes the undeniable impact of these programs is to weaken the market position of the U.S. film-making industry and those who depend on the industry for employment.

E. Exchange Rates

Because the U.S. dollar is stronger than Canadian, Australian and U.K. currencies, American producers have more purchase power when they opt to film abroad. As a result, producers are tempted to locate where the dollar has the most value. The Canadian, Australian and U.K. currencies have all declined by fifteen to twenty-three percent, relative to the U.S. dollar, since 1990.

IV. THE IMPACT OF RUNAWAY PRODUCTION

A. The Economic Impact

In total, U.S. workers and the government lost $10.3 billion to economic runaways in 1998. According to the Monitor Report, ''$2.8 billion in direct expenditures were lost to the United States in 1998 from both theatrical films and television economic runaways.'' For example, if a theatrical picture is shot in New York, then carpenters are employed to make the set, caterers are employed to prepare and serve food, and costume designers are hired to provide wardrobe. As the Department of Commerce Report explains, ''[B]ehind the polished, finished film product there are tens of thousands of technicians, less well-known actors, assistant directors and unit production managers, artists, specialists, post-production workers, set movers, extras, construction workers, and other workers in fields too numerous to mention.''

This fiscal loss ripples through the economy affecting peripheral industries. In addition to the direct economic loss discussed

above, the Monitor Report calculated an additional $5.6 billion lost in indirect expenditures. Indirect expenditures include real estate, restaurants, clothing and hotel revenues, which are not realized. In addition to these private industry losses, the government lost $1.9 billion in taxes to runaway production. As opposed to the $10.3 billion lost in 1998, the study estimated those figures will be between $13 and $15 billion in 2001.

B. The U.S. Production Drought

The Monitor Report stated that between 1990 and 1998, U.S. film production growth fell sharply behind the growth occurring in the top U.S. runaway production locations of Canada, Australia and the U.K. It stated that Australia ''is growing 26.4 percent annually in production of United States-U.S.-developed feature films, or more than three times the U.S. growth rate.'' Similarly, ''Canada is growing at 18.2 percent annually in production of U.S.-developed television projects, more than double the U.S. rate.'' During the same period, annual growth rates in the United States were 8.2 percent for feature films, and 2.6 percent for television.''

C. Job Loss

Runaway production also impacts the U.S. labor market. It is estimated there are 270,000 jobs directly tied to film production. It is further estimated that 20,000 jobs were lost in 1998 alone due to runaway production. However, these statistics do not fully reflect the impact of economic runaway production on employment. They fail to account for spin-off employment that accompanies film production. It is estimated by the Commerce Department that the ripple effect of secondary and tertiary jobs associated with the industry might easily double or triple the number of jobs dependent upon the industry.

Regardless of the understated nature of the economic impact, the Commerce Department acknowledges that at least $18 billion in direct and indirect export revenues and $20 billion in economic activity are generated by the industry annually.

D. Loss of Pension and Health Benefits

Performers and others who work on foreign productions may lose valuable pension and health benefits. As provided in the SAG collective bargaining agreements, performers are entitled to receive pension and health contributions made to the plans on behalf of performers when they work on productions. Although SAG does allow for some pension and health reciprocity with the Canadian performers union, performers must negotiate this term into their contracts. More often than not, performers are unable to negotiate this benefit for work performed in Canada.

E. Cultural Identity

In 1961, Congress was warned that the trend of runaway production threatened to destroy a valuable ''national asset'' in the field of worldwide mass communications. As H. O'Neil Shanks, John Lehners and Robert Gilbert of the Hollywood AFL Film Council testified in 1961, if Hollywood became ''obsolete as a production center'' and the United States voluntarily surrendered its position of leadership in the field of theatrical motion pictures, the chance to present a more favorable American image on the movie screen would be forever lost. Although the Cold War is no longer a reason to protect cultural identity, today U.S.-produced pictures are still a conduit through which our values, such as democracy and freedom, are promoted.

V. SOLUTIONS

A. The Film California First Program

California remains a leading force in the industry, and last year took a legislative step to remedy the problem of runaway production. The state passed a three-year, $45 million program aimed at reimbursing film costs incurred on public property. The Film California First (''FCF'') program is specifically geared toward increasing the state's competitive edge in attracting and retaining film projects. To accomplish this goal, the legislation provides various subsidies to production companies for filming in California, including offering property leases at below-market rates. This legislation should serve as a model for other states, as they too struggle with an issue of increasing economic importance.

B. Wage-Based Tax Credit

A possible solution could be patterned after a legislative proposal offered, but never advanced, in the 106th Congress. Specifically, this proposal called for a wage-based tax credit for targeted productions and provided: (1) a general business tax credit that would be a dollar-for-dollar offset against any federal income tax liability; (2) a credit cap at twenty-five percent of the first $25,000 in wages and salaries paid to any employee whose work is in connection with a film or television program substantially Produced in the United States and (3) availability of credit only to targeted film and television productions with costs of more than $500,000 and less than $10 million.

C. Future Solutions

To rectify the problems of runaway productions, legislation at the local, state and federal levels is paramount. Over the past thirty years, the film industry has expanded beyond California to become a major engine of economic growth in states such as New York, Texas, Florida, Illinois and North Carolina. To achieve effective legislative remedies, it is critical to examine the successful programs implemented by other nations.

Maybe it is the inexorable result of a changing world. Regardless, the proliferation of foreign subsidies for U.S. film production, which is occurring at an increasing rate worldwide, raises troubling questions of fairness and equity. From a competitive standpoint, it appears as though the deck is stacked against a class of workers who seek to derive their livelihood from this industry but find their jobs have moved overseas. It is understandable that producers will take the opportunity to film abroad when the reduction in costs is as much as twenty-five percent. Consequently, the only remedy for America's workforce is to pass legislation that provides commensurate benefits in the United States.

It is apparent that a laissez-faire, market-oriented approach has failed the American worker. Unemployment is extraordinarily high within the creative community, leading to seventy percent of SAG'S 100,000 plus members earning less than $7,500 annually. This economic hardship is exacerbated by runaway production. Thus, it is abundantly clear that legislative remedies attempting to more adequately level the playing field must be pursued. Amid encouraging signs that a tax bill of significant consequence is likely to pass Congress in the coming months, it is imperative that the creative community take a proactive position to ensure that the tax bill provides incentives for domestic film production. It must use all resources to cure the concerns presented in the two reports outlined in this Article. Organizations, such as SAG, must work with Congress to develop a proposal that is acceptable in terms of cost and other political considerations.

While it seems unlikely that there is the political will or desire to match the incentives offered by many of our competitors, it is conceivable to the authors that an effective approach can be designed to substantially close the gap on cost savings without eliminating them. Thus, the approach advocated involves identifying the level where cost savings of filming abroad are minimized so as not to be the determinative location factor. An appropriate level may be in the range of ten percent cost savings versus the twenty-six percent cost savings now common in some Canadian locations.

It is important to note the strategy used to fashion a remedy is just as important as the relief sought. The industry should be willing to approach the tax-writing committee staff with the afore-mentioned concept and work closely with them in designing a legislative remedy. This strategy represents a holistic approach to a global problem. It is important to remember the United States risks losing its economic advantage in a vital industry which carries with it enormous economic consequences. As noted in the Department of Commerce Report:

''If the most rapid growth in the most dynamic area of film production is occurring outside the United States, then employment, infrastructure, and technical skills will also grow more rapidly outside the United States, and the country could lose its competitive edge in important segments of the film industry.''

VI. CONCLUSION

Politics represents the art of the possible. The approach advocated in this Article should find a receptive ear in the halls of Congress if for nothing else than its simplicity. Timing is crucial. Left unchecked, the only certainty is continuing runaway production with the attendant of economic costs, lost jobs, and diminished tax revenues at all levels of government. In a time of waning economic growth and warning signs of dwindling surpluses and future economic weakness, including production incentives into any upcoming tax relief is essential to preserving the U.S. workforce in the American entertainment industry.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JAMES H. MALONEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 2001

Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, June 26, 2001, I was unavoidably detained and missed rollcall No. 190. Had I been present, I would have voted No on rollcall vote No. 190.

TRIBUTE TO THE CITY OF MURRIETA, 10TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. KEN CALVERT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, June 28, 2001

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure today to pay tribute to a wonderful, young city in my district as they prepare to celebrate their 10th Anniversary—Murrieta, California, a ''Gem of the Valley.'' Murrieta is an expansive valley covered with grasses and dotted with oak trees.

Incorporated as a city in July of 1991 after an overwhelming supportive vote, Murrieta has seen tremendous growth since its small beginnings as a sheep ranch. It was a young Don Juan Murrieta who first recognized the natural