

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. MACK, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. BAUCUS):

S. 879. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a shorter recovery period for the depreciation of certain leasehold improvements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. INHOFE:

S. 880. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to remove flammable fuels from the list of substances with respect to which reporting and other activities are required under the risk management plan program; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Ms. SNOWE (for herself, Mr. HELMS, Mr. GRAMS, Mr. ROBB, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. EDWARDS, Mr. CLELAND, Mr. HATCH, Mr. TORRICELLI, Mr. MACK, Mr. CRAPO, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LAUTENBERG, and Mr. DODD):

S. Res. 84. A resolution to designate the month of May, 1999, as "National Alpha 1 Awareness Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. THOMAS, Mr. REED, Mr. HELMS, Mr. WELLSTONE, Mr. COVERDELL, and Mr. KERRY):

S. Res. 85. A resolution supporting the efforts of the people of Indonesia in achieving a transition to genuine democracy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. INOUYE:

S. 874. A bill to repeal the reduction in the deductible portion of expenses for business meals and entertainment; to the Committee on Finance.

#### REPEAL THE REDUCTION IN BUSINESS MEALS AND ENTERTAINMENT TAX DEDUCTION

Mr. INOUYE. Mr. President, I rise to introduce legislation to repeal the current fifty percent tax deduction for business meals and entertainment expenses, and to gradually restore the tax deduction to 80 percent over a five-year period. Restoration of this deduction is essential to the livelihood of the food service, travel, tourism, and entertainment industries throughout the United States. These industries are being economically harmed as a result of the 50 percent tax deduction.

The deduction for business meals and entertainment was reduced from 80 percent to 50 percent under the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993, and went into effect on January 1, 1994. Many companies, small and large, have changed their policies and guidelines on travel and entertainment expenses as a result of this reduction. Additionally, businesses have been forced to curtail company reimbursement policies because of the reduction in business meals and entertainment expenses. In some cases, businesses have even eliminated their expense accounts. Consequently, restaurants

which previously relied heavily on business lunches and dinners are being adversely affected by the reduction in business meals. For example:

Currently, there are 23.3 million business meal spenders in the U.S. down from 25.3 million in 1989.

The total economic impact on small businesses of restoring the business meal deductibility from 50 percent to 80 percent ranges from \$8 to \$690 million, depending on the state.

In Hawaii, the restaurant industry alone employs 47,400 people and generates \$2 billion into the state's economy. An increase in the business meal tax deduction from 50 percent to 80 percent would result in a 13 percent increase in business meal spending in the State of Hawaii.

One issue of great importance to business travelers is the deductibility of expenses, particularly the business meal expense.

Restauranteurs have reported lower business meal sales forcing some restaurants to close during luncheon hours and lay off employees which in turn adversely affects those employed in agriculture, food processing, and any businesses related to the restaurant sector.

With sales equaling more than 4 percent of the U.S. gross domestic product, and more than 10.2 million persons employed in the industry, the restaurant business is obviously very important to the economic foundation of America. The 50 percent deduction has adversely affected the restaurant and entertainment industry and resulted in detrimental factors for the U.S. economy as a whole. I urge my colleagues to join me in cosponsoring this important legislation.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill text be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### S. 874

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. REPEAL OF REDUCTION IN BUSINESS MEALS AND ENTERTAINMENT TAX DEDUCTION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 274(n)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to only 50 percent of meal and entertainment expenses allowed as deduction) is amended by striking "50 percent" and inserting "the applicable percentage".

(b) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—Section 274(n) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking paragraph (3) and inserting the following:

"(3) APPLICABLE PERCENTAGE.—For purposes of paragraph (1), the term 'applicable percentage' means the percentage determined under the following table:

"For taxable years beginning—	The applicable percentage is—
1999 .....	56
2000 .....	62
2001 .....	68
2002 .....	74
2003 or thereafter .....	80."

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The heading for section 274(n) of the Internal Revenue

Code of 1986 is amended by striking "ONLY 50 PERCENT" and inserting "PORTION".

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1998.

By Mr. ALLARD (for himself, Mr. GRAMM, Mr. BENNETT, Mr. SHELBY, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. HAGEL, Mr. ENZI, Mr. MACK, and Mr. GRAMS):

S. 875. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand S corporation eligibility for banks, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

#### SMALL BUSINESS AND FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1999

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, today I am pleased to introduce legislation that will expand and improve Subchapter S of the Internal Revenue Code. I am joined in this effort by Senators GRAMM, BENNETT, SHELBY, ABRAHAM, HAGEL, ENZI, MACK, and GRAMS.

The Subchapter S provisions of the Internal Revenue Code reflect the desire of Congress to eliminate the double tax burden on small business corporations. Pursuant to that desire, Subchapter S has been liberalized a number of times, most recently in 1996. This legislation contains several provisions that will make the Subchapter S election more widely available to small businesses in all sectors. It also contains several provisions of particular benefit to community banks that may be contemplating a conversion to Subchapter S. Financial institutions were first made eligible for the Subchapter S election in 1996. This legislation builds on and clarifies the Subchapter S provisions applicable to financial institutions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill and the attached explanation of the provisions of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### S. 875

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Small Business and Financial Institutions Tax Relief Act of 1999".

#### SEC. 2. EXPANSION OF S CORPORATION ELIGIBLE SHAREHOLDERS TO INCLUDE IRAS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1361(c)(2)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to certain trusts permitted as shareholders) is amended by inserting after clause (v) the following:

"(vi) A trust which constitutes an individual retirement account under section 408(a), including one designated as a Roth IRA under section 408A."

(b) TREATMENT AS SHAREHOLDER.—Section 1361(c)(2)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to treatment as shareholders) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(vi) In the case of a trust described in clause (vi) of subparagraph (A), the individual for whose benefit the trust was created shall be treated as a shareholder."

(c) SALE OF STOCK IN IRA RELATING TO S CORPORATION ELECTION EXEMPT FROM PROHIBITED TRANSACTION RULES.—Section 4975(d) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to exemptions) is amended by striking “or” at the end of paragraph (14), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (15) and inserting “; or”, and by adding at the end the following:

“(16) a sale of stock held by a trust which constitutes an individual retirement account under section 408(a) to the individual for whose benefit such account is established if such sale is pursuant to an election under section 1362(a).”

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1999.

**SEC. 3. EXCLUSION OF INVESTMENT SECURITIES INCOME FROM PASSIVE INCOME TEST FOR BANK S CORPORATIONS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1362(d)(3)(C) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining passive investment income) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(v) EXCEPTION FOR BANKS; ETC.—In the case of a bank (as defined in section 581), a bank holding company (as defined in section 246A(c)(3)(B)(ii)), or a qualified subchapter S subsidiary bank, the term ‘passive investment income’ shall not include—

“(I) interest income earned by such bank, bank holding company, or qualified subchapter S subsidiary bank, or

“(II) dividends on assets required to be held by such bank, bank holding company, or qualified subchapter S subsidiary bank to conduct a banking business, including stock in the Federal Reserve Bank, the Federal Home Loan Bank, or the Federal Agricultural Mortgage Bank or participation certificates issued by a Federal Intermediate Credit Bank.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1996.

**SEC. 4. INCREASE IN NUMBER OF ELIGIBLE SHAREHOLDERS TO 150.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1361(b)(1)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining small business corporation) is amended by striking “75” and inserting “150”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1999.

**SEC. 5. TREATMENT OF QUALIFYING DIRECTOR SHARES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(f) TREATMENT OF QUALIFYING DIRECTOR SHARES.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) qualifying director shares shall not be treated as a second class of stock, and

“(B) no person shall be treated as a shareholder of the corporation by reason of holding qualifying director shares.

“(2) QUALIFYING DIRECTOR SHARES DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualifying director shares’ means any shares of stock in a bank (as defined in section 581) or in a bank holding company registered as such with the Federal Reserve System—

“(i) which are held by an individual solely by reason of status as a director of such bank or company or its controlled subsidiary; and

“(ii) which are subject to an agreement pursuant to which the holder is required to dispose of the shares of stock upon termination of the holder’s status as a director at the same price as the individual acquired such shares of stock.

“(3) DISTRIBUTIONS.—A distribution (not in part or full payment in exchange for stock)

made by the corporation with respect to qualifying director shares shall be includable as ordinary income of the holder and deductible to the corporation as an expense in computing taxable income under section 1363(b) in the year such distribution is received.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(i) Section 1361(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by inserting “, except as provided in subsection (f),” before “which does not”.

(2) Section 1366(a) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) ALLOCATION WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFYING DIRECTOR SHARES.—The holders of qualifying director shares (as defined in section 1361(f)) shall not, with respect to such shares of stock, be allocated any of the items described in paragraph (1).”

(3) Section 1373(a) of such Code is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (1), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (2) and inserting “, and”, and adding at the end the following:

“(3) no amount of an expense deductible under this subchapter by reason of section 1361(f)(3) shall be apportioned or allocated to such income.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1996.

**SEC. 6. BAD DEBT CHARGE OFFS IN YEARS AFTER ELECTION YEAR TREATED AS ITEMS OF BUILT-IN LOSS.**

The Secretary of the Treasury shall modify Regulation 1.1374-4(f) for S corporation elections made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1996, with respect to bad debt deductions under section 166 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat such deductions as built-in losses under section 1374(d)(4) of such Code during the entire period during which the bank recognizes built-in gains from changing its accounting method for recognizing bad debts from the reserve method under section 585 of such Code to the charge-off method under section 166 of such Code.

**SEC. 7. INCLUSION OF BANKS IN 3-YEAR S CORPORATION RULE FOR CORPORATE PREFERENCE ITEMS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1363(b) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to computation of corporation’s taxable income) is amended by adding at the end the following new flush sentence:

“Paragraph (4) shall apply to any bank whether such bank is an S corporation or a qualified subchapter S subsidiary.”

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1999.

**SEC. 8. C CORPORATION RULES TO APPLY FOR FRINGE BENEFIT PURPOSES.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1372 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to partnership rules to apply for fringe benefit purposes) is repealed.

(b) PARTNERSHIP RULES TO APPLY FOR HEALTH INSURANCE COSTS OF CERTAIN S CORPORATION SHAREHOLDERS.—Paragraph (5) of section 162(l) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended to read as follows:

“(5) TREATMENT OF CERTAIN S CORPORATION SHAREHOLDERS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—This subsection shall apply in the case of any 2-percent shareholder of an S corporation, except that—

“(i) for purposes of this subsection, such shareholder’s wages (as defined in section 3121) from the S corporation shall be treated as such shareholder’s earned income (within the meaning of section 401(c)(1)), and

“(ii) there shall be such adjustments in the application of this subsection as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe.

“(B) 2-PERCENT SHAREHOLDER DEFINED.—For purposes of this paragraph, the term ‘2-

percent shareholder’ means any person who owns (or is considered as owning within the meaning of section 318) on any day during the taxable year of the S corporation more than 2 percent of the outstanding stock of such corporation or stock possessing more than 2 percent of the total combined voting power of all stock of such corporation.”

(c) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for part III of subchapter S of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking the item relating to section 1372.

(d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1999.

**SEC. 9. EXPANSION OF S CORPORATION ELIGIBLE SHAREHOLDERS TO INCLUDE FAMILY LIMITED PARTNERSHIPS.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1361(b)(1)(B) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (defining small business corporation) is amended—

(1) by striking “or an organization” and inserting “an organization”, and

(2) by inserting “, or a family partnership described in subsection (c)(8)” after “subsection (c)(6)”.

(b) FAMILY PARTNERSHIP.—Section 1361(c) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to special rules for applying subsection (b)), as amended by section 5, is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(8) FAMILY PARTNERSHIPS.—

“(A) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of subsection (b)(1)(B), any partnership or limited liability company may be a shareholder in an S corporation if—

“(i) all partners or members are members of 1 family as determined under section 704(e)(3), and

“(ii) all of the partners or members would otherwise be eligible shareholders of an S corporation.

“(B) TREATMENT AS SHAREHOLDERS.—For purposes of subsection (b)(1)(A), in the case of a partnership or limited liability company described in subparagraph (A), each partner or member shall be treated as a shareholder.”

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1999.

**SEC. 10. ISSUANCE OF PREFERRED STOCK PERMITTED.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 5(a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(g) TREATMENT OF QUALIFIED PREFERRED STOCK.—

“(I) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subsection—

“(A) qualified preferred stock shall not be treated as a second class of stock, and

“(B) no person shall be treated as a shareholder of the corporation by reason of holding qualified preferred stock.

“(2) QUALIFIED PREFERRED STOCK DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection, the term ‘qualified preferred stock’ means stock which meets the requirements of subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) of section 1504(a)(4). Stock shall not fail to be treated as qualified preferred stock solely because it is convertible into other stock.

“(3) DISTRIBUTIONS.—A distribution (not in part or full payment in exchange for stock) made by the corporation with respect to qualified preferred stock shall be includable as ordinary income of the holder and deductible to the corporation as an expense in computing taxable income under section 1363(b) in the year such distribution is received.”

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1361(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 5(b)(1), is amended by striking “subsection (f)” and inserting “subsections (f) and (g)”.

(2) Section 1366(a) of such Code, as amended by section 5(b)(2), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(4) ALLOCATION WITH RESPECT TO QUALIFIED PREFERRED STOCK.—The holders of qualified preferred stock (as defined in section 1361(g)) shall not, with respect to such stock, be allocated any of the items described in paragraph (1).”

(3) Section 1373(a)(3) of such Code, as added by section 5(b)(3), is amended by inserting “or 1361(g)(3)” after “section 1361(f)(3)”.  
 (c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1999.

#### SEC. 11. CONSENT TO ELECTIONS.

(a) 90 PERCENT OF SHARES REQUIRED FOR CONSENT TO ELECTION.—Section 1362(a)(2) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to all shareholders must consent to election) is amended—

(1) by striking “all persons who are shareholders in” and inserting “shareholders holding at least 90 percent of the shares of”, and  
 (2) by striking “ALL SHAREHOLDERS” in the heading and inserting “AT LEAST 90 PERCENT OF SHARES”.

(b) RULES FOR CONSENT.—Section 1362(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to election) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) RULES FOR CONSENT.—For purposes of making any consent required under paragraph (2) or subsection (d)(1)(B)—  
 “(A) each joint owner of shares shall consent with respect to such shares,  
 “(B) the personal representative or other fiduciary authorized to act on behalf of the estate of a deceased individual shall consent for the estate,  
 “(C) one parent, the custodian, the guardian, or the conservator shall consent with respect to shares owned by a minor or subject to a custodianship, guardianship, conservatorship, or similar arrangement,  
 “(D) the trustee of a trust shall consent with respect to shares owned in trust,  
 “(E) the trustee of the estate of a bankrupt individual shall consent for shares owned by a bankruptcy estate,  
 “(F) an authorized officer or the trustee of an organization described in subsection (c)(6) shall consent for the shares owned by such organization, and  
 “(G) in the case of a partnership or limited liability company described in subsection (c)(8)—

“(i) all general partners shall consent with respect to shares owned by such partnership,  
 “(ii) all managers shall consent with respect to shares owned by such company if management of such company is vested in 1 or more managers, and

“(iii) all members shall consent with respect to shares owned by such company if management of such company is vested in the members.”

(c) TREATMENT OF NONCONSENTING SHAREHOLDER STOCK.—  
 (1) IN GENERAL.—Section 1361 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 10(a), is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(h) TREATMENT OF NONCONSENTING SHAREHOLDER STOCK.—  
 “(I) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of this subchapter—

“(A) nonconsenting shareholder stock shall not be treated as a second class of stock,  
 “(B) such stock shall be treated as C corporation stock, and

“(C) the shareholder’s pro rata share under section 1366(a)(1) with respect to such stock shall be subject to tax paid by the S corporation at the highest rate of tax specified in section 11(b).  
 “(2) NONCONSENTING SHAREHOLDER STOCK DEFINED.—For purposes of this subsection,

the term ‘nonconsenting shareholder stock’ means stock of an S corporation which is held by a shareholder who did not consent to an election under section 1362(a) with respect to such S corporation.

“(3) DISTRIBUTIONS.—A distribution (not in part or full payment in exchange for stock) made by the corporation with respect to nonconsenting shareholder stock shall be includable as ordinary income of the holder and deductible to the corporation as an expense in computing taxable income under section 1363(b) in the year such distribution is received.”

(2) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 1361(b)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended by section 10(b)(1), is amended by striking “subsections (f) and (g)” and inserting “subsections (f), (g), and (h)”.  
 (d) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to elections made in taxable years beginning after December 31, 1999.

#### SEC. 12. INFORMATION RETURNS FOR QUALIFIED SUBCHAPTER S SUBSIDIARIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 1361(b)(3)(A) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to treatment of certain wholly owned subsidiaries) is amended by inserting “and in the case of information returns required under part III of subchapter A of chapter 61” after “Secretary”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1999.

#### SMALL BUSINESS AND FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS TAX RELIEF ACT OF 1999—LEGISLATION TO REDUCE THE FEDERAL TAX BURDEN ON SMALL BANKS

This legislation expands Subchapter S of the IRS Code. Subchapter S corporations do not pay corporate income taxes, earnings are passed through to the shareholders where income taxes are paid, eliminating the double taxation of corporations. By contrast, Subchapter C corporations pay corporate income taxes on earnings, and shareholders pay income taxes again on those same earnings when they pass through as dividends. Subchapter S of the IRS Code was enacted in 1958 to reduce the tax burden on small business. The Subchapter S provisions have been liberalized a number of times over the last two decades, significantly in 1982, and again in 1996. This reflects a desire on the part of Congress to reduce taxes on small business.

This S corporation legislation would benefit many small businesses, but its provisions are particularly applicable to banks. Congress made S corporation status available to small banks for the first time in the 1996 “Small Business Job Protection Act” but many banks are having trouble qualifying under the current rules. The proposed legislation:

Permits S corporation shares to be held as Individual Retirement Accounts (IRAs), and permits IRA shareholders to purchase their shares from the IRA in order to facilitate a Subchapter S election.

Clarifies that interest and dividends on investments maintained by a bank for liquidity and safety and soundness purposes shall not be “passive” income. This is necessary because S corporations are restricted in the amount of passive investment income they may generate.

Increases the number of S corporation eligible shareholders from 75 to 150.

Provides that any stock that bank directors must hold under banking regulations shall not be a disqualifying second class of stock. This is necessary because S corporations are permitted only one class of stock.

Permits banks to treat bad debt charge offs as items of built in loss over the same

number of years that the accumulated bad debt reserve must be recaptured (four years) for built in gains tax purposes. This provision is necessary to properly match built in gains and losses relating to accounting for bad debts. Banks that are converting to S corporations must convert from the reserve method of accounting to the specific charge off method and the recapture of the accumulated bad debt reserve is built in gain. Presently the presumption that a bad debt charge off is a built in loss applies only to the first S corporation year.

Clarifies that the general 3 Year S corporation rule for certain “preference” items applies to interest deductions by S corporation banks, thereby providing equitable treatment for S corporation banks. S corporations that convert from C corporations are denied certain interest deductions (preference items) for up to 3 years after the conversion, at the end of three years the deductions are allowed.

Provides that non-health care related fringe benefits such as group-term life insurance will be excludable from wages for “more-than-two-percent” shareholders. Current law taxes the fringe benefits of these shareholders. Health care related benefits are not included because their deductibility would increase the revenue impact of the legislation.

Permits Family Limited Partnerships to be shareholders in Subchapter S corporations. Many family owned small businesses are organized as Family Limited Partnerships or controlled by Family Limited Partnerships for a variety of reasons. A number of small banks have Family Limited Partnership shareholders, and this legislation would for the first time permit those partnerships to be S corporation shareholders.

Permits S corporations to issue preferred stock in addition to common. Prohibited under current law which permits S corporations to have only one class of stock. Because of limitations on the number of common shareholders, banks need to be able to issue preferred stock in order to have adequate access to equity.

Reduces the required level of shareholder consent to convert to an S corporation from unanimous to 90 percent of shares. Non-consenting shareholders retain their stock, with such stock treated as C corporation stock. The procedures for consent are clarified in order to streamline the process.

Clarifies that Qualified Subchapter S Subsidiaries (QSSS) provide information returns under their own tax id number. This can help avoid confusion by depositors and other parties over the insurance of deposits and the payer of salaries and interest.

By Mr. HOLLINGS:

S. 876. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to require that the broadcast of violent video programming be limited to hours when children are not reasonably likely to comprise a substantial portion of the audience; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### CHILDREN’S PROTECTION FROM VIOLENT PROGRAMMING ACT

Mr. HOLLINGS. Mr. President, I rise to offer legislation to help parents limit the amount of television violence coming into their homes. We have reviewed this issue for decades and the analysis has not changed. All of the assurances and promises have been insufficient to protect our children from the dangerous influence of television violence.

The bill that I introduce today requires a safeharbor time period during which broadcasters and basic cable programmers would not be permitted to transmit violent programming. The legislation directs the Federal Communications Commission to develop an appropriate safeharbor time period to protect television audiences that are likely to be comprised of a substantial number of children.

We can argue all day long about which study reaches what conclusion about the impacts of television violence. But it defies common sense to believe that television violence does not impact our kids in some adverse way. Even the National Cable Television Association's own study on television violence states that the "evidence of the harmful effects associated with televised violence" is "firmly established."

The recent events in Littleton, Colorado serve to highlight the sad and unfortunate fact that violence in our culture is begetting violence by our youths. Violence is everywhere, it is readily accessible, and, to make matters worse, it is a source of corporate profits. A recent Washington Post article entitled, "When Death Imitates Art," made this very point. It states:

For young people, the culture at large is bathed in blood and violence . . . where the more extreme the message, the more over the top gruesomeness, the better. . . . Film, television, music, dress, technology, games: They've become one giant playground filled with accessible evil, darker than ever before.

While we know we can't regulate every market and every technology, and don't want to, we also know that the purveyors of violence must be held accountable in those instances when we can do so, consistent with our values and our Constitution. One way to do this is through television programming.

This approach has already been successfully applied to television with respect to indecent programming, for which a safeharbor has been on the books since 1992—an approach that the D.C. Circuit has validated. I am confident that a similar result would be obtained if the video programming industry or First Amendment advocates were to attack this legislation that I introduce today. Indeed, prior legislative history also substantiates the constitutionality of my approach. In 1993, when I introduced my safeharbor legislation for the first time, the Commerce Committee held a hearing at which Attorney General Janet Reno and FCC Commissioner Reed Hundt both testified that the bill was constitutional.

Now, I know that there will be opponents of this legislation who will state that the ratings system is working, that the V-chip is being deployed, and that our parents are being armed with the tools to protect their children from television violence. I also know that some Senators wrote a letter in July 1997, suggesting that the government forbear from regulation TV violence.

But I'm not convinced. We should not forbear from protecting our children.

Besides, the ratings system is incomplete. For example, one major broadcast network refuses to this day to use content ratings, and one major cable channel refuses to use any ratings at all. We all know what is going on here—money talks and violence sells. A recent article in USA Today illustrates this point. Entitled "TV Violence for Profit," the article reports that some TV networks and basic cable channels increase the amount of violent programming during "sweeps—the key months when Nielsen measures audience size in every market."

Regardless, even if the industry is right that the V-Chip will eventually be the magic solution, we all know that thousands, and perhaps millions of families, will be without a V-chip for years. The V-chip is not required by the FCC to be manufactured in all television until January 1, 2000. Will every parent go to Circuit City on New Year's day and buy a new TV with a V-chip? Of course not. The V-Chip is not a complete solution. The only complete solution is a safeharbor.

To conclude, I want to stress that this is an issue about accountability and responsibility. Those responsible for supplying video programming have been granted a public trust through the availability of broadcast spectrum and FCC licenses to deliver their programming to America's children. They should be responsible in their programming choices. We know, however, that market forces may encourage them to be irresponsible and transmit excessive violent programming. We in the Congress therefore have a responsibility to hold them accountable. This legislation does just that.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 876

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

**SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.**

This Act may be cited as the "Children's Protection from Violent Programming Act".

**SEC. 2. FINDINGS.**

The Congress makes the following findings:

(1) Television influences the perception children have of the values and behavior that are common and acceptable in society.

(2) Broadcast television, cable television, and video programming are—

(A) pervasive presences in the lives of all American children; and

(B) readily accessible to all American children.

(3) Violent video programming influences children, as does indecent programming.

(4) There is empirical evidence that children exposed to violent video programming at a young age have a higher tendency to engage in violent and aggressive behavior later in life than those children not so exposed.

(5) Children exposed to violent video programming are prone to assume that acts of violence are acceptable behavior and therefore to imitate such behavior.

(6) Children exposed to violent video programming have an increased fear of becoming a victim of violence, resulting in increased self-protective behaviors, resulting in increased self-protective behaviors and increased mistrust of others.

(7) There is a compelling governmental interest in limiting the negative influences of violent video programming on children.

(8) There is a compelling governmental interest in channeling programming with violent content to periods of the day when children are not likely to comprise a substantial portion of the television audience.

(9) Because some programming that is readily accessible to minors remains unrated and therefore cannot be blocked solely on the basis of its violent content, restricting the hours when violent video programming is shown is the least restrictive and most narrowly tailored means to achieve a compelling governmental interest.

(10) Warning labels about the violent content of video programming will not in themselves prevent children from watching violent video programming.

(11) Although many programs are now subject to both age-based and content-based ratings, some broadcast and non-premium cable programs remain unrated with respect to the content of their programming.

(12) Technology-based solutions may be helpful in protecting some children, but may not be effective in achieving the compelling governmental interest in protecting all children from violent programming when parents are only able to block programming that has in fact been rated for violence.

(13) Technology-based solutions will not be installed in all newly manufactured televisions until January 1, 2000.

(14) Even though technology-based solutions will be readily available, many consumers of video programming will not actually own such technology for several years and therefore will be unable to take advantage of content based ratings to prevent their children from watching violent programming.

(15) In light of the fact that some programming remains unrated for content, and given that many consumers will not have blocking technology in the near future, the channeling of violent programming is the least restrictive means to limit the exposure of children to the harmful influences of violent programming.

(16) Restricting the hours when violent programming can be shown protects the interests of children whose parents are unavailable, are unable to supervise their children's viewing behavior, do not have the benefit of technology-based solutions, are unable to afford the costs of technology-based solution, or are unable to determine the content of those shows that are only subject to age-based ratings.

**SEC. 3. UNLAWFUL DISTRIBUTION OF VIOLENT VIDEO PROGRAMMING.**

Title VII of the Communications Act of 1934 (47 U.S.C. 701 et seq.) is amended by adding at the end the following:

**SEC. 715. UNLAWFUL DISTRIBUTION OF VIOLENT VIDEO PROGRAMMING NOT SPECIFICALLY BLOCKABLE BY ELECTRONIC MEANS.**

"(a) **UNLAWFUL DISTRIBUTION.**—It shall be unlawful for any person to distribute to the public any violent video programming during hours when children are reasonably likely to comprise a substantial portion of the audience.

"(b) **RULEMAKING PROCEEDING.**—The Commission shall conduct a rulemaking proceeding to implement the provisions of this section and shall promulgate final regulations pursuant to that proceeding not later than 9 months after the date of enactment of

the Children's Protection from Violent Programming Act. As part of that proceeding, the Commission—

“(1) may exempt from the prohibition under subsection (a) programming (including news programs and sporting events) whose distribution does not conflict with the objective of protecting children from the negative influences of violent video programming, as that objective is reflected in the findings in section 551(a) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996;

“(2) shall exempt premium and pay-per-view cable programming; and

“(3) shall define the term ‘hours when children are reasonably likely to comprise a substantial portion of the audience’ and the term ‘violent video programming’.

“(c) REPEAT VIOLATIONS.—If a person repeatedly violates this section or any regulation promulgated under this section, the Commission shall, after notice and opportunity for hearing, revoke any license issued to that person under this Act.

“(d) CONSIDERATION OF VIOLATIONS IN LICENSE RENEWALS.—The Commission shall consider, among the elements in its review of an application for renewal of a license under this Act, whether the licensee has complied with this section and the regulations promulgated under this section.

“(e) DISTRIBUTE DEFINED.—In this section, the term ‘distribute’ means to send, transmit, retransmit, telecast, broadcast, or cablecast, including by wire, microwave, or satellite.”

#### SEC. 4. SEPARABILITY.

If any provision of this Act, or any provision of an amendment made by this Act, or the application thereof to particular persons or circumstances, is found to be unconstitutional, the remainder of this Act or that amendment, or the application thereof to other persons or circumstances shall not be affected.

#### SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The prohibition contained in section 715 of the Communications Act of 1934 (as added by section 3 of this Act) and the regulations promulgated thereunder shall take effect 1 year after the regulations are adopted by the Commission.

By Mr. BROWNBACK (for himself, Mr. NICKLES, and Mr. CRAIG):

S. 877. A bill to encourage the provision of advanced service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

#### BROADBAND INTERNET REGULATORY RELIEF ACT OF 1999

Mr. BROWNBACK. Mr. President, I rise today to introduce the Broadband Internet Regulatory Relief Act of 1999 on behalf of myself, Senator NICKLES, and Senator CRAIG. This bill is intended to speed up the deployment of broadband networks throughout the United States and to make residential high-speed Internet access a widely-available service.

Mr. President, the Internet has revolutionized the way we communicate, conduct business, shop, and learn. The Internet presents us with the opportunity to remove distance as an obstacle to employment and education. But while tens of millions of Americans now log onto the Internet every day, narrowband connections to the Internet make using the Net a slow and cumbersome process.

Broadband connections, on the other hand, provide ultra-fast access to the Internet. With a broadband connection, users may download and upload data from and to the Internet at substantially greater speeds than with a narrowband connection. From downloading full-motion video to uploading an architect's plans, broadband permits consumers to utilize many more applications that will increase the value of the Internet as a communications medium.

The technology to provide broadband connections to the Internet is a reality. Cable companies are deploying hybrid fiber-coax (HFC) networks that will enable cable modems to provide high-speed Internet access. In addition, telephone companies have discovered a way to provide high-speed Internet access over their copper-based telephone loops. With the addition of a digital switch in a telephone company's central office, a digital modem at a customer's premises, and the conditioning of a copper loop, consumers may obtain access to the Internet at more than ten times the speed of narrowband connections.

The most promising technology employed by telephone companies for residential high-speed Internet access is digital subscriber line (DSL) technology. The family of DSL services, especially asymmetric digital subscriber line (ADSL) service, have the greatest potential to ensure that all consumers throughout the United States obtain high-speed Internet access. Cable service has penetration rates approaching telephone service in urban and densely-populated suburban areas. However, cable penetration is much lower in rural areas whereas the ubiquity of the telephone network makes telephone penetration rates close to one hundred percent even in rural areas. Thus, for many rural consumers, including those in Kansas, high-speed Internet access may only be available in the next several years through the telephone network.

As a result, Congress needs to ensure that high-speed Internet access is being made available over the public telephone network as rapidly as possible. While ADSL service is being rolled out in many urban and densely-populated suburban areas, most rural consumers do not have access to it.

I am introducing the Broadband Internet Regulatory Relief Act to ensure that high-speed Internet access is available to my rural constituents as soon as possible. To accomplish this goal, I am proposing to provide regulatory relief to telephone companies willing to deliver broadband connections to rural areas. My proposal has several components.

First, incumbent local exchange carriers that make seventy percent of their loops ready to support high-speed Internet access will not have to resell their advanced services to competitors and will not have to make the network elements used exclusively for the pro-

vision of advanced services available to competitors. Second, the prices for advanced services offered by incumbent local exchange carriers that face competition in the provision of such services will be deregulated. Third, where incumbent local exchange carriers are offering advanced services but do not face competition, the companies will receive pricing flexibility. Fourth, competitive local exchange carriers will not be required to resell their advanced services.

Mr. President, the ubiquity of our nation's telephone network presents us with a tremendous opportunity to deliver high-speed Internet access to our rural constituents at a pace comparable with the rate at which urban and suburban consumers will be offered such service. But to realize this goal, we must remove unnecessary regulation that has impeded the rapid deployment of broadband networks. Advanced services should not be regulated in the same manner as basic telephone service. Broadband services are an entirely new market, one in which no company can exercise market power.

In the absence of market power, the incumbents should not have to resell their advanced services or provide competitors with access to unbundled advanced service elements. And pricing regulations applied to telephone service should not be applied to advanced services. In addition, a competitive local exchange carrier willing to deploy the facilities necessary to provide broadband services should not be forced to resell its service.

Mr. President, I am confident that we can ensure the rapid deployment of broadband networks to rural areas. But to do so, we must be willing to provide companies with an incentive to build out their broadband networks in rural areas. The Broadband Internet Regulatory Relief Act would provide companies with such incentives, and I hope that my colleagues will support this crucial legislation.

By Mr. TORRICELLI (for himself, Mr. MACK, Mr. GREGG, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. MOYNIHAN, Mr. KERRY, Mrs. BOXER, Mr. REED, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mrs. MURRAY):

S. 878. A bill to amend the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to permit grants for the national estuary program to be used for the development and implementation of a comprehensive conservation and management plan, to reauthorize appropriations to carry out the program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

#### NATIONAL ESTUARY CONSERVATION ACT OF 1999

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, today, Senators MACK, GREGG, GRAHAM, MOYNIHAN, KERRY, BOXER, REED, FEINSTEIN, MURRAY, and I are introducing the National Estuary Conservation Act of 1999. I rise to draw this country's attention to our nationally significant estuaries that are threatened by pollution, development, or

overuse. With forty five percent of the nation's population residing in estuarine areas, there is a compelling need for us to promote comprehensive planning and management efforts to restore and protect them.

Estuaries are significant habitat for fish, birds, and other wildlife because they provide safe spawning grounds and nurseries. Seventy five percent of the U.S. commercial fish catch depends on estuaries during some stage of their life. Commercial and recreational fisheries contribute \$111 billion to the nation's economy and support 1.5 million jobs. Estuaries are also important to our nation's tourist economy for boating and outdoor recreation. Coastal tourism in just four states—New Jersey, Florida, Texas, and California—totals \$75 billion.

Due to their popularity, the overall capacity of our nation's estuaries to function as healthy productive ecosystems is declining. This is a result of the cumulative effects of increasing development and fast growing year round populations which increase dramatically in the summer. Land development, and associated activities that come with people's desire to live and play near these beautiful resources, cause runoff and storm water discharges that contribute to siltation, increased nutrients, and other contamination. Bacterial contamination closes many popular beaches and shellfish harvesting areas in estuaries. Also, several estuaries are afflicted by problems that still require significant research. Examples include the outbreaks of the toxic microbe, *Pfiesteria piscicida*, in rivers draining to estuaries in Maryland and Virginia.

Congress recognized the importance of preserving and enhancing coastal environments with the establishment of the National Estuary Program in the Clean Water Act Amendments of 1987. The Program's purpose is of facilitate state and local governments preparation of comprehensive conservation and management plans for threatened estuaries of national significance. In support of this effort, section 320 of the Clean Water Act authorized the EPA to make grants to states to develop environmental management plans. To date, 28 estuaries across the country have been designated into the Program. However, the law fails to provide assistance once plans are complete and ready for implementation. Already, 18 of the 28 plans are finished.

As the majority of plans are now in the implementation stage, it is incumbent upon us to maintain the partnership the Federal Government initiated ten years ago to insure that our nationally significant estuaries are protected. The legislation we are introducing will take the next step by giving EPA authority to make grants for plan implementation and authorize annual appropriations in the amount of \$50 million. To insure the program is a true partnership and leverage scarce resources, there is a direct match re-

quirement for grant recipients so funds will be available to upgrade sewage treatment plants, fix combined sewer overflows, control urban stormwater discharges, and reduce polluted runoff into estuarine areas.

By Mr. CONRAD (for himself, Mr. MACK, Mr. NICKLES, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. BAUCUS):

**S. 879.** A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a shorter recovery period for the depreciation of certain leasehold improvements; to the Committee on Finance.

**TEN-YEAR LEASEHOLD IMPROVEMENT DEPRECIATION**

Mr. CONRAD. Mr. President, I rise today, joined by my colleagues Mr. NICKLES, Mr. MACK, Mr. ROBB, and Mr. BAUCUS, to introduce important legislation to provide for a 10-year depreciation life for leasehold improvements. Leasehold improvements are the alterations to leased space made by a building owner as part of the lease agreement with a tenant.

These improvements can include interior walls, partitions, flooring, lighting, wiring and plumbing—essentially any fixture that an owner provides in space leased to a tenant. They keep a building modern, upgraded, and energy efficient. In actual commercial use, leasehold improvements typically last as long as the lease—an average of 5 to 10 years. However, the Internal Revenue Code requires leasehold improvements to be depreciated over 39 years—the life of the building.

Economically, this makes no sense. The owner receives taxable income over the life of the lease (i.e., 10 years), yet can only recover the costs of the improvements associated with the lease over 39 years—a rate nearly four times slower. This wild mismatch of income and expenses causes the owner to incur an artificially high tax cost on these improvements.

The bill we introduce today will correct this irrational and uneconomic tax treatment by shortening the cost recovery period for certain leasehold improvements from 39 years to a more realistic 10 years. If enacted, this legislation would more closely align the expenses incurred to construct these improvements with the income they generate during the lease term.

For example, a building owner who makes a \$100,000 leasehold improvement for a 10-year, \$1 million lease would be able to recover this entire investment by the end of that lease at a rate of \$10,000 per year. Under current law, this \$100,000 improvement is recovered at a rate of \$2,564 per year over 39 years.

By reducing this cost recovery period, the expense of making these improvements would fall more into line with the economics of a commercial lease transaction, and more property owners would be able to adapt their buildings to fit the demanding needs of today's modern business tenant. Small business should find this bill particu-

larly helpful, because small businesses turn over their rental space more frequently than larger businesses. And we cannot forget that over 80 percent of building owners who provide space to small businesses are themselves small businesses.

We have an interest in keeping existing buildings commercially viable. When older buildings can serve tenants who need modern, efficient commercial space, there is less pressure for developing greenfields in outlying areas. Americans are concerned about preserving open space, natural resources and a sense of neighborhood. The current law 39-year cost recovery for leasehold improvements is an impediment to reinvesting in existing properties and communities.

This legislation has the strong backing of six major real estate organizations, including the National Realty Committee, the national Association of Realtors, the International Council of Shopping Centers, the national Association of Industrial and Office Properties, the national Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, and the Building and Office Managers Association, International.

I urge all Senators to join us in supporting this legislation to provide rational depreciation treatment for leasehold improvements.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 879

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.*

**SECTION 1. RECOVERY PERIOD FOR DEPRECIATION OF CERTAIN LEASEHOLD IMPROVEMENTS.**

(a) **10-YEAR RECOVERY PERIOD.**—Subparagraph (D) of section 168(e)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to 10-year property) is amended by striking "and" at the end of clause (i), by striking the period at the end of clause (ii) and inserting ", and", and by adding at the end the following new clause:

“(iii) any qualified leasehold improvement property.”.

(b) **QUALIFIED LEASEHOLD IMPROVEMENT PROPERTY.**—Subsection (e) of section 168 of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(6) **QUALIFIED LEASEHOLD IMPROVEMENT PROPERTY.**—

“(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term 'qualified leasehold improvement property' means any improvement to an interior portion of a building which is nonresidential real property if—

“(i) such improvement is made under or pursuant to a lease (as defined in subsection (h)(7))—

“(I) by the lessee (or any sublessee) of such portion, or

“(II) by the lessor of such portion,

“(ii) such portion is to be occupied exclusively by the lessee (or any sublessee) of such portion, and

“(iii) such improvement is placed in service more than 3 years after the date the building was first placed in service.

(B) **CERTAIN IMPROVEMENTS NOT INCLUDED.**—Such term shall not include any

improvement for which the expenditure is attributable to—

- “(i) the enlargement of the building,
- “(ii) any elevator or escalator,
- “(iii) any structural component benefiting a common area, and
- “(iv) the internal structural framework of the building.

“(C) DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this paragraph—

“(i) COMMITMENT TO LEASE TREATED AS LEASE.—A commitment to enter into a lease shall be treated as a lease, and the parties to such commitment shall be treated as lessor and lessee, respectively.

“(ii) RELATED PERSONS.—A lease between related persons shall not be considered a lease. For purposes of the preceding sentence, the term ‘related persons’ means—

“(I) members of an affiliated group (as defined in section 1504), and

“(II) persons having a relationship described in subsection (b) of section 267; except that, for purposes of this clause, the phrase ‘80 percent or more’ shall be substituted for the phrase ‘more than 50 percent’ each place it appears in such subsection.”

(c) REQUIREMENT TO USE STRAIGHT LINE METHOD.—Paragraph (3) of section 168(b) of such Code is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) Qualified leasehold improvement property described in subsection (e)(6).”.

(d) ALTERNATIVE SYSTEM.—The table contained in section 168(g)(3)(B) of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to subparagraph (D)(ii) the following new item:

“(D)(iii) ..... 10 ”.

(e) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to qualified leasehold improvement property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

#### ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 56

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Alabama (Mr. SHELBY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 56, a bill to repeal the Federal estate and gift taxes and the tax on generation-skipping transfers.

S. 85

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the names of the Senator from Florida (Mr. MACK) and the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) were added as cosponsors of S. 85, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the tax on vaccines to 25 cents per dose.

S. 88

At the request of Mr. BUNNING, the name of the Senator from Illinois (Mr. DURBIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 88, a bill to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to exempt disabled individuals from being required to enroll with a managed care entity under the medicaid program.

S. 309

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Alaska (Mr. MURKOWSKI) was added as a cosponsor of S. 309, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that a member of the uniformed services shall be treated as using a principal residence while away from home on qual-

fied official extended duty in determining the exclusion of gain from the sale of such residence.

S. 434

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. COVERDELL) was added as a cosponsor of S. 434, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the method of payment of taxes on distilled spirits.

S. 459

At the request of Mr. BREAUX, the names of the Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN) and the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) were added as cosponsors of S. 459, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the State ceiling on private activity bonds.

S. 514

At the request of Mr. COCHRAN, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 514, a bill to improve the National Writing Project.

S. 542

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from California (Mrs. BOXER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 542, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to expand the deduction for computer donations to schools and allow a tax credit for donated computers.

S. 577

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 577, a bill to provide for injunctive relief in Federal district court to enforce State laws relating to the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquor.

S. 595

At the request of Mr. DOMENICI, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. BREAUX) was added as a cosponsor of S. 595, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a graduated response to shrinking domestic oil and gas production and surging foreign oil imports, and for other purposes.

S. 608

At the request of Mr. MURKOWSKI, the name of the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 608, a bill to amend the Nuclear Waste Policy Act of 1982.

S. 659

At the request of Mr. MOYNIHAN, the name of the Senator from Minnesota (Mr. WELLSTONE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 659, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require pension plans to provide adequate notice to individuals whose future benefit accruals are being significantly reduced, and for other purposes.

S. 679

At the request of Mr. GRAMS, the names of the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. HAGEL) and the Senator from Montana (Mr. BURNS) were added as cosponsors of S. 679, a bill to authorize

appropriations to the Department of State for construction and security of United States diplomatic facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 692

At the request of Mr. KYL, the name of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. VOINOVICH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 692, a bill to prohibit Internet gambling, and for other purposes.

S. 693

At the request of Mr. HELMS, the name of the Senator from Arkansas (Mr. HUTCHINSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 693, a bill to assist in the enhancement of the security of Taiwan, and for other purposes.

S. 731

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN) and the Senator from South Dakota (Mr. DASCHLE) were added as cosponsors of S. 731, a bill to provide for substantial reductions in the price of prescription drugs for medicare beneficiaries.

S. 761

At the request of Mr. ABRAHAM, the name of the Senator from Colorado (Mr. ALLARD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 761, a bill to regulate interstate commerce by electronic means by permitting and encouraging the continued expansion of electronic commerce through the operation of free market forces, and for other purposes.

S. 803

At the request of Mr. MCCAIN, the name of the Senator from Wisconsin (Mr. FEINGOLD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 803, a bill to make the International Olympic Committee subject to the Foreign Corrupt Practices Act of 1977, and for other purposes.

S. 858

At the request of Mr. COVERDELL, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. CLELAND) was added as a cosponsor of S. 858, a bill to designate the Federal building and United States courthouse located at 18 Greenville Street in Newnan, Georgia, as the “Lewis R. Morgan Federal Building and United States Courthouse”.

S. 860

At the request of Mr. GRAHAM, the name of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. CONRAD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 860, a bill to require country of origin labeling of perishable agricultural commodities imported into the United States and to establish penalties for violations of the labeling requirements.

S. 864

At the request of Mr. BINGAMAN, the name of the Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 864, a bill to designate April 22 as Earth Day.

S. 867

At the request of Mr. ROTH, the names of the Senator from North Carolina (Mr. EDWARDS) and the Senator from Virginia (Mr. ROBB) were added as cosponsors of S. 867, a bill to designate