Wilson 16 pp. 1-23-91

| EXECUTIVE | COMMITTEE | ME | ETING |
|------------|-----------|-----|-------|
| WEDNESDAY, | JANUARY | 23, | 1991 |

Committee on Finance

Washington, D.C.

U.S. Senate

ORIGINAL

The meeting was convened, pursuant to notice, at 10:37 a.m., in Room SD-215, Dirksen Senate Office Building, the Hon. Lloyd Bentsen (Chairman) presiding.

Also present: Senators Moynihan, Baucus, Boren, Bradley, Mitchell, Pryor, Daschle, Breaux, Danforth, Chafee, Heinz, Durenberger and Symms.

Also present: Vanda McMurtry, Staff Director and Chief Counsel; Edmond Mihalski, Chief of Staff, Minority.

Also present: Sam Sessions, Chief Tax Counsel; Barry Wold, Legislative Counsel, Joint Tax Committee; Denise Roy, Tax Counsel, Majority; Nina Ovedo, Tax Counsel, Minority.

(The press release announcing the meeting follows:)

3

4

6

7 8

9

11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

The Chairman. If you will please be seated. We have a quorum present. We will get underway.

The first order of business or the first business meeting of the Finance Committee of the new Congress is to approve the Committee rules. The Committee rules have remained virtually unchanged over the years, but I am going to ask the Committee to make one minor change.

We have been advised by the Senate legal counsel that our quorum rules have in part a conflict with the Senate rules. We have stated that to start the meeting that seven members have to be present in order to constitute a quorum, but that after the meeting had started that we could drop to five members in order to keep a legal quorum.

We have been advised by the Senate counsel that we have to retain it at one-third throughout in order to retain a quorum, which means seven members. We would have to have that.

So I would ask that I have a motion to that effect.

Senator Moynihan. I so move, Mr. Chairman.

The Chairman. Is there a second?

Senator Baucus. I second it.

The Chairman. All in favor of the motion as stated --

Senator Moynihan. Mr. Chairman, I so move with no very great enthusiasm.

The Chairman. All right. So noted.

All in favor of the motion as stated make it known by

stating aye. 1 2 (A chorus of ayes.) 3 The Chairman. Opposed, similar sign. 4 (No response.) 5 The Chairman. Would you include in that the adoption of the rules? 6 Senator Moynihan. So moved, Mr. Chairman. 7 The Chairman. 8 All right. All in favor make it known by saying aye. 9 10 (A chorus of ayes.) 11 The Chairman. Opposed, similar sign. 12 (No response.) 13 The Chairman. The next item on the Committee's agenda is the selection of the members of the Finance Committee to go on 14 15 the Joint Tax Committee. I propose that the following members 16 be reappointed to the Joint Committee on Taxation. Senators Bentsen, Moynihan, Baucus, Packwood and Dole. 17 May I have a motion to approve the nominations? 18 Senator Moynihan. I so move, Mr. Chairman. 19 20 The Chairman. Is there a second? 21 Senator Baucus. Second. 22 The Chairman. All in favor of the motion stated make it 23 known by saying aye. 24 (A chorus of ayes.) 25 The Chairman. Opposed, similar sign.

(No response.)

The Chairman. Motion carried.

Next is a piece of legislation that was motivated by a bill introduced by Senator Dole and a bi-partisan group of Senators and that was S.8 on January 14. That included the Majority Leader, myself and 11 members of this Committee. It is to address a concern that has been on the minds of our troops in the Middle East, a concern that ought to be the last thing they have to worry about at a difficult time like this. That concern is their taxes.

I want to commend Senator Dole for taking the lead on that effort. He responded quickly to solve a problem that's very important to our troops and I am privileged to be working with him, the Majority Leader, and members of this Committee in that regard.

Now since the introduction of S.8 war has, of course, broken out. So we have worked to make some modifications with the Treasury Department, the Department of Defense, to take account of the outbreak of the war, to ensure that the new rules make sense in light of what we have done for veterans of previous conflicts, and to provide the most generous treatment possible under the time and revenue constraints that we are working under.

So the Chairman's mark before you is the result of that kind of an effort. We have set aside disagreement about policy,

tactics and timing; and dealing with the aggression of Saddam Hussein. The country and the Congress are united behind the troops and the President in the Middle East; and we are unanimous in regard to one important issue, that we all stand behind them and their effort there to wish them a very early success and an early return home to America.

But they are coping with significant hardship and great danger and they need our support even more in the days ahead. The least we can do is recognize this extraordinary disruption in their personal lives and relieve them of the burden of filing tax returns when they are bearing a much greater burden on our behalf.

The current law allows Armed Forces personnel serving in a combat zone to suspend their tax obligations during the period of combat service. That is including any time when they are hospitalized abroad due to combat, plus an additional 180 days. In addition, the Tax Code provides an exemption from Federal income tax for certain compensation for service in a combat zone.

Now the President has issued an Executive Order designating the Persian Gulf area and surrounding waters as a combat zone effective as of January 17. That designation triggers the deferral and the exclusion rules that I have just described.

However, there are certain changes in the Tax Code that have to be brought about to give them peace of mind where their taxes

are concerned. I am going to ask the staff to describe the Chairman's mark in greater detail, but I will highlight the main changes in the law.

First, the mark extends the military service qualifying for deferral of tax obligations to include service in the Persian Gulf and Operation Desert Shield as well as service in a combat zone. That means that the deferral period will start on August 2, 1990 rather than January 17, 1991.

Second, the Chairman's mark says that interest on income tax refunds due our soldiers in the Middle East will accrue after April 15, 1991, even if the refund for taxes is filed later.

And finally, the mark continues to provide relief for those hospitalized in the United States as a result of Desert Shield or Desert Storm for a period of up to five years. Of course, it would cover them also if they are in a hospital in a foreign country.

Now I want to say also that today the Ways and Means
Committee will be meeting on this and they are marking up their
bill and expect to have it out, and expect to have it passed
sometime this afternoon. I have talked Chairman Rostenkowski
and breakfast this morning I talked to the Majority Leader in
the House, Mr. Gephart. He thought that late this afternoon
they would have it passed.

We would hope to bring it up on the floor of the Senate this afternoon if we get it reported out this morning.

I know there is a great temptation to try to offer other amendments. There are many other things that can be addressed and should be addressed insofar as the concerns of the men and women who are serving overseas. But I would strongly urge that you not offer them this morning or on the floor of the Senate.

We are operating under these kinds of rules: That under the rules of the House if the amount of money involved exceeds \$50 million then you have to cite the Joint Tax Committee in the legislation showing how much they estimate that to be. In this instance we are talking about something that is approximately \$10 million, far below the \$50 million limitation.

The President of the United States has also said that if that piece of legislation citing the Joint Tax Committee report, if that is in it, that he would veto legislation. So we ought to avoid that kind of a controversy. We ought to address the other issues involved in trying to assist whether we are talking about foreclosures, whether we are talking about raising the amount of money that commissioned officers will have exempt from taxes which is now \$500. There are some that are thinking, Senator Glenn, for example, and others are talking about, that has not been changed to reflect inflation since the time it was set at \$500 and it ought to be moved up to something like \$2,000.

Frankly, I am sympathetic to that. But if we try to do that on this piece of legislation there is no question but what we

slow it down. I would urge that we not attach any amendments. We have the agreement of the leadership on the House side. We have bi-partisan support for the legislation. And we have bi-partisan support and leadership support for it here on the Senate side.

I would like to avoid any conference if we can and get this one accomplished this week.

Now, are there comments? I see the Majority Leader here. I defer to him for any comment he wants to make.

Senator Mitchell. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much for your courtesy; and I thank my colleagues for permitting me to make these brief comments.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this meeting on an expedited basis. I would also like to thank and pay recognition to the role of Senator Dole as the principal sponsor of this legislation which I, the Chairman, and others are co-sponsoring.

When this nation is engaged in armed conflict in the Persian Gulf as it is today, all Americans feel a deep sense of obligation and gratitude to the young men and women whose lives are now on the line as part of the Desert Storm Operation. They face many difficult and dangerous days in the near future and it is important that they know that the American people are fully behind them.

The legislation we consider today is a modest, yet important effort to assist them in being secure in the knowledge that

their tax obligations are well taken care of.

I traveled to Saudi Arabia in November and in December. There I met with a great many American service men and women. They were busy preparing for war, but they were also thinking about the lives they left behind. And one matter of concern that they expressed to me -- I know they expressed to Senator Dole and others -- on those trips was their obligation to file tax returns by April 15.

The President's Executive Order declaring certain areas in the Middle East a combat zone triggers current law rule providing for the suspension of tax filing requirements similar to those provided in the legislation. But other issues remain, including the treatment of personnel prior to the start of hostilities, the payment of interest, and the application of these provisions to personnel transferred to hospitals in the United States.

These are matters which should not be a concern of our Armed Service men and women. For that reason I am pleased this Committee is moving this legislation today.

Following consultation with the Chairman and with Senator Dole, it is my decision and my intention to bring this bill to the floor as soon as it passes the House and becomes available for full consideration. As I announced last evening, I hope that we can have a reported vote on this measure sometime during the day tomorrow. That we can bring it up as early as today and

have the vote tomorrow noon.

., 14

I understand the version we are considering today is identical to that being considered in the House and I join the Chairman in urging that we enact this without amendment so that we may ensure the swiftest possible passage of this important bill.

Mr. Chairman, thank you.

The Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Leader.

I want to reiterate that -- Senator Packwood is not here -we worked with Senator Packwood, his staff. It is a true bipartisan effort; and up to this point has been agreed to by the
leadership in both bodies. And if we report it out this morning
the Majority Leader is ready for us to bring it up this
afternoon and we will be pleased to do that.

Are there further comments? Yes, Senator Chafee.

Senator Chafee. Mr. Chairman, I have a question here on page 3 of the description that has been given to us, and I am not quite clear. I am on the top item. "Exclusion for combat pay." And then it just says, "Gross income does not include certain combat pay of members of the Armed Forces." Then it says, "If enlisted personnel serve in a combat zone during any part of a month, military pay for that month is excluded from gross income."

What are we talking about? Are we saying that if they serve in a combat zone no pay whatsoever is taxed or combat pay is not

taxed?

The Chairman. My understanding is that none of the enlisted man's pay is included. But let me get to the details of that.

Senator Chafee. And then following that question would be, "In the case of a commissioned officer, exclusions from income are limited to \$500."

The Chairman. That is correct.

Senator Chafee. So what we are going to end up with is you could well have an enlisted -- Well, if no pay is counted for enlisted personnel and his pay could well be over \$500, yet an officer you exempt only \$500. I am not quite clear of the rationale.

The first question is: Do you exempt the total pay of the combat pay?

Ms. Roy. You exclude all compensation for active service in the combat zone. I don't believe there is actually a pay that is called combat pay, per se. It is any of the military compensation while serving in the combat zone that would be excluded.

Senator Chafee. Well there, as I understand it, that currently it is I believe \$125 a month extra they receive and that is so-called combat pay for being there. Now is that what we are excluding or are we excluding all of the pay?

Mr. Wold. Senator Chafee, in the case of an enlisted man, the entire military pay is excluded. It is the entire pay, not

just the additional pay for being in a combat zone.

Senator Chafee. So that could be well be, let's say, he could well be getting \$1,000. Let us say he is receiving \$1,000 a month plus \$125, so he is getting \$1,125 a month. That totally is excluded?

Mr. Wold. That is correct.

The Chairman. Senator Chafee, I think that without a question that results in an inequity for a commissioned officer. But what I am urging -- Senator Glenn and others have talked to me about it and they are talking about coming back with an amendment that may be as much as \$2,000 for commissioned officers and there are a number of other issues that will fall within the jurisdiction of the Finance Committee that I want us to address involving these folks overseas to see where we can be of help.

But I would urge that we try to get this one passed now and we come back and address all of those.

Senator Chafee. Well, I just want to understand and see if I have understood this correctly. So with an enlisted man you could well have \$1125 more totally exempt, with the officer it would be \$500?

Mr. Wold. That is correct. The \$500 number was set in 1966 and has not been adjusted. And an adjustment for inflation would amount to a number approximating the number that the Chairman has mentioned in the \$2,000 range. That has been

5

6 7

8

9

10

11

12

13 14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21 22

23

25

24

proposed but is not part of this legislation as I understand it.

Senator Chafee. And what is the total estimate in the cost of this, Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman. \$10 million.

Senator Chafee. \$10 million for a year?

The Chairman. Yes.

Mr. Sessions. The cost of this bill is \$10 million, not the cost of the proposal to increase the exclusion for officers.

The Chairman. No, I understand that.

Senator Chafee. I understand that.

The Chairman. That is what he was asking.

Senator Chafee. Just a question. Have we ever done this before, exclude the total pay?

Mr. Wold. Yes. That has been the general rule since World War I, Senator. The enlisted man's pay has been historically excluded in full and the commissioned officer's pay has been limited by an amount going back a number of decades and having been raised, as I say, to \$500 most recently in 1966.

The Chairman. Senator Durenberger?

Senator Durenberger. Mr. Chairman, I am one who has a couple of amendments which I will be pleased to withhold at your request. But I must ask Michael a question, if I may, that deals with tax exempt status of organizations.

Most of us are having the experience now in our home States of meeting with families and of people that are over there.

When I came back with several members of this Committee from the Gulf the 1st of September, there was already an organization in Minnesota called the 'Support our Country's Military,' which has become the umbrella group in our whole State for families to relate to it. They do practically everything on a voluntary basis for these families.

In November at my suggestion they applied for a tax-exempt status. The IRS deposited their check in December. But when my staff called down to the IRS yesterday to find out why can't we get approval of it, they said, well, it is in line with everything else in this place. We will get at it 120 days from now. And if Michael can promise to help out this organization and expedite that it would sure help a lot.

Mr. Wold. I can promise to speak to the Commissioner about that.

Senator Durenberger. Please. Thank you.

Mr. Wold. It is not in my portfolio. But I will speak to the IRS about it.

Senator Durenberger. Thank you.

The Chairman. Senator Breaux?

Senator Breaux. Just very quickly, I strongly support the legislation, Mr. Chairman. But just as a clarification to make certain National Guard's men and women would also be included if they fit into the other circumstances.

Ms. Roy. Yes, that is correct.

Senator Breaux. Okay. Thank you.

The Chairman. Well, we have an excellent quorum here and I know a number of members have other commitments.

Senator Boren?

Senator Boren. Mr. Chairman, just a brief question. I agree with you. I have joined with Senator Glenn and Senator Nunn on some other proposals. But I think we should all withhold so we can move this very, very speedily.

As I understand this, this will, as opposed to the Executive Order be able to let us do some additional things. Rolling the deadline for the suspension back to August 2 as opposed to January 17; and as I understand it, it would also mean that we would not suspend interest due and owing to members of the Armed Forces which otherwise might be suspended by the general action of the Executive Order.

So that if interest were owed by the Government on refund amounts due back that military personnel will be still assured that they will get that interest.

I gather also that if they are hospitalized in the United States as opposed to being hospitalized in the theater of operations that they will also be covered.

Am I correct that those are three of the major differences between what we can do under the Executive Order -- and we are all pleased that had been issued -- but what this bill will allow us to do in addition to help young men and women in

· 13

14

uniform? Are those correct statements?

Ms. Roy. Yes, Senator, that is correct.

The Chairman. That is right. Those are the differences and the changes as cited by the Chairman at the beginning of the meeting.

Are there other comments? Senator Moynihan?

Senator Moynihan. Mr. Chairman, if there is no further comment, I would move that we report out the legislation as proposed by you, sir.

The Chairman. All in favor of the motion as stated make it known by saying aye.

(A chorus of ayes.)

The Chairman. Opposed?

(No response.)

The Chairman. Motion carried, supported out.

Thank you very much for your attendance in the beginning of the action of the Finance Committee this year.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 10:57 a.m.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing proceedings of a meeting of the Executive Committee, Committee on Finance, United States Senate, held on January 23, 1991, were transcribed as herein appears and that this is the original transcript thereof.

WILLIAM J. MOFFITT

Official Court Reporter

My Commission Expires April 14, 1994.

.