The Chairman. The Committee will come to order.

Let's start with the compliance section which we did not do Friday, because I cancelled the afternoon session, and then move on to interest and real estate.

Mr. Colvin. Mr. Chairman, that begins on Page 33.

The Chairman. All right.

Mr. Colvin. The first provision on Page 33 raises and unifies several information return filing penalties. And the second provision on Page 33 raises penalties for failure to pay tax to one percent a month after the taxpayer has been notified that the IRS will levy on the taxpayer's assets. It also requires a study on the Treasury cost-of-collection proposal.

On Page 34 are changes to the negligence and fraud penalties. The changes increase the fraud penalty and target the penalty to the under-payment attributable to fraud and also makes a couple of changes to the negligence penalties.

One is to extend the negligence penalty to all information returns, and also to extend the penalty to estate and excise taxes.

Continuing on Page 34, Item B, the interest rate provision would change how the amount of interest is computed for both the Treasury and the taxpayer. Under the proposal, the Treasury would pay interest on over-payments equal to the three-month Treasury bill rate plus two percent. And a

The Internal Revenue Service opposes the

Mr. Persky.

changes on the payment of interest tax refund. Currently for individual timely filed income tax returns, we have until approximately dune 1 of each year to process all the returns. And because we get the returns in sort of a bunched format — we get a lot in February and a lot around April the 15th — this provision permits us to level our workload over the period. It also reduces the amount of interest that we pay.

The Chairman. Got it.

Mr. Colvin. Mr. Chairman, the next provisions are on Page 35. There are several information reporting provisions there.

Number one requires real estate brokers to file information returns on real estate transactions.

Provision number two requires federal agencies to file an information return on each person with which the agency enters into a contract.

Provision number three in the Chairman's proposal would require a reporting of income tax payments to state and local governments. This is somewhat similar to the House bill, but the House bill had also included real and personal property taxes.

The fourth provision on that page, the Chairman's proposal does not include the House provision which would require reporting of tax-exempt bond interest.

On Page 36 --

The Chairman. I am curious about something. In the

House provision on the tax-exempt interest where you report it,
all you do is report it, don't you?

Mr. Colvin. That is right.

The Chairman. I have got a gain of \$50 million or less than \$50 million in the House. How do you gain any money by reporting tax-exempt income?

Mr. Colvin. It may have some minor effect on some areas of the tax code where minimum tax can affect your tax liability, such as the payment of tax on some Social Security payments; another might be the denial of the interest deduction.

The Chairman. Got it.

Mr. Colvin. When you have loans to purchase tax-exempt bonds.

On Page 36, provision D in the Chairman's proposal would toll the statute of limitations for tax returns during the time required to obtain third-party records.

And Item number E on Page 36 is the proposed tax shelter user's fee. The purpose of the proposed fee would be to compensate the IRS for its estimated \$165 million cost of its tax shelter audit program. That has had a significantly adverse effect on IRS compliance efforts in other areas. And the proposal would compensate the IRS for those costs.





2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Mr. Persky. Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman. Right.

As unusual as it might seem, the Internal Mr. Persky. Revenue Service and the Treasury Department do not support this increase in a penalty.

Our view is that this would be an extremely difficult provision for us to administer, number one. And, number two, it would affect a lot of businesses that would not meet sort of a common sense test of what is a tax shelter.

And as we try to determine more and more carefully what a tax shelter is, the provision would probably become more and more difficult to administer, and the revenue would probably go down.

So we currently don't support this provision.

Mr. Colvin. The definition of tax shelter for the proposal is taken from existing definitions of tax shelters in the Internal Revenue Code.

On Page 37 are several additional tax shelter proposals. Paragraph number 2 would modify the calculation of credits for tax shelter definition purposes to conform to the tax rate cuts.

Provision number 3 would increase the penalty for failure to register a tax shelter.

And provision number 4 would raise the penalty on a taxpayer for failure to report the tax shelter identification

Moffitt Reporting Associates

Falls Church, Virginia 22046 (703) 237-4759



number on his or her return.

Continuing tax shelter provisions on Page 38. Provision number 5 would increase the penalty on tax shelters for failure to maintain lists of investors.

Number 6 in the Chairman's proposal would raise the interest rate on under-payments, which are part of tax motivated transactions.

And then a different subject, paragraph number F on Page 38, would require estimated tax payments for individuals equal to 90 percent of current-year tax liability. And as in the House bill, the Chairman's proposal retains the alternative test of 100 percent of last year's tax liability, if less than the 90 percent.

Page 39, the Chairman's proposal includes the legislation sponsored by Senators Baucus and Grassley to provide for the award of attorney's fees in tax cases. And the provision here is almost identical to that contained in the reconciliation bill approved by the Finance Committee in 1985. It would make the attorney's fees provision permanent, and it would change the burden and standard of proof. And it changes the limits on attorney's fees allowable.

The Chairman. And I assume Treasury and the IRS don't like that.

Mr. Persky. That is correct.

The Chairman. All right. It is not a change of position.

Moffitt Reporting Associates
Falls Church, Virginia 22046
(703) 237-4759







That has been your position for 10 years.

Mr. Persky. That is correct, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Colvin. At the bottom of Page 39, the Chairman's proposal does not include a House bill provision which would impose personal liability or allow the court to impose personal liability on IRS employees for some of the attorney's fees payments.

On Page 40, item number 2, the Chairman's proposal does not include a House provision which would authorize the tax court to impose a \$120.00 penalty if a taxpayer fails to exhaust administrative remedies at the IRS.

At the bottom of Page 40 begins a number of -
The Chairman. Mr. Wilkins, come here a second. Let me
ask you a question.

Go ahead, John.

Mr. Colvin. At the bottom of Page 40 begin a number of provisions relating to the tax courts. Item A authorizes a registration fee for attorneys. Item B provides the tax court with jurisdiction over late payment penalties. Item C authorizes U.S. marshalls to be available to the tax courts. Item D provides for salary and travel expenses of special trial judges.

On Page 41, Item E allows retirement pay for tax court judges under the same circumstances as for district court judges.

And that is the conclusion of the provisions relating to the tax courts.

Item H on Page 41 allows recision of a 90-day letter or a statutory notice of deficiency.

Item 2 on Page 41 would give the IRS authority to abate interest charges if the delay was attributable to the IRS.

On Page 42, item number 3 is a pro-taxpayer provision suspending the compounding of interest in certain circumstances.

Item 4 would in the Chairman's proposal and in the House bill exempt service-connected disability pay from IRS levy.

Item number 5 retains current law and does not include the House provision. Raising from \$2,500.00 to \$100,000.00 the amount the IRS may sell administratively in collecting taxes.

Mr. Persky. Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman. Yes.

Mr. Persky. May I just make one comment about that?

The Chairman. Yes.

Mr. Persky. The House bill changes the IRS authority from \$2,500.00 to \$100,000.00. It basically brings it in line with the current Customs authority and DEA authority for administrative forfeitures.

The Chairman. And you support that?

Mr. Persky. Yes, sir.

Mr. Colvin. Continuing on Page 42, item number 6, the Chairman's proposal does not include the House bill provision exempting IRS special agents from the automobile record-keeping regulations.

Mr. Persky. Again, Mr. Chairman, it is our view that a law enforcement officer is a law enforcement officer. In our criminal investigation agents who are involved in basic law enforcement activities carry firearms and act as other law enforcement officers should be treated the same.

The Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. Colvin. On Page 43, item number I, simply indicates that the withholding tables for individuals would be conformed to the tax changes made by the bill.

Item J would pick up the House provision, which requires a report on the return-free tax system.

On Page 44, item number K, is a provision that would cut tax deferral available to trusts to three months, and also require estimated tax payments for trusts.

Item number L applies to income tax payments by estates.

And it ends the right to defer taxes by making four quarterly payments after the year the income is earned, which is available under current law. And also requires the states to make estimated tax payments.

Mr. Chairman, that completes the compliance provision.

The Chairman. All right. Let us move on to interest.





Mr. Colvin. Interest begins at Page 115.

Item A(1) imposes limitations on the deduction of interest by individuals to interest relating to debt on the principal residence plus a second residence, an amount equal to investment income plus \$1,000.00 for singles and \$2,000.00 for joint returns.

Item number 2 treats limited partnership interest as an investment; not as a trade or business. And the effect of that is to limit the interest deduction available to debt incurred to purchase limited partnership interests.

Paragraph number 3 on Page 115 also affects tax shelter investments and requires more complete accounting of investment expenses for purposes of figuring investment income.

Item number 4 is a provision which allows services performed by a property owner to count as expenses for purposes of figuring whether the 15 percent rental income limit is met for the net lease rule.

On Page 116, item number 5, has the effect of treating vacation homes as an investment; not as a trade or business; thus, subjecting interest payments in connection with buying vacation homes to stricter deductibility limits.

Item 6 is the effective date and provides a five-year phase in for the interest limits.

And the last item on Page 116, item B, eliminates the

deduction for money borrowed to deposit in an individual retirement account.

That completes the interest provisions, Mr. Chairman. The next title scheduled for discussion is real estate beginning on Page 177.

The Chairman. All right. Let us conclude with real estate.

Mr. Colvin. On Page 177, item A, the at-risk rule, the Chairman's proposal includes the House provision which would apply at risk to real estate with an exception for third-party, non-recourse debt.

Item B on Page 177, rehabilitation credits, the Chairman's proposal includes the House provision which cuts the rehabilitation credits from either 15 or 20 percent to 10 percent and limits them to property placed in service before 1936. In addition, the proposal drops the rule allowing eligibility for the rehabilitation credit if 75 percent of external walls are kept. And, as a result, under the alternative test now provided in the law, 75 percent of the internal structure, internal structural frame work, would be required to be kept.

On Page 178, the credit for certified historic structures, the Chairman's proposal includes the provision from the House bill which cuts the credit from 25 percent to 20 percent, and raises the basis adjustment from a one-half basis adjustment



to a full basis adjustment.

. 8

And, finally, the provision would drop the external walls requirement because the Department of the Interior approves these rehabilitations and it would give the Department of the Interior more flexibility in approving historic structure projects.

The remainder of Page 178 describes the transitional rules for the rehabilitation credits.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to take the next two real estate provisions in reverse order, and pass over low-income housing for a moment and go to the real estate investment trust provisions which begin on Page 182.

The Chairman. All right.

Mr. Colvin. Those provisions cover Page 182 through 185, and they make several technical reforms to the real estate investment trust rules to enable those rules to work more effectively.

There are numerous changes there, and I don't believe we need to describe them specifically.

Now back to low-income housing on Page 179. The Chairman's proposal combines the various low-income housing incentives that are now scattered throughout the code into one targeted credit. And the proposal either repeals or allows to sunset the other -- the low-income incentives that are now in the code.







As originally described in the spread sheet on Page 180, the provision would be available as an alternative to tax—exempt bond financing for multifamily housing bonds, which were originally intended to be placed in the volume cap by the Chairman's proposal. That has now been taken out of the volume cap, and we are working with staffs of other senators to make some modifications in this proposal as a result of that.

That completes the real estate title.

The Chairman. Well, I would like to go on to other sections, but I think having announced them for this afternoon, we had better wait.

Let me ask you, John. When we finish this afternoon with minimum tax and the ITC refund, that just leaves us then the excise issues and then technical transitional and miscellaneous.

Mr. Colvin. That is correct.

The Chairman. All right. We will go back then into our private sessions tomorrow morning. And my hunch would be that we will be in private sessions most of the rest of this week.

Mr. Colvin. Mr. Chairman, one other issue you have not discussed is the tax rates for corporations and individuals.

The Chairman. Didn't we discuss that? Oh, that is right.

Well, if we reach some conclusions in our private meetings,

what is in the Chairman's draft may be slightly changed. That will conclude, then, our meeting this morning. We will come back at 2:00 this afternoon. (Whereupon, at 10:23 a.m., the meeting was recessed.)

Moffitt Reporting Associates
Falls Church, Virginia 22046
(703) 237-4759

AFTERNOON SESSION

2

(2:09 p.m.)

4

3

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The Chairman. Let's start. And John, I wonder if we might go in reverse order.

Let's take the Mandatory ITC Refund and discuss the ITC a bit until some other members get here because, if we have to replow and reexplain that ground, it isn't that complicated.

Then, we can move on to the minimum tax when we get a few people here.

Mr. Chairman, the Mandatory Refund of the Mr. Colvin. ITC is on page 23 on the spreadsheets.

The Chairman. What page?

Mr. Colvin. Page 23.

The Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. Colvin. The proposal would require a refund on the investment tax credit carryover at a 70 percent rate; and it is set at a 70 percent rate to be approximately revenue neutral.

The Chairman. Now, here I want to ask something because I have noted some errors in reporting on this in terms of cost.

And I will ask Treasury to comment on this, Mr. Secretary, if you will.

If we follow the procedure in the House bill of letting

the credits play out, it costs roughly what our 70 percent refund costs. Is that correct?

Mr. Colvin. Do you mean that for Treasury?

The Chairman. If Treasury knows, because I want to

make sure that people understand.

Secretary Mentz. I think that is basically correct, although the way the 70 percent was developed was taking the existing investment credits that were carried over to 1986 and, on a statistical basis, figuring out how many of them would be used, using current law, and then developing a percentage that would bring you out to revenue neutrality

Now, if you cut the rate from 46 to 36 or 33 or 35, you may have—it depends—you may have less tax, you may have more tax, depending upon the taxpayer involved.

If you have less tax, there would be less investment credit used and your 70 percent would be a revenue winner.

The Chairman. Now, say that again.

Secretary Mentz. Well, it depends on the taxpayer; but if a particular taxpayer is a high-bracket taxpayer—the company that pays tax at the 46 percent level—if the rates go down to 35, that corporation is going to have less tax liability.

And if they have less tax liability, therefore, less credits.

The Chairman. So, the lower the corporate tax rate, the

 \mathcal{C}

more likely the buy-back is a better revenue deal for the Treasury than the straight play-out over five years?

Secretary Mentz. That is right, but it of course also depends upon accounting changes and all the other changes that are in the corporate package.

The Chairman. Now, is it a fair statement—and anybody can answer this that knows—if you have the straight play—out of them over the five years, companies that will get the advantage of them are those companies that are genuinely profitable that have something to offset the credits against?

And the companies that cannot use them are the companies that simply have no tax obligation and, therefore, have nothing to use the credits against?

Secretary Mentz. That would be right under current law.

The Chairman. Yes.

Secretary Mentz. And under the House bill, it is a little trickier because a lot of companies would be under the minimum tax.

If you are under the minimum tax in the House bill, you can only use credits if you have net operating losses in two out of three years.

The Chairman. Right.

Secretary Mentz. So, in some cases, companies would be simply not able to use their carryovers at all if they are in that situation.

except it would be phased out for persons with taxable incomes above \$150,000.

Preferences for the individual minimum tax: first, the dividend exclusion is repealed for regular tax purposes; so, it is irrelevant for minimum tax.

Accelerated depreciation on real property would become a tax preference to the extent the deduction exceeds a 40 year deduction computed on a straight-line basis.

For personal property, accelerated depreciation would be a preference to the extent it exceeds depreciation deducted on a straight-line basis over the ADR life.

On page 118, intangible drilling costs would remain a preference for individuals as in current law.

Item (e), pollution control facilities. The five-year amortization is repealed for regular tax purposes; and so, it is dropped from the minimum tax.

Expensing of mining exploration and development costs would remain a preference as in current law.

Circulation expenses are kept as a preference for individuals as in current law.

Research and development is kept as a preference for individuals as in current law.

Percentage depletion is kept as a preference as in current law.

The capital gains deduction is kept as a preference

and the language here relating to insolvent farmers has substantially been enacted in the reconciliation bill; and so, it is no longer contained in this spreadsheet.

Incentive stock options are kept as a preference as in current law.

Tax-exempt interest with respect to bonds issued after January 1, 1987 remains as a part of the spreadsheets.

Income excludable under Section 911 by U.S. citizens living abroad would be made a preference under the chairman's proposal.

That is also as in the House bill. Unlike the House bill, however, the chairman's proposal does not reduce the exclusion.

The Chairman. Hold on just a second, please.

(Pause)

The Chairman. Go ahead.

Secretary Mentz. Mr. Chairman?

The Chairman. Mr. Secretary?

Secretary Mentz. Let me just say that the Administration has some concern about making the exclusion of earnings earned abroad a preference for the minimum tax.

It hits hardest at the level of income of \$75,000 to \$125,000; and basically, it will in most cases result in a tax equalization payment by the corporation that is employing the individual.

The net result is that it makes it more expensive to have that individual employed overseas; and so, Americans get displaced by Europeans or people from other nationalities.

It just tends to weaken our competitive position. So, I just simply want to note that for the record.

The Chairman. I am curious. The Treasury must have more objections than that because you raise \$1.6 billion and we raise \$24.9 billion out of the individual minimum tax; and the difference is not solely income earned abroad.

Secretary Mentz. We applaud the direction in which you are going.

The Chairman. Thank you. I am glad to hear that.

Any other sections we can cover today? Go ahead, John.

Mr. Colvin. On page 119, the use of the completed contract method of accounting would become a preference; and it would be measured by a comparison to percentage of completion method.

The installment method of accounting would become a preference under the chairman's proposal.

An exception would be provided for consignment sales by manufacturer to a dealer if the amount of installment obligations exceeds the manufacturer's net worth.

The last two items on page 119 are the preference for passive investment activities in general and the passive loss from farming activities preference.

А

1 4

The chairman's proposal has substantially the same rules for both of those preferences.

Under the House bill, the preferences would have been effective January 1, 1986.

Under the chairman's proposal, they are not effective at all in 1986; they take half-effect in 1987 and they are fully effective in 1988.

The chairman's proposal provides an insolvency exception for both farm and nonfarm passive loss preference purposes.

The chairman's proposal retains the activity-by-activity rule for purposes of farming activities, but allows aggregation for purposes of the general passive loss other than farms.

The definition of passive investment is the same in both proposals, that is, it applies to a trade or business activity in which the taxpayer did not materially participate in the management.

With respect to cash-basis offset, the chairman's proposal does not allow an offset based on cash basis.

The House bill had allowed an offset of twice basis for farm passive losses and basis up to \$50,000 for nonfarm passive losses.

On page 120, the chairman's proposal treats interest from limited business interests as a minimum tax itemized deduction and does not include charitable contributions of

appreciated property as a preference.

Item number 6 on page 120. The chairman's proposal is the same as present law, which allows the taxpayer to have minimum tax rules for a preference applied for regular tax purposes. This is sometimes called the "Normative Tax Election."

Item number 7 is an adjustment for deferral preferences for the minimum tax.

Under item number 8, the chairman's proposal is the same as present law in that it would not allow incentive credits to offset minimum tax.

Item number 9 is a change from present law in that the foreign tax credit could not offset more than 90 percent of minimum tax.

Item number 10 --

Secretary Mentz. Mr. Chairman, I would just note

Treasury concern about or objection to number 9, just because

it is a departure from the basic rule of using foreign tax

credit to relieve international double taxation.

Mr. Colvin. As in the proposal, the intent was not to undermine the foreign tax credit, but rather to prevent its use to entirely offset minimum tax payments.

Item number 10, net operating losses. The chairman's proposal is the same as present law. Net operating losses would be allowed against minimum tax.

Moffitt Reporting Associates
Falls Church, Virginia 22046
(703) 237-4759









Page 121, the corporate minimum tax. As proposed by the President, the structure of the tax would be changed from an add-on minimum tax to an alternative minimum tax. The rate would be 20 percent compared to 25 percent in the House bill. The exempt amount would be increased from \$10,000 to \$40,000 and phased out for larger corporations. The preferences for the corporate minimum tax. first accelerated depreciation on real property would be a preference measured against 40-year depreciation on a straight-line basis. Item B, capital gains, would remain a preference. Item C, five-year amortization for pollution control is repealed for regular tax purposes; so it need not be retained as a preference. Item D, bad debt reserve. It would be retained as a preference for financial institutions. Item E, percentage depletion, would be retained as a preference as in current law. Item F, accelerated depreciation for personal property, would be a preference for all corporations to the extent that the accelerated depreciation deduction exceeds a straight-line deduction computed over the ADR life.

1

2

3

5

6

7

R

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Item G, mining exploration expenses, would remain a preference, and it would be extended to all corporations.

On page 122, the first issue is intangible drilling costs.

Intangible drilling costs would remain as a preference under the chairman's proposal, and the definition in current law would be retained; but it would be extended to all corporations.

Item I, circulation expenses, would remain as a preference as in current law.

Item J, research and development expenses would not be a preference for the corporate minimum tax.

Item K, tax-exempt interest. The applicability of this to bonds issued after January 1, 1987 remains an issue in the spreadsheet.

Senator Durenberger. Mr. Chairman, we will revisit that issue at some point, won't we?

The Chairman. That is correct. All we did, as you will recall, is say that we would not have it retroactive.

And when we came to the issue of whether we would have it at all if we had it, it would be prospective; but we didn't even vote as to whether we would have it.

Mr. Colvin. Item L, foreign sales corporations.

Foreign sales corporations would not be a preference under the chairman's proposal.

Completed contract method of accounting would be a preference to the extent it exceeds the percentage of

completion method.

Charitable contributions and appreciated property would not be a preference under the chairman's proposal.

The installment method of accounting for dealers would be a preference as in the individual minimum tax; and also, as in the individual minimum tax, there would be an exception for consignment sales by a manufacturer to a dealer if the amount of the installment obligation exceeds the manufacturer's net worth.

Capital construction funds would become a preference under the chairman's proposal.

Item Q. This is usually called the "book preference."

A new preference would be created equal to 50 percent of profits reported to shareholders or to creditors or to regulatory agencies to the extent not included in the minimum tax base but for that preference.

On page 123, the first issue is the normative election. Under that provision, the chairman's proposal includes a provision from the House bill which allows the taxpayer to have the minimum tax rules for a preference apply for regular tax purposes.

Item number 6 allows minimum tax liability arising from a deferral preference as a carry-forward credit against regular tax.

Item number 7, incentive credits. As in present law,

incentive credits would not be allowed to offset minimum 2 tax. 3 Item number 8, the foreign tax credit. This is the same as the point we mentioned earlier on the individual minimum 5 tax. The foreign tax credit would not be allowed to offset 6 more than 90 percent of minimum tax. 7 Secretary Mentz. The same objection from the 8 Administration. 9 Net operating losses would be allowed 10 Mr. Colvin. against minimum tax. 11 Item number 10, estimated tax payments. The House bill 12 and the chairman's proposal would require estimated tax 13 payments for the minimum tax. 14 And that completes the minimum tax provisions. 15 The Chairman. I want to ask Treasury a question. 16 Mr. Secretary, apart from your objection on the foreign 17 tax credit, both individual and corporate, you did not raise 18 any other objections. 19 In the President's proposal, there was on corporate 20 \$10.4 billion raised. The House cut the corporate minimum 21 tax to \$5.8; we raise \$20.9 on corporate. 22 Do you think we are heading in the right direction on 23 the corporate minimum tax? 24 Secretary Mentz. Yes, I think you are. I think that 25

when you get a more complete discussion, there will be these various pieces pulled apart and discussed and negotiated; but your general question—do I think you are heading in the right direction?—the answer is yes.

I think under current law it is possible for corporate taxpayers to zero out fairly easily, and indeed, the President's proposal did not have a very tough minimum tax. That is very clear.

The Chairman. And also, on the minimum side, the President's proposal raises \$1.6, ours raises \$24.9; and I know you raised an objection on the credit.

But for several weeks, people were critical of the committee losing money, losing money, losing money.

Here are two areas where we have got very tough minimum taxes. I think on the corporate one it would be impossible on a book-value basis for a profit-making public corporation to escape paying tax. I don't care what their other preferences are.

Secretary Mentz. I think that is right.

The Chairman. We will see the end of those stories of profit-making corporations not paying tax, and the minimum one is tough.

Because we haven't yet made the decision on municipal interest and because of the decision to allow appreciated value deduction at the full value of the appreciated value,

there is still some possibility of some individuals escaping, although not many.

But indeed, if there is any place where we have been

tougher than the President and tougher than the House, it

Senator Mitchell?

is in these two areas.

Senator Mitchell. No questions, Mr. Chairman. I just thought I would come up and keep you company for a while.

The Chairman. Well, you got here just in time to adjourn.

Senator Mitchell. Oh, did I?

The Chairman. Yes. Let me just tell you very quickly what we discussed on the investment tax credit because there has been some criticism of the so-called buy-back provision.

Roughly, the buy-back at 70 percent of their value, it figured at present corporate tax rates would cost about as much as letting it play out over five years and letting the unused credit be used up over the next five years.

But Secretary Mentz called to our attention that if we cut the corporate rate, the buy-back is actually a revenue producer, vis-a-vis letting them take it back at the lower corporate rates.

It is a shift in the incidence of taxation. If you allow the play-out over five years, the companies that take it are the profitable companies who have taxes against which to

take credits.

The companies that don't take it are those that don't have any profits and therefore no taxes; therefore, nothing to take a credit against, but that was the principal difference on it.

And then, as John Colvin assured me--because I know the members when we met last week were stunned that we could lower the corporate tax rate to 33 percent with solely the use of the investment tax credit proceeds--John Colvin assures me that we could do both the buy-back, which are past credits, and reduce the corporate rate to 33 percent using just the investment tax credit.

There is no other discussion?

(No response)

The Chairman. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 2:32 p.m., the meeting was recessed to reconvene at 9:30 a.m. on Tuesday, April 29, 1986.)

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the foregoing proceedings of an Executive Session of the Committee on Finance, held on April 28, 1986, in re: Tax Reform, were held as herein appears and that this is the original transcript thereof.

WILLIAM J. NOFFITT

Official Court Reporter

My Commission expires April 14, 1989.

