



In this issue:

Inflation dominates the discussion as taxwriters quiz Yellen on FY 2023 budget proposals	1
Manchin says ‘no deal’—yet—on revamped ‘Build Back Better’ bill.....	9
Brady: ‘Nowhere close’ to decision on tax title for China competitiveness bill.....	11
Kustoff tapped for Ways and Means slot.....	12

Inflation dominates the discussion as taxwriters quiz Yellen on FY 2023 budget proposals

The recent spike in inflation—and what the Biden administration intends to do about it—took center stage this week as the two congressional taxwriting committees held separate hearings with Treasury Secretary Janet Yellen to discuss the White House’s budget proposals for fiscal year 2023; but Yellen also fielded questions on a range of issues such as a pending global tax pact, the federal tax gap, retirement security, and the federal debt ceiling. (For a summary of the tax provisions in the White House’s latest budget blueprint, see *Tax News & Views*, Vol. 23, No. 12, Mar. 29, 2022.)

[URL: https://dhub.blob.core.windows.net/dhub/Newsletters/Tax/2022/TNV/220329_1.html](https://dhub.blob.core.windows.net/dhub/Newsletters/Tax/2022/TNV/220329_1.html)

Yellen appeared before the Senate Finance Committee on June 7 and the House Ways and Means Committee on June 8.

Inflation

During both hearings, Democratic and Republican taxwriters alike raised the issue of soaring inflation and its impact on US households, but there was a distinct partisan split on questions regarding what caused the problem and how to address it.

Yellen repeatedly told both panels that the current inflation rate of more than 8 percent is “unacceptable” and stated that lowering inflation should be the country’s number-one priority. She also noted that even though the Federal Reserve has a role to play in bringing down inflation and the administration has taken what action it can (such as releasing fuel from the Strategic Oil Reserves to increase supply), Congress can do a great deal to address high costs.

Build Back Better: Democrats agreed with Yellen’s argument that the key to lowering inflation is for Congress to pass provisions in the House-approved Build Back Better Act that would reduce the cost of child care, elder care, housing, energy, and prescription drugs. The cost of that relief would be offset through tax increases directed largely at multinational corporations and certain wealthy individuals. (The House approved its version of Build Back Better legislation last year. That measure is currently stalled in the Senate, although Democrats hope to craft a narrower compromise package that can win passage in the chamber under fast-track budget reconciliation rules. See separate coverage in this edition for an update on the status of those efforts. A detailed summary of the tax provisions in the House-passed legislation is available from Deloitte Tax LLP.)

URL: <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/pages/tax/articles/build-back-better-tax-legislation.html?id=us:2em:3na:tnv:awa:tax:061022&sfid=7015Y000003bKPoQAM>

But GOP taxwriters criticized the proposed tax increases in the Build Back Better Act—such as a 15 percent corporate minimum tax on book income. Finance Committee ranking member Mike Crapo, R-Idaho, questioned whether it is appropriate for the government to consider raising taxes and increasing spending at a time when the economy faces the prospect of stagflation. Yellen reiterated her position that the Build Back Better legislation would drive down costs for consumers in several key areas. She also defended the administration’s plan to offset the cost of that relief through tax increases.

“It is appropriate to pay for it or more than pay for it,” she said, adding that “asking high-income taxpayers and large corporations to pay their fair share is the right way to finance those investments.”

American Rescue Plan: Republican taxwriters also took aim at the \$1.9 trillion American Rescue Plan (P.L. 117-2), the emergency COVID relief legislation that was enacted in 2021, saying that this third major bill addressing the economic fallout from the global pandemic was untargeted and injected far too much spending into the US economy, increasing household liquidity and demand at a time when global supply chains were already showing signs of breaking.

URL: <https://www.congress.gov/117/plaws/publ2/PLAW-117publ2.pdf>

Democrats generally countered that passing the American Rescue Plan was the appropriate action to take in the face of a singular and unexpected economic calamity—an assessment that Yellen endorsed.

In an exchange with Ways and Means Committee member Brian Higgins, D-N.Y., for example, Yellen said that the Biden administration came into office facing economic conditions rivaling those of the Great Depression and that it was critical for Congress to act decisively to avert a disastrous outcome. Enactment of the legislation led to a strong economic recovery with low levels of unemployment and higher levels of personal savings, she said.

In response to a question from Ways and Means Chairman Richard Neal, D-Mass., Yellen contended that the temporary enhancements to the child tax credit, the earned income tax credit, and Affordable Care Act premium assistance credits enacted in the American Rescue Plan provided a measure of economic stability for low- and middle-income households.

Rethinking ‘transitory’: Yellen took significant fire for statements she made last year—similar to those made by President Biden and Federal Reserve Chairman Jerome Powell—indicating she expected the growth in inflation to be “transitory.” With the rate now at a 40-year high, Yellen acknowledged in a recent television interview that she was wrong—an admission she repeated as she took questions from taxwriters.

“We could have used a better term than ‘transitory,’” she said in an exchange with Finance Committee Republican John Thune of South Dakota, adding that she now expects inflation to remain elevated and that the administration’s estimate of 4.7 percent inflation for 2022 is likely to be revised higher in an upcoming forecast.

However, Yellen argued that spending in 2021 on benefits such as the enhanced and expanded child tax credit contributed “little or nothing” to inflation and instead pointed to “Putin’s war in Ukraine” and multiple COVID-19 variants that disrupted global supply chains as the key drivers of consumer price increases.

“There is no question that inflation is too high, and it has to be addressed, but we’re starting to do that from a situation of strength,” she said, highlighting the country’s historically low unemployment rate and the higher household savings rate compared to pre-pandemic levels.

But Finance Committee member John Barrasso, R-Wyo., took the harshest line against Yellen in his comments, pointing to her description of the inflation risk from the American Rescue Plan as “manageable.”

“Given that, it makes me wonder why Americans should put any confidence in your pronouncements, and decisions, and recommendations today,” Barrasso said.

OECD agreement

Republican taxwriters also expressed concern that the commitments the Biden administration made on behalf of the US in last year’s international tax agreement led by the OECD and G-20 would erode both US

competitiveness and tax revenue. That agreement, which nearly 140 countries signed in October, seeks to reallocate some of the taxing rights of countries (Pillar 1) and to ensure that multinational corporations are paying a minimum level of tax globally (Pillar 2).

Sen. Mike Crapo, the top Republican on the Finance Committee, led the GOP's criticism of the global tax agreement at that panel's hearing this week, saying that the deal will "harm US businesses and undermine tax provisions enacted by Congress to encourage certain activities."

Pillar 2 and nonrefundable tax credits: A significant challenge that US multinational companies have raised since the OECD released model rules for Pillar 2 in December is that nonrefundable tax credits could lower a company's effective tax rate below the 15 percent minimum and allow other countries to impose a "top-up" tax on companies receiving them.

Many key tax incentives US businesses use are nonrefundable, including the credits for research and development and low-income housing, leading business groups and lawmakers alike to argue for a change in the rules. OECD officials have said recently that the rules will not be reopened.

Although she did not provide any details, Yellen said in an exchange with Finance Committee member James Lankford, R-Okla., that Treasury will work with Congress to ensure the incentives Congress has intended "are structured so that they will be available."

Revenue impact: Addressing the potential impact of the agreement on the US fisc, Yellen told Senate taxwriter Pat Toomey, R-Pa., that Pillar 1 could gain or lose revenue, depending on the specific details in place when the pact is finalized; but she said the impact would be small compared to that of Pillar 2, which was scored by the Joint Committee on Taxation staff as a revenue raiser in the House-passed Build Back Better Act.

"We will gain revenue [under Pillar 1] from our ability to tax foreign corporations that are doing business in the United States," Yellen said. "We will lose some revenue—taxing authority—that's reallocated to foreign countries. Net, it could be positive or negative, depending on details that have not yet been worked out—and that's why we've not provided data."

Toomey disputed Yellen's assertion that that the OECD agreement will be beneficial because it would end a perceived global race to the bottom on tax rates. He stated that he would characterize the current global tax climate as one that promotes competition among countries to create an attractive environment for investment.

"We should be looking to win the race, not prevent it from taking place," he said.

Advise and consent: GOP Finance Committee members also argued that the Treasury Department has not engaged in meaningful consultation with Congress or shared its analysis of the agreement's likely impact on the US, despite the fact that they believe implementing the reallocation of taxing rights under Pillar 1 will require tax treaty changes and therefore will need Senate approval.

This latter point has been a question since Yellen told the Senate Banking Committee last October that a treaty “would be one way” to implement Pillar 1. Responding to a question from Sen. Toomey at the Finance Committee hearing, Yellen stated that “ratification requires Congress’s approval—I think there is no doubt about it,” but she added that “the form that that needs to take is still to be determined.”

A ‘surrender’ of taxing authority?: Across the Capitol, Ways and Means Committee ranking member Kevin Brady, R-Texas, contended that if the US signs on to the OECD agreement, it would essentially be “surrendering” the domestic tax base to foreign governments and that the bulk of the revenue generated under the agreement would flow from US-based companies.

Yellen disputed the assertion that the US would be ceding its taxing authority, stating that the US would gain the ability under Pillar 1 to tax a share of the profits generated by foreign companies. She also commented that the agreement includes enforcement mechanisms under Pillar 2 that allow signatories to impose penalties on noncompliant countries.

In an exchange with Ways and Means Committee Democrat Lloyd Doggett of Texas, Yellen argued that participating in the agreement is “very much in the US national interest.” She noted that the US is currently the only nation in the world to impose a minimum tax on its multinational corporations and that Pillar 2 of the OECD agreement would level the playing field for US multinationals and their global competitors.

She also commented that inaction on Pillar 1 would leave US technology companies subject to a “global proliferation” of unilateral digital services taxes. Adopting Pillar 1 would avert that outcome and “create an environment of tax certainty,” she said.

Foreign tax credit regulations

Taxwriters from both parties asked about foreign tax credit final regulations that were issued late last December and took effect on March 7 of this year. Business organizations have raised numerous concerns with the final regulations since January and have requested a one-year delay in their implementation. (For prior coverage, see *Tax News & Views*, Vol. 23, No. 16, May 6, 2022.)

URL: https://dhub.blob.core.windows.net/dhub/Newsletters/Tax/2022/TNV/220506_3.html

In response to questions from Finance Committee Republicans James Lankford of Oklahoma and Rob Portman of Ohio, Yellen said she does not expect that Treasury will delay the implementation of the regulations; however, she said that some changes could be applied retroactively.

At the Ways and Means hearing, Democratic taxwriter Brad Schneider of Illinois argued that retroactive revisions to the regulations may not provide adequate relief for some taxpayers and urged Treasury to consider delaying the implementation date. Republican taxwriter Kevin Hern of Oklahoma went a step further and asked if Treasury would consider withdrawing the regulations.

Yellen did not change her position, however, and stated in response to Hern that the rules are intended “to protect the American tax base and make sure that foreign tax credits are allocated when foreign countries have a taxing right, but not when they do not.”

Fossil fuels and green energy

With consumer fuel prices at record highs (not adjusted for inflation), GOP Finance Committee members including John Barrasso of Wyoming, Bill Cassidy of Louisiana, and Mike Crapo of Idaho took issue with the administration’s stance towards the fossil fuel industry, pointing to proposals in the fiscal year 2023 Green Book to repeal numerous tax incentives for oil and gas companies, as well as to decisions about pipelines and drilling on public land.

“On one hand you and the president both say gas prices are too high, to which I agree,” said Barrasso, “but on the other you are targeting American energy with taxes, and that’s going to result in higher costs for Americans.”

Yellen argued that the way to lower prices for American consumers in the “medium term” is to incentivize increased production of renewable energy to reduce US dependence on global oil markets. In the short term, with the US affected by uncertainties in the global oil market stemming from the Russia-Ukraine war, she argued that US producers hold leases on 37 million acres of land and can increase domestic production by drilling there. (Barrasso, however, retorted that the federal government will not issue the permits necessary to drill much of it).

A similar dynamic unfolded at the Ways and Means Committee hearing, where Republican taxwriter Tom Rice of South Carolina argued that fuel prices were on the upswing before the start of the Russia-Ukraine war. He asked whether the government intends to do more to increase the domestic energy supply.

Yellen replied that the Biden administration has done what it can by opening up Strategic Oil Reserves. She also commented that domestic oil producers, who lost money as oil prices fell in the early days of the COVID pandemic, made a deliberate decision to decrease oil production.

In response to a question from West Virginia Republican taxwriter Carol Miller, Yellen stated that “over time, it’s important to transition away from fossil fuels” and toward green energy sources to address what she called the “existential threat” of climate change.

IRS funding and the ‘tax gap’

Democratic taxwriters on both panels decried recent reports indicating that lower-income taxpayers are more likely than wealthier taxpayers to face an IRS audit—a situation they attributed to years of congressionally mandated cuts to the agency’s budget—and lauded the administration’s request (which is included in the House-passed Build Back Better Act) to beef up the agency’s enforcement budget by roughly \$80 billion over 10 years.

Yellen agreed that the Service's fiscal position is dire.

"The IRS is under siege," she told Finance Committee member Elizabeth Warren, D-Mass. "It is suffering from huge underinvestment. It has massive problems that it is dealing with."

Responding to a question from Finance Committee Democrat Bob Casey of Pennsylvania, who cited declining audit rates of large passthrough businesses, Yellen observed that the Service's budget has been "cut to the point where they have largely cut back on the complicated audits ... of high-income taxpayers."

In an exchange with Ways and Means Committee Chairman Richard Neal, D-Mass., at that panel's hearing, Yellen noted that the dearth of experienced enforcement agents at the IRS makes it easier for wealthier taxpayers—who often have "opaque" sources of income and engage in complex financial transactions—to avoid paying taxes. The resulting underpayment, she said, drives up the "tax gap" (the difference between the amount of tax legally owed to the government and the amount actually paid on a timely basis). Yellen noted in contrast that lower- and middle-income taxpayers—who primarily have income from wages and other sources that are subject to third-party reporting—are largely compliant.

"It's unjust that ordinary wage earners are compliant with tax returns, yet for high earners who accrue income in opaque ways tax compliance is, in effect, voluntary," she said.

Yellen also commented that reducing the tax gap—which is currently estimated to be roughly \$600 billion a year—is "critical to ensuring fiscal responsibility."

Yellen told House taxwriters that increasing IRS funding across all of its program areas—as proposed in the administration's fiscal year 2023 budget request—would allow the agency to shore up its customer service ranks and mitigate the impact of unanticipated emergencies such as the COVID-related shutdowns that left the agency with a backlog of unprocessed paper returns and refund claims, along with an inadequate number of employees to process them once service centers were reopened.

Funding problems or misplaced priorities?: For his part, Kevin Brady, the top Republican on Ways and Means, argued that the problems at the IRS are largely the result of misplaced priorities rather than a lack of money.

"For the past year, Treasury has ignored the tax refund crisis, with an unconscionable total of 26 million returns backlogged at the IRS. Americans hit hard with inflation can't even get their own refunds back to help keep their family budgets afloat," he said in his opening statement at the Ways and Means hearing.

"Congress gave the IRS over \$1.8 billion in emergency funding, but instead of using it to work off the backlog, Treasury instead focused on pushing a dangerous bank surveillance scheme that targets the privacy of families, small businesses, and farmers"—a reference to a proposal in the administration's fiscal year 2022 budget blueprint that would have imposed an annual information return requirement on business and personal accounts from financial institutions, including bank, loan, and investment accounts, except those meeting a *de minimis* threshold. (That proposal was not included in the administration's latest budget package.)

Brady also criticized the proposed 10-year boost in IRS enforcement funding in the House-passed Build Back Better legislation, saying that it would “unleash 80,000 new IRS agents on American taxpayers—including low- and moderate-income families.”

High-wealth minimum income tax

In an exchange with Ways and Means Committee member Don Beyer, D-Va., Yellen endorsed a proposal in the administration’s fiscal year 2023 budget blueprint that would impose a minimum tax of 20 percent on total income, generally inclusive of unrealized capital gains, for all taxpayers with wealth greater than \$100 million.

Yellen said the proposal was “well crafted” and would make it easier for the government to collect tax on income “that is often undertaxed and sometimes untaxed” altogether. She noted that because capital gains would be taxed regardless of whether the underlying asset is sold, the proposal would eliminate the “lock-in effect” and encourage taxpayers to invest in productive assets.

Retirement security

Senate Democratic taxwriter Ben Cardin of Maryland noted that the Finance Committee is preparing to mark up legislation that would build on the retirement security protections in 2019’s Setting Every Community Up for Retirement Enhancement (SECURE) Act, a bipartisan measure that was enacted into law as part of the Further Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2020 (P.L. 116-94). He urged the White House to share its priorities with the panel as it decides what provisions to include.

URL: <https://www.congress.gov/116/plaws/publ94/PLAW-116publ94.pdf>

“We need your push here to get to the finish line,” Cardin said.

Yellen indicated that Treasury is willing to work with taxwriters to advance such a package.

Finance Committee Chairman Ron Wyden, D-Ore., recently told reporters that his panel is currently sorting through an array of proposals with a goal of holding a mark-up on a so-called “SECURE 2.0” bill this month. The House, meanwhile, approved its own version of a SECURE 2.0 bill—the Securing a Strong Retirement Act of 2022 (H.R. 2954) on March 29 by a vote of 414-5. (For prior coverage, see *Tax News & Views*, Vol. 23, No. 13, Apr. 1, 2022.) Leaders in both chambers have indicated that they hope to send a bipartisan retirement security bill to the White House later this year.

URL: <https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/2954/text>

URL: https://dhub.blob.core.windows.net/dhub/Newsletters/Tax/2022/TNV/220401_1.html

Debt ceiling

Ways and Means Committee member Brendan Boyle, D-Pa., asked Yellen for her thoughts on legislation (H.R. 5415) he introduced last year with House Budget Committee Chairman John Yarmuth, D-Ky., that would transfer authority for raising the debt ceiling from Congress to the Treasury Department but allow Congress to

rescind a debt ceiling increase by adopting a resolution of disapproval. (A disapproval resolution would require a 60-vote supermajority to clear the Senate.)

[URL: https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/5415/text](https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/house-bill/5415/text)

Yellen said she was “strongly supportive” of that approach, adding that it is “simply insanity” that the government is periodically brought to a crisis point when legislation to raise the debt ceiling comes before Congress.

In response to a separate question from Boyle, Yellen indicated that she does yet not know exactly when the government will next be forced to address the debt ceiling.

Congress late last year approved and President Biden signed into law a resolution (S.J. Res. 33) that increased the federal statutory borrowing cap to roughly \$31 trillion, an amount likely sufficient to ensure the nation can continue to pay its bills until after the November 2022 mid-term elections. (For prior coverage, see *Tax News & Views*, Vol. 22, No. 55, Dec. 17, 2021.)

[URL: https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/senate-joint-resolution/33/text](https://www.congress.gov/bill/117th-congress/senate-joint-resolution/33/text)

[URL: https://dhub.blob.core.windows.net/dhub/Newsletters/Tax/2021/TNV/211217_2.html](https://dhub.blob.core.windows.net/dhub/Newsletters/Tax/2021/TNV/211217_2.html)

— Storme Sixeas and Michael DeHoff
Tax Policy Group
Deloitte Tax LLP

Manchin says ‘no deal’—yet—on revamped ‘Build Back Better’ bill

Although talks continued behind the scenes this week between Senate Majority Leader Charles Schumer, D-N.Y., and Sen. Joe Manchin, D-W.Va., on the potential contours of a revised “Build Back Better” bill, the pair remained unable to agree on a legislative package that could win the support of all 50 members of the Senate Democratic caucus.

As approved in the House last November, the roughly \$1.75 trillion Build Back Better Act calls for significant tax increases impacting large corporations and high-income individuals to pay for lower- and middle-class tax relief and fund new spending for White House priorities such as expanded access to pre-kindergarten education, child care and elder care, affordable housing, and programs to mitigate climate change. (A detailed summary of the tax provisions in the House-passed legislation is available from Deloitte Tax LLP.)

[URL: https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/pages/tax/articles/build-back-better-tax-legislation.html?id=us:2em:3na:tnv:awa:tax:061022&sfid=7015Y000003bKPoQAM](https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/pages/tax/articles/build-back-better-tax-legislation.html?id=us:2em:3na:tnv:awa:tax:061022&sfid=7015Y000003bKPoQAM)

But shortly before Christmas, Manchin brought Senate action on the legislation to a halt when he announced that he would not support it in its current form and thus would not provide the crucial fiftieth vote needed to get it through the chamber. Under the budget reconciliation rules that Democrats are relying on to move Build Back Better legislation through Congress, the measure can clear the Senate by a simple majority rather than

the three-fifths supermajority—typically, 60 votes—that is normally required to avert a filibuster. Because Democrats control only 50 seats in the Senate and are not expected to receive any Republican support for the bill, they need all of their own votes—plus the tie-breaking vote of Vice President Kamala Harris—to get it across the finish line.

Manchin: Tackling inflation is key

Manchin, who remains key to securing a Democratic majority for a revised Build Back Better package in the Senate, has indicated he supports energy incentives, prescription drug pricing reform, and a rollback of many of the tax cuts enacted in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (P.L. 115-97). But in remarks to a CNN reporter on June 6, he reiterated that addressing historically high inflation levels is his top priority in any bill moving under the guise of his party's Build Back Better initiative.

“The bottom line is how do we fight inflation,” Manchin said. “That’s all. If they’re not serious about really getting our financial house in order and fighting inflation, paying down debt, then it’s all for naught.”

In recent weeks, Manchin has argued that roughly half of the revenue and other savings generated by any Build Back Better bill should be dedicated to reducing federal budget deficits—an approach that would, in theory, remove money from the private economy and help tamp down price increases.

Energy and climate policy still in flux?

Although Manchin has long suggested he is amenable to many of the roughly \$300 billion worth of tax provisions included in the House-passed version of the Build Back Better Act aimed at mitigating climate change through incentives for renewable energy and energy efficiency, he suggested in his comments to CNN that the climate portion of the bill, writ large, still is not locked down.

“The administration is having a hard time and the climate people are having a hard time coming to agreement on that,” Manchin said. (Manchin in the past has cited his own reservations about certain elements of the House-approved energy package, such as enhanced tax credits for electric vehicles.)

“There’s no deal,” he said, while implying that negotiations would nonetheless continue.

Bipartisan energy talks faltering: In a related development, separate negotiations among a group of Democratic and Republican senators—led by Manchin and Republican Sen. Lisa Murkowski of Alaska—on a possible stand-alone bipartisan tax-and-spending bill to address climate change and energy security appear to have lost momentum.

The group reportedly has met a few times since it was convened in late April, but one Republican participant indicated this week that there are no apparent plans for additional meetings in the immediate future.

“I don’t know if we’re going to have any more, nor do I see anything on my calendar,” North Dakota Republican Sen. Kevin Cramer told reporters June 7 in response to questions about the status of that group’s efforts.

Any proposal emerging from those discussions would have to move through Congress without budget reconciliation protections and thus would require a 60-vote supermajority to clear the Senate. (For prior coverage, see *Tax News & Views*, Vol. 23, No. 16, May 6, 2022.)

URL: https://dhub.blob.core.windows.net/dhub/Newsletters/Tax/2022/TNV/220506_1.html

Window for action is closing

The window for Democrats to strike a Build Back Better accord is closing relatively quickly as the November 2022 mid-term elections draw near—and taking difficult votes becomes more politically challenging in the minds of some members of Congress.

It is equally important to note that, from a parliamentary perspective, Democrats’ ability to shuttle a Build Back Better package through the Senate on a filibuster-proof basis will expire after September 30 of this year. That is because the Build Back Better-related reconciliation instructions Democrats are operating under were included in a congressionally adopted budget resolution for fiscal year 2022, which closes at the end of September. (The reconciliation instructions in the budget resolution lapse once the current fiscal year is over.)

For his part, Senate Finance Committee Chairman Ron Wyden, D-Ore., told a reporter this week that he hopes a revised Build Back Better package can make it through the Senate by August 1—in advance of Congress’s extended summer recess.

— Alex Brosseau
Tax Policy Group
Deloitte Tax LLP

Brady: ‘Nowhere close’ to decision on tax title for China competitiveness bill

House Ways and Means Committee ranking Republican Kevin Brady of Texas said this week that lawmakers have yet to tackle the issue of whether any tax provisions will be included in a potential conference report being negotiated among members of a recently convened House-Senate conference committee on China competitiveness legislation.

“We’re nowhere close to resolutions on these issues,” Brady said June 6. “We’ve not yet begun serious discussions about a tax title in the conference report.”

Brady’s was referring to a conference committee formed to hash out differences on H.R. 4521, which is variously referred to as the United States Innovation and Competition Act of 2021 (USICA), the America

COMPETES Act, or the “CHIPS” bill (as in, microchips and/or semiconductors, the domestic production of which would be bolstered under the legislation).

The committee, which was formally established on April 28 and held its first public meeting on May 12, is comprised of a massive group of 107 House and Senate members, including Brady. The committee’s size is due largely to the fact that the sweeping legislation touches the jurisdiction of many different congressional committees.

Many lawmakers, including Senate Finance Committee Chairman Ron Wyden, D-Ore., who also sits on the conference committee, have pushed for reversing a change within tax code section 174—originally enacted as part of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (P.L. 115-97)—that, as of January 1 of this year, requires certain research expenditures to be amortized over a number of years rather than deducted currently—as part of a China competition bill.

However, although the section 174 proposal enjoys broad bipartisan support, there is a concern that including even a single tax provision in any forthcoming conference report could open up the floodgate to myriad other tax provisions—such as a proposal by Wyden and Finance Committee ranking Republican Mike Crapo of Idaho to provide an investment tax credit for semiconductors produced in the US—that are favored by lawmakers both on and off the conference committee.

Some Democrats, for their part, are also concerned that addressing research expensing could result in unfavorable political optics if moved outside their parallel effort to raise taxes on corporations and high-income individuals as part of the so-called “Build Back Better” initiative or, similarly, if not done in concert with extending enhancements to family tax credits, such as the child tax credit, that Democrats enacted in early 2021 as part of their American Rescue Plan and which lapsed at the end of last year.

— Alex Brosseau
Tax Policy Group
Deloitte Tax LLP

Kustoff tapped for Ways and Means slot

House Ways and Means Committee ranking member Kevin Brady, R-Texas, announced June 8 that GOP Rep. David Kustoff of Tennessee has been selected to fill the vacancy on the panel that was created when taxwriter Tom Reed, R-N.Y., unexpectedly resigned from Congress last month.

URL: <https://gop-waysandmeans.house.gov/brady-welcomes-kustoff-to-ways-means-announces-schweikert-as-republican-leader-of-social-security-subcommittee/>

Kustoff is an attorney who was elected to his first term in Congress in 2016. He previously served on the House Financial Services Committee but relinquished that appointment when he moved to Ways and Means.

Brady also noted that the post of ranking member of the Ways and Means Social Security Subcommittee—which Tom Reed had held before he left Capitol Hill—has been awarded to Republican taxwriter David Schweikert of Arizona. An updated roster of GOP subcommittee assignments for Ways and Means is included in Brady’s announcement.

— Michael DeHoff
Tax Policy Group
Deloitte Tax LLP

This document contains general information only and Deloitte is not, by means of this document, rendering accounting, business, financial, investment, legal, tax, or other professional advice or services. This document is not a substitute for such professional advice or services, nor should it be used as a basis for any decision or action that may affect your business. Before making any decision or taking any action that may affect your business, you should consult a qualified professional advisor. Deloitte shall not be responsible for any loss sustained by any person who relies on this document.

About Deloitte

Deloitte refers to one or more of Deloitte Touche Tohmatsu Limited (“DTTL”), its global network of member firms, and their related entities (collectively, the “Deloitte organization”). DTTL (also referred to as “Deloitte Global”) and each of its member firms and related entities are legally separate and independent entities, which cannot obligate or bind each other in respect of third parties. DTTL and each DTTL member firm and related entity is liable only for its own acts and omissions, and not those of each other. DTTL does not provide services to clients. Please see www.deloitte.com/about to learn more.