DESCRIPTION OF S. 2051

RELATING TO THE DEDUCTION OF ADVERTISING WHICH IS CARRIED BY CERTAIN FOREIGN BROADCASTERS

SCHEDULED FOR A JOINT HEARING

BEFORE THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND THE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON TAXATION AND DEBT MANAGEMENT

OF THE

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

ON

MAY 14, 1982

PREPARED BY THE STAFF

OF THE

JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

MAY 12, 1982

JCX-17-82

CONTENTS

Page

INTRODUCTION ii

I. SUMMARY 1

II. DESCRIPTION OF S. 2051 2

A. Background 2

B. Present Law 3

C. Issues 5

D. Explanation of the Bill 6

E. Effective Date 7

III. REVENUE EFFECT 7

INTRODUCTION

The Subcommittees on International Trade and on Taxation and Debt Management of the Senate Finance Committee have scheduled a joint hearing on May 14, 1982, on S. 2051. The bill (introduced by Senators Danforth, Moynihan, Bentsen, Wallop, Mitchell, Heinz, Symms, Cohen, Gorton, and Jackson) would deny deductions for expenses paid or incurred to a foreign broadcaster for advertising directed primarily to United States markets if the foreign broadcaster were located in a country that denied its taxpayers a deduction for advertising directed to that country and carried by United States broadcasters. The bill "mirrors" a Canadian provision, and Canada is apparently the only country to which the bill would now apply.

Part I of this document provides a summary of S. 2051. Part II is a more detailed description of the bill, including background, present law, issues, and effective date. Finally, Part III is an estimate of the revenue effect of the bill.

I. SUMMARY

Background

In 1976, the Canadian Parliament enacted legislation denying tax deductions for Canadian income tax purposes for advertisements directed primarily at Canadian markets and carried by non-Canadian broadcasters. Presidents Carter and Reagan determined that this Canadian tax rule unnecessarily burdened U.S. commerce under Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974. Each of them suggested retaliation along the lines of S. 2051, described below.

Present law

Ordinary and necessary advertising expenses paid or incurred by a U.S. taxpayer in the conduct of a trade or business are generally deductible whether incurred in the United States or abroad. In certain limited situations, however, tax results of foreign-related transactions depend on the identity of the foreign nation involved. Examples of harsher tax results include the following: Foreign persons subject to U.S. taxation whose countries tax U.S. persons at discriminatory rates or at rates higher than U.S. rates may owe more taxes than they would otherwise owe (secs. 891 and 896); certain conduct by a foreign nation may make articles produced therein ineligible for the investment tax credit in the hands of a U.S. purchaser (sec. 48(a)(7)); and participation or cooperation by a country in an international boycott will cause U.S. taxpayers who support the boycott to lose certain tax benefits (secs. 908, 952, and 995).

S. 2051

The bill would deny deductions for expenses of advertising primarily directed to U.S. markets and carried by a foreign broadcaster, if the broadcaster were located in a country that denied its taxpayers a deduction for advertising directed to its markets and carried by a U.S. broadcaster. Although the bill does not mention Canada by name, Canada is the only known country to which the bill would now apply.

II. DESCRIPTION OF S. 2051

A. Background

In 1976, the Canadian Parliament amended the Canadian tax law to deny deductions, for purposes of computing Canadian taxable income, for an advertisement directed primarily to a market in Canada and broadcast by a foreign television or radio station (Income Tax Act of Canada, sec. 19.1). This provision, which supplemented a similar provision for print media, became fully effective in 1977. The purpose of this provision was to strengthen the market position of Canadian broadcasters along the U.S.-Canadian border. The Canadian Government officially views the tax provision as a means of protecting the Canadian broadcast industry, whose goal is "to safeguard, enrich and strengthen the cultural, social and economic fabric of Canada." 1/

At the time this provision was adopted by Canada, the U.S. and Canada were renegotiating the income tax treaty between the two countries. The Treasury Department negotiators raised U.S. concerns with the Canadians, but the Canadian negotiators apparently refused to discuss this provision. 2/

1/ Statement of Canadian Government Position Concerning Complaint [under Section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974] of U.S. Television Licensees Relating to Section 19.1 of Canadian Income Tax Act, *citing* Canadian Broadcasting Act of 1968.

2/ *Tax Treaties, Hearings before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations*, 97th Cong., 1st Sess. 36 (September 24, 1981) (testimony of John B. Chapoton, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy); Bureau of National Affairs, *Daily Report for Executives*, No. 97 at G-5 (May 16, 1980) (reporting testimony of Donald Lubick, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Tax Policy).

After the Canadian Parliament passed the provision denying foreign broadcasting deductions, the U.S. Senate approved a resolution finding that the provision appeared to inhibit commercial relations between Canadian businesses and U.S. broadcasters, and asked the President to raise the issue with the Canadian Government. 3/ In addition, some broadcasters filed a complaint under section 301 of the Trade Act of 1974, 19 U.S.C. 2411(a)(2)(B). The complaint alleged that the Canadian provision was an unreasonable practice that burdened U.S. commerce. On September 9, 1980, President Carter determined that the provision unreasonably and unnecessarily burdened U.S. commerce, reported an estimate that the Canadian provision was costing U.S. broadcasters $20,000,000 annually in lost advertising revenues, and suggested legislation along the lines of this bill (S. 2051). On November 17, 1981, President Reagan sent a message to the Congress concurring in President Carter's views. On December 24, 1981, Representative Conable introduced H.R. 5205, a bill identical to S. 2051.

B. Present Law

Deductibility of advertising expenses

Under present law, taxpayers may generally deduct, in computing their Federal income tax, all ordinary and necessary expenses paid or incurred in carrying on any trade or business. The reasonable cost of advertising, whether paid to a domestic or foreign entity, generally qualifies as a deductible ordinary and necessary business expense under Code section 162.

Tax results dependent on the identity of a particular foreign country involved

Under present law, the income tax consequences of a transaction involving a foreign country ordinarily do not depend on the particular foreign country involved. However, the Internal Revenue Code 4/ provides in a number of cases for more burdensome

---

3/ S. Res. 152, 95th Cong., 1st Sess., 123 Cong. Rec. S14349 (1977).

4/ In addition to the Code provisions discussed in the text, the bilateral tax treaties to which the United States is a party alter Federal tax rules for transactions involving the U.S. and the treaty partner in varying degrees. For instance, absent a treaty, interest paid by a U.S. borrower is ordinarily subject to a 30-percent withholding tax if the interest income is not effectively connected with a U.S. trade or business of the lender. Some treaties reduce this rate below 30 percent, while some treaties eliminate the tax altogether.

income tax treatment for foreign-related transactions on the basis of the laws or policies of the particular foreign country involved. These rules have the effect of adversely affecting taxpayers from a particular foreign country or of discouraging U.S. taxpayers from dealing with a particular foreign country or its persons. 5/

Several specific Code sections allow higher taxation of foreign taxpayers from offending countries. For example, there are two alternative remedies that the President may invoke against taxpayers from a foreign country that taxes United States persons more heavily than its own citizens and corporations. When the President makes a finding that a foreign country's tax system discriminates against U.S. persons, he is to double the applicable U.S. tax rate on citizens and corporations of that foreign country (sec. 891). Alternatively, upon a finding of intransigent discrimination against U.S. citizens and corporations, the President is to raise U.S. tax rates on citizens, residents, and corporations of the discriminating foreign country substantially to match the discriminatory foreign rate if he finds such an increase to be in the public interest (sec. 896). In addition, if the President finds that a foreign country intransigently taxes U.S. persons more heavily than the United States taxes foreign persons, he is to increase the U.S. tax rates on U.S.-source income of residents and corporations of the high-tax foreign country to the pre-1967 rates if he finds such an increase to be in the public interest (sec. 896). These provisions have apparently never been used.

Moreover, U.S. taxpayers may have to pay higher taxes because of transactions involving certain countries. The President, by executive order, may eliminate the investment tax credit on articles produced in a country that engages

---

5/ By contrast, some tax rules favor dealings with specific countries. For example, convention expenses incurred in Canada or Mexico receive more favorable treatment than similar expenses incurred in other foreign countries (sec. 274). In addition, certain corporations formed under the laws of Canada or Mexico will, if the U.S. parent elects, be permitted to join in the U.S. consolidated return of their parent companies (sec. 1504(a)). Moreover, a mutual life insurance company with branches in Canada or Mexico may elect to defer taxation on income of those branches until its repatriation (sec. 819A).

---

in discriminatory acts or policies unjustifiably restricting United States commerce (sec. 48(a)(7)). 6/ The power to eliminate the investment tax credit as a retaliatory measure was aimed in part at a number of countries that discriminated in favor of locally produced motion pictures. 7/

In addition, taxpayers participating in or cooperating with an international boycott generally lose certain tax benefits--the foreign tax credit and tax deferral under the rules governing controlled foreign corporations and domestic international sales corporations--allocable to their operations in or connected with countries involved in a boycott (sec. 999). Unlike the previously described rules, the international boycott provisions of the Code do not necessarily require a finding or decision by any person in the executive branch of government. Although the Secretary of the Treasury maintains a list of countries requiring participation in or cooperation with an international boycott, the absence of a country from this list does not necessarily mean that the country is not participating in an international boycott.

C. Issues

The bill, S. 2051, raises the following general issues:

(1) Is it appropriate to deny tax deductions to U.S. persons who incur ordinary and necessary business expenses for advertising directed primarily at U.S. markets through Canadian broadcast media?

(2) Will retaliatory denial of tax deductions for use of Canadian broadcast media to reach U.S. markets prompt repeal of the discriminatory Canadian provision denying deductions for use of U.S. broadcast media to reach Canadian markets?

6/ This provision has apparently never been applied. Recently, however, Houdaille Industries of Florida sought application of this provision. See Bureau of National Affairs, Daily Report for Executives, No. 86 at LL-1 (May 4, 1982).

7/ See S. Rept. No. 437, 92nd Cong., 1st Sess. (1971), reprinted in 1972-1 C.B. 559, 573-74 n. 1.

D. Explanation of the Bill

S. 2051 would deny taxpayers any deduction for expenses of advertising carried by a foreign broadcast undertaking and directed primarily to a market in the United States, but would apply only to foreign broadcast undertakings located in a country that denies a similar deduction for the cost of advertising directed primarily to a market in the foreign country when placed with a United States broadcast undertaking. Although the only known country to which the bill would now apply is Canada, the bill does not mention Canada by name, and it would apply to any other country that had a tax provision similar to Canada's.

If Canada repealed its rule of nondeductibility, the bill would have no further application to Canada from the effective date of the repeal. 8/ That is, on the first day that a Canadian taxpayer could make a deductible payment to a U.S. broadcaster for advertising directed primarily to a Canadian market, a U.S. taxpayer could make a deductible payment to a Canadian broadcaster for advertising directed primarily to a U.S. market.

Under the bill, the term "broadcast undertaking" includes, but is not limited to, radio and television stations. Transmission of video programming by cable would also be considered a broadcast undertaking.

The bill would disallow deductions for foreign-placed advertising only if the advertising were directed primarily to a United States market. Whether advertising is primarily directed to a United States market would be a question of intent. In the event of a dispute, objective determination of subjective intent could depend on a number of factors, which could include the geographic range of the broadcast, the distribution of population within that geographic range, the proximity of the advertiser's place of business to the border, whether the purchaser of the advertised product or user of the advertised service would ordinarily come to the advertiser's place of business (or whether the advertiser conducted a mail-order sales business or a mobile service business), and even the nature of the broadcast program the advertiser sponsored (e.g., a sporting event featuring teams from one of the two countries).

8/ It is, of course, unclear whether Canada would repeal its rule in the face of this bill. The use of U.S. broadcasters by Canadian advertisers affected by the Canadian legislation would likely have been greater than the use of Canadian broadcasters by U.S. advertisers who would be affected by the bill. S. Rept. No. 402, 95th Cong., 1st Sess. 1 (1977). The Canadian Parliament may believe that Canada retains a comparative advantage even upon enactment of the bill, and political factors might also be important.

The bill would automatically become effective without any finding or action by the executive branch (although the Secretary of the Treasury could announce those countries to which the bill applied). The determination of the nondeductibility of advertising expenses accordingly would be made in the first instance by the taxpayer, who would be expected on his return to reduce his deduction for advertising expenses by the amount of such expenses paid or incurred to foreign broadcasters for advertising directed primarily to U.S. markets through broadcast undertakings located in a discriminating country.

F. Effective Date

The provisions of the bill would apply to taxable years beginning after the date of its enactment.

III. REVENUE EFFECT

This bill is expected to have no appreciable revenue effect.