

New York State Bar Association

TAX SECTION

Letter on Investments in Tax-Exempt

May 21, 1986

Table of Contents

Cover Letter:i

TAX SECTION

New York State Bar Association

OFFICERS

RICHARD G. COHEN
Chairman
40 Wall Street
24th floor
New York City 10005

DONALD SCHAPIRO
First Vice-Chairman
26 Broadway
New York City 1004

HERBERT L. CAMP
Second Vice-Chairman
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York City 10112

WILLIAM L. BURKE
Secretary
One Wall Street
New York City 10005

CHAIRMEN OF COMMITTEES

Alternative Minimum Tax
Eugene L. Vogel, New York City
William H. Weigel, New York City

Bankruptcy
Peter C. Canellos, New York City
Kenneth H. Heitner, New York City

Commodities and Financial Futures
Richard L. Reinhold, New York City
Michelle P. Scott, New York City

Continuing Legal Education
Sydney R. Rubin, Rochester

Corporations
Edward D. Kleinbard, New York City
Michael L. Schler, New York City

Criminal and Civil Penalties
Sherry S. Kraus, Rochester
Sherman F. Levey, Rochester

Depreciation and investment Credit
Victor Zonana, New York City
Richard J. Bronstein, New York City

Employee Benefits
Laraine S. Rothenberg, New York City
Robert E. Brown, Rochester

Estate and Gift Taxes
Carlyn S. McCaffrey, New York City
Sherwin Kamin, New York City

Exempt Organizations
Henry Christensen III, New York City
Philip S. Winterer, New York City

Financial Institutions
Donald S. Rice, New York City
Michael H. Simonson, New York City

Foreign Activities of U.S. Taxpayers
Alan W. Granwell, Washington, D.C.
Matthew M. McKenna, New York City

Income of Estates and Trusts
Robert F. Baldwin, Jr. Syracuse
Jerome A. Manning, New York City

Income From Real Property
Martin B. Cowan, New York City
Arthur A. Feder, New York City

Insurance Companies
Donald C. Alexander, Washington D.C.
Hugh T. McCormick, New York City

Interstate Commerce
James H. Peters, Basking Ridge, N.J.
William M. Colby, Rochester

Net Operating Losses
James M. Peaslee, New York City
Matthew A. Rosen, New York City

New York State Tax Matters
Paul R. Comeau, Buffalo
Arthur R. Rosen, Morristown, N.J.

Partnerships
William F. Indoe, New York City
Bruce M. Montgomerie, New York City

Personal Income
Steven C. Todrys, New York City
Patricia Geoghegan, New York City

Practice and Procedure
Sterling L. Weaver, Rochester
Michael I. Saltzman, New York City

Problems of the profession
Thomas V. Glynn, New York City
Paul Pineo, Rochester

Reorganizations
Robert A. Jacobs, New York City
Richard O. Loengard Jr., New York City

Sales, Property and Miscellaneous
E Parker Brown II, Syracuse
Edward H. Hein, New York City

Tax Accounting Matters
Victor F. Keen, New York City
Richard M. Leder, New York City

Tax Exempt Bonds
Dennis R. Deveney, New York City
Jackson B. Browning, Jr., New York City

Tax Policy
Mark L. McConaghy, Washington, D. C.
James S. Halpern, Washington, D. C.

Unreported Income & Compliance
M. Bernard Aidinoff, New York City
Robert S. Fink, New York City

U.S. Activities of Foreign Taxpayers
Leslie J. Schreyer, New York City
John A. Corry, New York City

MEMBERS-AT-LARGE OF EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Martin B. Amdur	Morris L. Kramer	Robert J. McDermott	Sidney I. Roberts	R. Donald Turlington
Cynthia G. Beerbower	Robert J. Levinsohn	Ronald A. Morris	Peter J. Rothenberg	David E. Watts
James S. Eustice	James A. Levitan	Stephen M. Piga	Stanley I. Rubenfeld	George E. Zeitlin

May 21, 1986

The Honorable J. Roger Mentz
Assistant Secretary (Tax Policy)
Department of the Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20220

Dear Roger:

A technical modification in the tax-exempt bond arbitrage rebate provisions would greatly simplify compliance by many issuers. This technical modification would make clear that an investment in shares of a tax-exempt money market mutual fund qualifies as an investment in a "tax-exempt obligation."

Because investments in tax-exempt obligations do not create a potential for an arbitrage profit resulting from differentials between taxable and tax-exempt yields, the arbitrage rebate requirement does not apply to such investments. If it were made clear that investments in shares of tax-exempt money market mutual funds also do not give rise to rebatable arbitrage profits, issuers would be given a simple investment option, providing protection of principal, demand withdrawal privileges and eliminating burdensome accounting requirements.

FORMER CHAIRMEN OF SECTION

Howard O. Colgan	Edwin M. Jones	Richard H. Appert	Gordon D. Henderson
Charles L. Kades	Hon. Hugh R. Jones	Ralph O. Winger	David Sachs
Charles J. Tobin, Jr.	Peter Miller	Hewitt A. Conway	Ruth G. Schapiro
Carter T. Louthan	John W. Fager	Martin D. Ginsburg	J. Roger Mentz
Samuel Brodsky	John E. Morrissey, Jr.	Peter L. Faber	Willard B. Taylor
Thomas C. Plowden-Wardlaw	Charles E. Heming	Renato Beghe	Richard J. Hiegel
		Alfred D. Youngwood	Dale S. Collinson

Such a modification would also ease the pressure on the Treasury Department's Bureau of Public Debt by reducing the volume of requests for issuance of special yield-restricted Treasury securities.

Section 147 of the House version of H.R. 3838, the Tax Reform Act of 1985 (the "Bill"), would extend to all tax-exempt bonds the arbitrage rebate requirement currently applicable to most industrial development bonds. Under the Bill, as under present law, the arbitrage rebate requirement would not apply to the investment of proceeds in another "obligation" exempt from tax.

The use of the term "obligation" in this context has caused a technical problem under current law, involving the investment of proceeds in tax-exempt mutual funds. This problem would be continued under the Bill. Specifically, the reference to an "obligation" appears not to include the investment in shares of a mutual fund that can pay exempt-interest dividends under Section 52(b)(5) of the Code. For purposes of the exception from the arbitrage restrictions, there should not be a technical distinction between an "obligation" and such a mutual fund share. Thus the exception from the definition of "investment property" in Section 147(b)(2) of the Bill should include a mutual fund share that pays exempt-interest dividends as well as any tax-exempt obligation.

Under Section 852(b)(5), only 50% or more of the total assets of a regulated investment company issuing such a security must consist of obligations described in Section 103(a) of the Code. Solely for purposes of an expanded exception to the arbitrage restrictions, it may be appropriate to apply a higher percentage standard (e.g., 95 %), so that substantially all of the assets of such a company would be obligations described in Section 103(a) of the Code.

Because Section 852(b)(5) requires that the company paying exempt-interest dividends be a "regulated investment company," as defined in Section 851 of the Code, the securities of such a company that might be sold to a tax-exempt issuer should be available to it on the same terms (including yield) as those offered to the general public. However, it may be appropriate to specify that a qualified fund could issue only one class of shares to ensure that a so-called "dual purpose fund" (which can issue two classes of shares) would not be eligible.

We would be pleased to discuss the foregoing
with you at your convenience.

Sincerely,

Richard G. Cohen
Chairman