This press release is from the collections at the Robert J. Dole Archive and Special Collections, University of Kansas. Please contact us with any questions or comments: http://dolearchive.ku.edu/ask

BOB DOLE ST DISTRICT, KANSAS

N HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING 225-2715

COMMITTEES: AGRICULTURE INMENT OPERATIONS Congress of the United States **House of Representatives** Washington, D.C. 20515

	COUNTIES:	
BER	HODGEMAN	RAWLINS
TON	JEWELL	RENO
YENNE	KEARNY	REPUBLIC
RK	KINGMAN	RICE
UD	KIOWA	ROOKS
ANCHE	LANE	RUSH
ATUR	LINCOLN	RUSSELL
ARDS	LOGAN	SALINE
IS	MEADE	SCOTT
SWORTH	MITCHELL	SEWARD
NEY	MORTON	SHERIDAN
D	NESS	SHERMAN
E	NORTON	SMITH
HAM	OSBORNE	STAFFORD
NT	OTTAWA	STANTON
YY	PAWNEE	STEVENS
ELEY	PHILLIPS	THOMAS
ILTON	PRATT	TREGO
PER		WALLACE
KEL		WICHITA

BAR BAR CHE CLA CLO COM DEC EDV ELL ELL FIN FOR GOV GR/ GR/ GR/ GR/ HAR

DISTRICT OFFICE: CHINSON, KANSAS 67501

WASHINGTON, D. C. FOR RELEASE THURSDAY OCTOBER 22, 1966 OCTOBER 27, 1966

Congressman Bob Dole (R-Kans) has written to Sheldon S. Cohen, Commissioner of Internal Revenue, Department of the Treasury, suggesting changes in proposed tax regulations with reference to deductions by teachers of certain expenses.

Congressman Dole stated that "on July 7, 1966, the Internal Revenue Service proposed regulations which were, in effect, discriminatory. Thereafter, a great number of Congressmen, and other interested parties, protested, and as a result, the Revenue Service withdrew its proposed regulation on October 1, 1966, and issued a revised proposal. The revised proposal, in many aspects, is an improvement over the July 7 regulations, but in my opinion, further changes should be made." The text of my letter to Commissioner Cohen is as follows:

Dear Commissioner Cohen:

I understand that the new proposed IRS regulations concerning the deduction of educational expenses as printed in the Federal Register for October 1, 1966, are the latest effort of IRS to meet the conditions which have caused considerable confusion, especially to members of the teaching profession.

The October 1 proposed regulations are far superior, of course, to those proposed in the July 7, 1966, Federal Register. However, I wish to urge further consideration for inclusion of additional features in these latest proposals as follows:

1. Elimination of such language as permits subjective judgments on the part of IRS agents in dealing with individual taxpayers. The regulations should be phrased in such language that the taxpayer cannot be subjected to whimsical interpretations based on the attitude of the IRS agent who may review his returns.

2. The discrimination against a teacher who, while presently employed as a teacher, has not yet earned the Bachelor's Degree should be eliminated. The authority to decide who is or who is not qualified for employment as a teacher is clearly not a matter for decision at the federal level, certainly not by IRS officials. The determination of the right to teach is made by the State or institution of higher education in which the teacher is employed, not the federal government. The regulation as written is a matter, intentional or not, of an invasion of the State's right to control education.

The new regulations are indefinite as to the types of educational ex-3. penses which are deductible. It seems reasonable that these should be specifically enumerated to include tuition, books, fees, supplies, materials, and traveling expenses. Such specific provision again would assist the taxpayer in knowing clearly just what items are deductible. As presently written, the reg ulations seem to leave this matter to the discretion of the IRS agent.

4. The right to deduct expenses incurred for education which may qualify a teacher to move into a principalship should be retained by the teacher.

This press release is from the collections at the Robert J. Dole Archive and Special Collections, University of Kansas. Please contact us with any questions or comments: http://dolearchive.ku.edu/ask

Principals are considered part of the instructional faculty in most schools. Also, while a teacher may take courses leading to qualification as a principal, these same courses may well be those which improve the taxpayers' competence as a teacher. The practice of IRS agents of analyzing college transcripts and deciding which courses are deductible and which are not is the basis of much of the understandable discontent of teachers with the present procedure.

-2-

I hope, before final regulations are adopted, that the improvements herein suggested may be included.

Sincerely yours,

propand any regulations with collected to deductions by seminrary of certain,

1.000

T Diestary, M

BOB DOLE

Member of Congress

vice proposed regularization while ware, in allect, distributiony. Thereafter, a great number of Congrussian, and other increased parties, protected, and as a result, the because Service withdrew its proposed repulseive on orderer b, 1960, and facted a revised proposal. The revised proposal, (a many aspects, to a featurement over the July 7 regulations, but is ay opinion. Europee changes should be adde." The text of an intrary to Constant for a point of a solution

Dear Goundationer Cehmin

1 understand that the new proposed its regulations conterving the defaution of educational superase as printed in the <u>fuderal legister</u> for Occeler 1, 1965, are the latent effort of UNS to mean the conditions which have cannot considcrable confusion, superially to membrary of the traching profession.

The October 1 proposed regulations are for superfort, of contrast to those first posed in the July 7, 1955, <u>Superal Negleter</u>, Honevey, 1 wish in urge further considerations for inclusion of additional features in these latest proposals as follows:

 Niteringtics of each language is presits subjective judgeens on the part of 188 agents in Secling with individual Languagers. The requisitors about he phraned in such language that the inspayor cannot be subjected to objected interpretations based on the strikude of the 100 agent abo may review its returns.

3. The discrimination against a reacher who, while proximily unployed as a tractor, has not yet earned the factualor's Degree should be eliminated. The saturity to decide who is or who is not qualified for exployent as a teach or is clearly out a matter for decision at the federal level, exclainly only by 100 officials. The derestication of the right to tamak is ands by the State or functivilate of higher education is which the teacher is employed, not the iederal government. The regulation as written is a matter, intentional or not, at an invariant of the State's right, to control education.

3. The new regulations are faderibits as to the types of educational exrenses which are deductible. It seems reasonable that there should be specifically commutated to include builder, books, fors, seppitar, materials, and starning expenses. Such quartitic provinion again would assist the trapaper its burning clearly just shot trans too deductible. As presently ordered, the ulations seem to ineve this matter to the discretion of the TSS agent.

A. The right to defuct expanses incurred for education which may quit. (By a reacher to nove into a principalably should be retained by the teachers.