

Internet transactions will help to ensure that the nearly limitless potential of electronic commerce is realized.

I would like to touch on another issue arising from this debate, the broader question of whether Congress should allow the States to require all remote sellers—be they over the new medium of the Internet, or the more traditional mediums of mail order or telephone to collect sales tax on deliveries into states where the seller has no physical presence or “tax nexus.”

I believe the current rules on whether an out-of-state company should collect sales tax are, in fact, fair and reasonable. Simply stated, a company is required to collect tax on deliveries into a State if it has a presence in that State. This rule has served interstate commerce well, and importantly, has not burdened small, entrepreneurial companies with having to hire lawyers and accounts to comply with 7,600 different taxing jurisdictions, and worse still, liability to audit from States and localities throughout the country.

I'm not prepared at this point to support any new tax collecting requirements on remote commerce. However, if this committee were to act on this broader issue, the Wyden bill's approach, which requires full congressional scrutiny and a mandatory up-or-down vote by Congress before there is any new tax collecting, seems to me to be the correct course.

RETIRED PAY RESTORATION ACT OF 2001

Mr. BIDEN. Mr. President, I am pleased to be a cosponsor of the Retired Pay Restoration Act of 2001, which corrects a long-standing inequity that has resulted in a major slap in the face of our dedicated service men and women.

Current law bans so-called concurrent receipt of VA disability compensation and military retired pay, so that the amount of any VA disability payment to a military retiree is subtracted from the monthly retirement check. In operation, this rule seems to turn logic and common sense on its head, and its repeal is long overdue.

Let's be clear what we're talking about. This provision only applies to military retirees, those who have served their country in uniform for at least 20 years. Such retirees receive a taxable monthly pension based on their length of service and their final pay, which is determined primarily by their rank and length of service. In this regard, the military retirement pay system resembles the civil service retirement system with which we are all familiar.

VA disability compensation is completely different. VA disability compensation consists of tax-free monthly payments to veterans who served in uniform for any length of time and who, during their time in the military, incurred a service-connected disability. These monthly payments are based only on the severity of the disability

and nothing else: not on the length of service, the person's rank, the active duty pay, and so on.

So at first blush, it seems that there is no logical reason why VA disability compensation should be offset against military retired pay: they are disbursed for completely different reasons and are calculated by totally different methods.

But the incongruities of the present rules are nothing short of mind-boggling. Let us hypothesize that twins Jack and Jill sign up for the military at age 18. After 1 year in the military, Jack and Jill both incur identical knee injuries after stepping into a hole while running the obstacle course. The military disability system evaluates both Jack and Jill, confirms a mild disability in both due to intermittent swelling and locking of the knee, but determines that this disability is not severe enough to render them unfit for continued military service.

At this point, Jack and Jill decide to pursue separate paths. Jack decides to leave the military when his enlistment is up, at age 22, and joins the Federal civil service in the Defense Department as a procurement specialist. Immediately after leaving the service, Jack applies to the VA for disability compensation, which is granted, and Jack then receives monthly payments from the VA for the rest of his life. At age 55, Jack retires from the Federal civil service and begins receiving his full monthly civil service retirement check in addition to the VA disability compensation that he has been receiving all along.

Jill, on the other hand, decides to stay in the military after her injury, working as a procurement specialist. Of course, while she remains in the military, she receives no VA disability compensation, even though her twin Jack is receiving VA disability payments for the same injury all along. At age 55, Jill retires from the military, and starts to receive monthly military retirement checks. Jill applies to the VA for disability compensation based on her knee injury, and it is granted. However, when she begins to receive her VA disability checks, the amount of those checks is subtracted from her monthly military retirement pay.

How can we rationalize this disparate treatment of Jack and Jill? We can't. It makes no sense that those in uniform who suffer a service-connected disability end up being penalized for deciding to remain in the military, while those who leave the military are amply rewarded. The longer you serve in the military, the more you are penalized. Does this make sense? I don't think so.

Or let's consider another option. Twins John and Jane both enter the military at the same time, serve in the same position, and retire at the same age. Both receive the same monthly retired pay. John has incurred a service-connected injury, and after retirement, he is granted a disability compensation

from the VA. Jane was never injured in the military. However, they both end up getting the same amount of pay, since John's VA disability payment is subtracted from his military retired pay. Does it make sense that we have an elaborate system for disability compensation that ends up treating the injured John and the uninjured Jane the same? I don't think so.

The logical inconsistencies of the present rules are overwhelming. It is time to repeal the provision in current law that prohibits military retirees from receiving concurrent receipt of full military retirement pay along with VA disability compensation. Those who put their lives at risk by putting on the uniform of this country, and who are then disabled as a result of their military service, must be treated fairly and awarded all the benefits they have earned and which they deserve. To do any less makes a mockery of the sacrifices of all our service men and women.

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS

RECOGNITION OF MAJOR GENERAL J. CRAIG LARSON

• Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I want to take this opportunity to recognize an outstanding American and soldier. Major General J. Craig Larson has devoted nearly thirty-three years to the U.S. Army and Army Reserve. It is only fitting that we pay tribute to a magnificent soldier and citizen who has done so much for his country and the great state of Utah.

Major General Larson is the Commander of the U.S. Army 96th Regional Support Command in Salt Lake City, UT. As such, he commands more than 6,000 Army Reservists in the six-state area of Colorado, Montana, North and South Dakota, Utah, and Wyoming.

He was drafted by the Army in 1966, and obtained the rank of Sergeant. He then attended and completed Officer Candidate School at the Ordnance Center and School in Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD. He was commissioned a Second Lieutenant in January 1968. He served nearly seven years on active duty with assignments as Assistant to the Depot Commander, Anniston Army Depot, Alabama; Commander, Company C, 702nd Maintenance Battalion, 2nd Infantry Division on the DMZ in Korea; and Assistant Director of Industrial Operations, Indiantown Gap, PA.

During his twenty-six years in the Army Reserve, he served as: Commander of the 259th Quartermaster Battalion (Petroleum Terminal and Pipeline) in Pleasant Grove, UT; Executive Officer and then Commander of the 162nd Support Group at Fort Douglas, UT, and Deputy Chief of Staff for Logistics, Headquarters, 96th U.S. Army Reserve Command, also at Fort Douglas, UT.