

5/14

ROBERT J. DOLE, KANS., CHAIRMAN

BOB PACKWOOD, OREG.
WILLIAM V. ROTH, JR., DEL.
JOHN C. DANFORTH, MO.
JOHN H. CHAFEE, R.I.
JOHN HEINZ, PA.
MALCOLM WALLOP, WYO.
DAVID DURENBERGER, MINN.
WILLIAM L. ARMSTRONG, COLO.
STEVEN D. SYMMS, IDAHO
CHARLES E. GRASSLEY, IOWA

RUSSELL B. LONG, LA.
LLOYD BENTSEN, TEX.
SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, HAWAII
DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN, N.Y.
MAX BAUCUS, MONT.
DAVID L. BOREN, OKLA.
BILL BRADLEY, N.J.
GEORGE J. MITCHELL, MAINE
DAVID PRYOR, ARK.

United States Senate

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20510

ROBERT E. LIGHTHIZER, CHIEF COUNSEL
MICHAEL STERN, MINORITY STAFF DIRECTOR

May 13, 1983

TO: Senator Dole
FROM: George Pieler
SUBJECT: Business Council speech

Attached in addition to the speech outline are talking points on the current budget situation; insurance taxation; mortgage bonds; and indexing and investment.

Attachments

Budget Update

● The budget is in considerable difficulty in the Senate: failure to agree on a plan for the next few years has resulted in the unusual procedure of recommitting the resolution to the Budget Committee to see if they can now come up with a package that will survive on the Senate floor. Committee action is expected by Tuesday night.

● When all is said and done, the real debate in the Senate is over the revenue question. While some may prefer a defense increase of 5% or 6% or 7%, there seems to be room to compromise and reach agreement on that issue. Similarly--and unfortunately--it seems to be conceded that we will not make any significant net reduction in domestic spending under this budget resolution. That leaves the choice between accepting for now the deficits that result from these decisions, or agreeing to implement tax increase now that would bring those deficits down somewhat while spending remains at high levels.

● There are sound reasons for caution on the revenue side. First, the higher the revenue figure in the budget, the greater the pressure is on the third year of the tax cut and indexing. Those changes are needed both to give the recovery a consumer lift this year and to provide some certainty for the years ahead--not to mention the issue of equity to the taxpayer. 78% of the benefit of the third year goes to those earning under \$50,000. In the case of indexing, about 80% of the benefit goes to those earning under \$50,000.

● In addition, we simply do not know yet what the shape or strength of the recovery will be. That means we ought to come down the side of caution when it comes to any revenue changes that might impede recovery, whether by retarding consumer activity or discouraging saving and investment.

● Finally, until Congress takes a more serious attitude to the growth of Federal spending, it makes no sense to set a precedent for letting all the pressure for deficit reduction to be applied on the revenue side of the ledger. There does have to be balance in a budget agreement--but when you have a House budget plan that raises \$30 billion in taxes and increases domestic spending by \$22 billion, you have to ask how serious we really are about the deficit problem.

● Hopefully the Budget Committee can produce a plan that will make progress on the deficit without overdoing it on revenues. We are willing to raise revenues in a way that is fair and economically productive--hopefully by improving compliance and closing loopholes. But we will be here to do that each year, and there is no need to make an unrealistic commitment to raise taxes now until we have a better idea of what the recovery will do.

INSURANCE COMPANY TAX ISSUES

TEFRA

- o We made some significant changes in insurance company taxes last year. The major accomplishment was closing the Modco loophole; but we also provided some substantial benefits to the life insurance industry (If the early post-TEFRA revenue estimates are correct, these benefits may have been too substantial).
- o Many of the life insurance provisions enacted last year expire at the end of this year. The sunset date was designed to give us more time to analyze what a permanent tax structure for life insurance companies should be.

STAFF REPORT

- o The Finance Committee and Joint Tax Committee staffs are working on a report on issues and options on insurance company taxation. I have asked them to examine the basic tax policy issues involved when considering the taxation system which should apply to any taxpayer: How do you accurately calculate income earned; are there special public policy issues which should be considered when deciding what the effective tax rate should be?

DOLE LETTER TO ACLI

- o I understand that the life insurance industry is working to reach a consensus on a revision of the life insurance company tax laws. In February I sent a letter to Dick Schweiker at the American Council of Life Insurance asking that the industry examine the basic tax policy issues before it brings any proposed legislative changes to the Congress. The ACLI has not yet responded to my questions, but I understand that a response should soon be forthcoming.
- o Whenever anybody ever talks about life insurance tax changes, people start worrying about the special tax advantages that exist for life insurance and deferred annuities. To the extent these products primarily serve the goals of economic protection against dying too soon or outliving your assets, I would expect these tax advantages to be retained without change.
- o However, to the extent an insurance company sells a product which is primarily an investment, that product is in competition with other investments. Life insurance companies should not have an unnecessary competitive tax advantage over other financial institutions with respect to savings vehicles.

WAYS AND MEANS SUBCOMMITTEE HEARING

- o This week Congressman Stark held two days of hearings in the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Select Revenue Measures to discuss life insurance company taxation next Tuesday and Wednesday.
- o I understand that the hearings were very well attended and that there was some lively discussion of the issues, and substantial disagreement as to how the issues should be resolved.

FINANCE COMMITTEE HEARING ON PROPERTY
AND CASUALTY INSURANCE COMPANIES

- o On June 13 the Finance Committee will hear testimony on the taxation of property and casualty insurance companies. Last fall I asked GAO to study the taxation of property and casualty insurance companies. This hearing will provide GAO an opportunity to provide us with their preliminary findings. It will also give the public an opportunity to discuss the issues.
- o The hearing should give the committee a better knowledge of the effective tax rate of companies in the property and casualty insurance business and some information on the impact of various tax code provisions on these companies' tax liability.
- o Among the issues I hope will be discussed are whether the tax accounting rules such as those that apply to reserve liabilities and costs of acquiring insurance business accurately reflect the income of a company.
- o At a minimum, if Congress is going to re-examine life insurance company taxation, it will be important to understand the property and casualty insurance industry, its relationship to the life insurance industry, and the differences in the method of taxation that applies to each.

POLICY

- o I hope that the insurance industry will work with us in an effort to analyze, and revise where necessary, the insurance company tax laws in a manner that is both fair to the industry and consistent with good public policy.
- o I want the insurance industry to remain an important part of the private economy. The capital formation and economic protection functions performed by the industry are vital to our society. But we also have an obligation to assure that life insurance companies are shouldering a fair part of the corporate tax burden.

Mortgage Revenue Bonds

● The efficiency of tax-exempt financing has long been a significant issue in both tax policy and public finance, and it is something the Finance Committee is continually called upon to reexamine. In 1980 Congress decided that mortgage subsidy bonds needed a comprehensive review and significant cutback because they were not doing the job they were intended to do in an effective way. At the end of this year the tax exemption for issues of bonds for single-family homes is sunsetted, which has led to legislative proposals to make the exemption permanent.

● We certainly want to encourage home ownership, and hopefully we can find an effective way to do so, especially for low- to moderate-income families. But efficiency is a key question, and we may conclude that subsidies provided by a tax exemption on bond issues may not be the best way to go.

● On April 18 the GAO issued a report on the costs and benefits of mortgage subsidy bonds for single family housing. Among other things, they concluded that a direct subsidy program that would generate the same amount of benefit to homebuyers could be 3 to 4 times more efficient than mortgage subsidy bonds. This finding demands serious review by Congress as we consider whether to continue the single-family exemption.

● GAO also found that the current program is not effectively targeted to the low- and moderate-income households we are concerned about. In 1982, according to GAO, about 53 of the borrowers subsidized by mortgage bonds were above the median level of affluence in their states. Only about 20% of the loans went to households with less than 80 percent of median income.

● The revenue loss associated with making exemption permanent would be \$100 million in 1984, \$200 million in 1985, rising to \$1.2 billion by 1988.

Indexing, Savings and Investment

• The indexing provision that takes effect in 1985 is critical to protecting low and moderate income taxpayers from unlegislated tax increases. But it is also a significant part of the President's program of tax incentives for greater savings, investment, and productivity.

• Without indexing, even though the maximum tax rate of 50% would remain constant, taxpayers would be pushed into the higher brackets and 'crowded' towards that maximum rate. If carried on indefinitely, we would have a flat rate tax--but at a 50% rate! That would be a huge disincentive to the taxpayers whose saving and investment decisions are crucial to generating the capital that finances business expansion as well as consumption.

• In addition, eliminating indexing would destroy any certainty as to what the tax rate structure will be in the years ahead. That makes personal and business financial planning very difficult--the experience of bracket creep in the 1970s shows that this is so.

• Indexing also is a pledge not to reflate the economy to reduce the deficit, as opposed to tackling our spending and revenue decisions head-on. A signal of reflation, such as de-indexing, would be the worst possible thing for financial markets, for investors who are just getting used to the process of disinflation, and for business planning in what we hope will be a stable and noninflationary period of growth.

OUTLINE OF REMARKS

BUSINESS COUNCIL

May 14, 1983--9:00 a.m.--HOMESTEAD, WEST VIRGINIA

I. The President and the Congress

A. President Reagan has made clear that he and the 98th Congress must work together to deal with an active agenda. Already that has meant constructive action on social security. Next to be dealt with are the deficit, unemployment, and the shifting patterns of industry and job creation in our economy. At the same time we have to realize there will be major areas where we will not agree. It makes no sense to compromise away the gains won towards restraining the growth of spending, controlling the tax burden, and beating back inflation. The American people still overwhelmingly support those goals.

B. The President, the House leadership, and the Senate leadership will have to work together to forge a consensus on major decisions if we are to get the job done. That doesn't mean there won't be a lot of hard bargaining on all sides; but on some issues we simply cannot afford to have a legislative stalemate.

C. The President still sets the agenda. On taxes, spending, deficits, employment, and trade the President proposes, and Congress must dispose. Those of us who have ideas of our own will work with the White House to get things done--but leadership still must come from the President. That is why we are unlikely to see any major departure from the principles of government Ronald Reagan has espoused in his first two years in office.

D. The fact remains that there is no coherent alternative to Republican leadership. The people still recognize that our economic problems were a long time in the making, and that the cure will take time too. According to CBS/New York Times voter exit polls in the last election, voters by a 5 to 4 margin blamed our economic problems on past Democratic policies rather than on President Reagan.

II. The Economy

A. Prognosis. We have to realistically assess the state of the economy and the prospects for the next few years. The fact is that the groundwork has been laid for a stable and lasting recovery, without renewed inflation. It is absolutely crucial that we proceed with care at this point, and not throw away the gains already made.

No one should doubt that we are making progress. In March the index of leading economic indicators jumped 1.5 percent--the seventh straight such increase, and the 10th increase out of the

last 11 months. In addition, industrial output rose 1.1 percent in March, and economists agree we are in a broad based recovery.

1. Inflation was cut to 3.9 percent in 1982, from 12.4 percent in 1980. This is the lowest inflation rate since 1972. And the trend is continuing: consumer prices rose less in the first quarter of 1983 than in any quarter since 1965.

2. Interest rates are down and still falling. The prime rate is down to 10 1/2 percent, way down from the 21 percent that prevailed when President Reagan took office. Home mortgage rates are down 3 points since last year. Long-term rates for business loans are off 3 to 4 points from a year ago.

3. Government spending growth rate is down to 11.2 percent this year from 17.4 percent in 1980. The 1983 budget resolution projects the growth rate of government to fall to 7.5 percent by 1985.

4. Lower taxes with major improvements in tax equity will help buoy the recovery, both on the consumer side and on the investment side. The combined effect of the 1981 and 1982 tax bills has been to lower individual taxes over 3 years by \$344 billion, as well as improve compliance and tax fairness. Lower individual rates boost personal income and restore incentive, while favorable capital cost recovery rules should spur investment.

5. In January, industrial production was up 0.9 percent; housing starts were up 36 percent; the stock market is up 450+ points over last August. These are tangible evidence of recovery. Consumer confidence is rising and auto sales were up in the first 10 days in April.

B. Unemployment. The January drop in unemployment to 10.4 percent was followed by a further decline to 10.3 percent in March and to 10.2 percent in April. That is major good news, and the decline has not been reversed, although there may be a few "blips" upward. Unemployment, of course, remains the major negative in the economic picture. High unemployment has to come down and stay down without inflationary stimulus--that is what we have failed to do in the past.

o Clearly there is a bipartisan consensus for more jobs. But resuming the inflationary policies of the past will not create lasting jobs, just an illusion of prosperity that leaves us worse off the next time we try to get "off the wagon."

o That means the most important thing we must do is judge carefully the degree of stimulus the economy can and should take, consistent with a firm anti-inflation policy. The Federal Reserve will play a key role, and has already shown a willingness

to adjust its short-term goals based on an assessment of the weakness of the economy. We will not allow the recession to continue, but we will not reflate the economy, either.

o While the main emphasis must remain on the long-term goals of growth with low inflation, there are steps we can take in the short term to deal with the plight of the unemployed. Many things have already been done:

- A new Federal supplemental unemployment compensation program was passed with the 1982 tax bill, providing additional unemployment benefits to about 2 million workers in 38 States. The House and Senate have agreed to extend this program through September 30.

- The President signed into law the new Job Training Partnership Act, which emphasizes training for permanent employment rather than make-work jobs. New initiatives outlined by the President focus on the long-term unemployed, youth, and on training or relocating displaced workers who lost jobs due to plant closures or force reductions.

- The targeted jobs tax credit, which was extended for 2 years by the 1982 tax bill, gives employers a real incentive to hire the disadvantaged--about 600,000 workers are certified under the program.

- The administration's enterprise zone legislation, reported last fall by the Finance Committee, can provide us with an experiment in private-sector job creation in depressed areas, through a combination of Federal tax incentives and State and local efforts to target an area for development with regulatory and tax relief, neighborhood participation, and capital and other improvements. Hearings were held in the Finance Committee April 22.

- The 5¢ per gallon gas tax increase can create over 300,000 jobs by funding much needed repairs and construction of the Federal highway system.

C. The Deficit and Interest Rates.

1. All our economic difficulties are, of course, related--high interest rates and slow growth boost the deficit, and higher deficits create greater uncertainty in the business community as to our future course; will there be more inflation, or less credit available for business expansion?

2. Because of this, it makes sense first of all to chart a path that is most likely to bring stable growth without inflation. Higher growth boosts revenues and cuts unemployment costs, thereby reducing the deficit as well: already, upward

revisions of growth estimates are being made in light of the economic indicators.

3. In the short term, as the President urges, it makes sense to continue to review every part of the Federal budget in an effort to bring the deficit down. This means both defense and entitlements must be under scrutiny to maximize the efficiency of every dollar spent. A balanced deficit reduction program is still our goal.

4. Continued efforts to restrain the deficit by controlling Federal spending will give the Federal Reserve a bit more room to accommodate the potential for real growth that exists in the economy without inflationary pump-priming. But restraint in both fiscal and monetary policy is crucial if we want to maintain long-term confidence in the economic program. That means long-range goals must be carefully reconciled with efforts to respond to particular weaknesses in the economy. Radical attempts to reverse course would be self-defeating and must be resisted.

III. The Budget: The House and the President

A. We all know that developing a credible, deficit-reducing budget for 1984 and beyond is going to take a lot of hard work and give and take on all sides, Democrat and Republican, liberal and conservative. The President has made his proposal, and the House has adopted a radically different alternative. We are likely to end up with something in between, but we ought to consider for a moment who is closer to the mark in terms of the vital needs of our economy and in terms of national priorities.

B. House resolution. The House-passed budget resolution, engineered by the Democratic leadership, simply is not a credible plan for meeting our priorities and achieving sustained economic growth. The House recommends a \$30 billion tax increase in FY 1984 alone. Unfortunately, the Senate Budget Committee has ratified that decision, subject to modification on the floor. That is not only an unreasonable increase in the tax burden as we come out of a recession, it can only mean modification or repeal the third year of the tax cut for the working people. Why run the risk of aborting recovery? Reneging on promises is no way to run the government, and that proposal must be rejected. Even the members of the House Ways and Means committee have expressed strong doubts that any more than \$8 billion in revenue can or should be raised in 1984.

C. Defense spending. The President has recommended a 10 percent real increase in defense spending, and the House recommends a mere 4 percent increase: 2.3 percent compared with the President, if you factor out the military pay increase. We all know that defense, like every area of the budget, will have

to assume a fair share of the burden of deficit reduction. But surely we ought to take more seriously the President's concern about our national strength vis-a-vis the Soviet Union. We can and probably will have to modify the President's defense request, and the President will have to deal with both the Senate and the House leadership if we are to get agreement. We do have to get more out of each defense dollar spent. But the House-proposed increase is not wise, reasonable, or in the national interest. The Senate Budget Committee has voted for a 5 percent increase exclusive of pay, which is at least closer to the mark.

D. Domestic spending. There is widespread agreement that we cannot let the burden of deficit reduction continue to fall on benefits for lower-income Americans. But that does not mean domestic spending is untouchable--it can and must be reduced, something the Democratic budget fails to acknowledge. The House resolution provides \$25 billion more for nonmilitary spending than does the President's budget. \$6 billion of that difference is in the health area: and certainly we have reached the point where we should acknowledge that Federal health program costs are not under control, and that changes to control costs are very much in order. The American people do want to share the cost of reducing the deficit in a fair way. But they do not want national security risked, or the tax burden on individuals raised to an unconscionable degree, just because some members of Congress do not want to reexamine programs that may have outlived their usefulness or have become grossly inefficient. Instead, let us work together, and with the President, to reach a bipartisan agreement like that worked out on social security.

IV. The Budget: Tax Issues

A. There are lots of ways to raise revenue, but our job is to choose ways that are fair and consistent with good tax policy. We should resist the temptation to undo the progress that has been made in providing greater incentives for savings, work, and investment: those incentives will become more important as recovery proceeds. There are many base-broadening measures still to be considered that would improve the equity and efficiency of the tax code.

B. Indexing. The House budget assumes repeal of the tax indexing provision of the 1981 tax act, which takes effect in 1985. We all know that we have to compromise to get things done, but this is one area that we ought to leave alone if we are interested in sound tax policy and honesty in government. We can raise revenues--but why resort once again to back-door revenue increases generated by inflation? Tampering with indexing further risks sending a signal that we are prepared to reinflate the economy and generate revenues through bracket creep to deal with the deficit. That would mean undoing all the progress we

have made over the past two years, and it would be a tremendous mistake.

C. Outyear tax increases. The President's budget recommends a contingency tax to raise \$46 billion in FY 1986, consisting of a 5 percent surcharge and an oil tax, to be triggered if the deficit remains too high despite adoption of major spending cuts. It is not clear why we would need to use a "trigger" device to raise taxes based on deficit levels. It seems unlikely that a "trigger" mechanism would create the kind of reassurance on the deficit that the country is looking for.

If growth and revenues turn out better than now projected, we can always reduce taxes to the extent that becomes fiscally desirable. One possibility is to enact some additional base-broadening measures--improvements in equity and eliminating tax provisions that are economically inefficient--then provide for further rate reductions if the deficit is brought under control more rapidly than is now expected. This would maintain the momentum for a lower-rate, broader-based tax system that has been built over the last two years. It is also consistent with the administration's consideration of a streamlined and simplified tax structure with lower rates.

V. Tax Issues of Continuing Concern

A number of issues that have been around for some time may receive attention from the 98th Congress.

1. 6-month holding period. Efforts to reduce the capital gains holding period to 6 months will continue. There is very strong support for this change, because it can give a boost to capital markets at a time when greater savings and investment is vitally important to sustained economic recovery. This change was approved by the House in 1981 and by the Senate on three separate occasions in 1982, so it is time to get it enacted into law.

2. Tuition Tax Credits. Although the Finance Committee fashioned a compromise tuition tax credit proposal last year after extensive consideration, the bill received no further action last year. But the Committee's efforts could form the basis for legislation in the 98th Congress. Legislation, S. 528, was introduced February 17.

3. Enterprise Zones. The Finance Committee reported out a modified version of the administration's enterprise zone proposal last September, but no further action was taken. New legislation has been sent up by the President, and the proposal is likely to come up again in connection with discussion of job-creation and economic development proposals, and possibly could be acted on with further refinements. A major question is

whether the House will take an interest in the idea, which they did not in the 97th Congress.

4. DISC. While no specific DISC proposal was made in the 97th Congress, the issue was extensively discussed-- particularly the question of legality under the GATT. The Administration has committed itself to bringing the DISC into conformity with the GATT and will submit legislation to do so shortly.

VI. Social Security

A. The National Commission developed a bipartisan package that deserves support. It is not perfect, and everyone had to swallow hard on some items: that is the cost of reaching agreement.

B. The work of the Commission made clear that we had to confront the crisis in social security. The Commission agreed that \$150-\$200 billion is needed between 1983 and 1989 to ensure the solvency of the system through 1990. This means providing about a 15 percent reserve ratio by 1990 under the pessimistic-- some would say realistic--assumptions.

C. The bipartisan package, includes a 6-month delay in cost-of-living adjustments, partial acceleration of scheduled payroll tax increases, coverage of new Federal workers and non-profit organizations, and partial taxation of benefits for higher-income beneficiaries.

D. We cannot forget that the payroll tax burden is already heavy and scheduled to increase, and the confidence of young people is critically low. The long-term deficit can be reduced considerably by very gradually slowing the growth of the system as people come on to the rolls in the future. The bill raises the retirement age to 67, again very gradually, for people retiring some 20 or 30 years from now. Ample time is available for people to adjust their savings and retirement decisions.

VII. Trade

A. Trade deficit is too large. The size of our trade deficit (which is now projected at \$75 billion in merchandise trade and \$30 billion in current account) alone means Congress will continue to look hard for ways to reform our trade policy. The system of multilateral arrangements has been called into serious question as many believe it fails to meet our needs. Many voters and members of Congress will want to see us approach more of our trade problems on a bilateral basis. The average American simply does not understand why Japanese cars and TV's sell well here but American cigarettes, beef, baseball bats, and cosmetics cannot be sold in Japan. Remedies for this type of

situation are certain to be a major focus of attention in this Congress.

B. Export issues. Unfortunately, the GATT ministerial failed to make progress on the question of foreign subsidies for agricultural exports. This will continue if pressure from Congress to resolve this situation through negotiation or for other export promotion actions like the recent wheat flour sale to Egypt. S. 822, recently passed by the Agricultural Committee, would establish several export promotion activities.

I support efforts to equalize the rules under which trade is conducted. This does not mean trade war, but does mean seeking to expand East-West trade, developing a viable substitute for DISC, utilizing Ex-Im Bank resources more adeptly, and enacting the trade reciprocity bill that the Senate approved April 21. Fair access to markets must be a two-way street, and Congress will be under considerable pressure to see that that is so.

C. Import issues. As you know, the House passed "local content" legislation at the end of the last Congress. That is a drastic proposal and likely to be counterproductive in the long run if our goal is to increase access to markets and to gain maximum benefit from the mutual advantages of international trade. There may be other areas, however, where we might make adjustments: in considering extension of the Generalized System of Preferences, there may be an interest on the part of some members of the Finance Committee to seek some reciprocal benefits from the major GSP beneficiaries. There appears to be substantial support for the trade provisions of the President's Caribbean Basin Initiative, however, as those countries offer U.S. exporters a potentially strong market. It may be difficult to renew the President's general authority to negotiate tariff reductions on a limited basis. It is a good sign that the Japanese have agreed to continue voluntarily to restrain their automobile imports to this market for a third year until the domestic industry has had an adequate time to get back on its feet.

D. Clearly the heat is on when it comes to seeing that American producers get fair treatment under our system of international trade. If we choose our battles carefully to secure an appropriate response from our trading partners, we have an opportunity to making trade freer and fairer, to the advantage of everyone. But we must avoid the two extremes of allowing the world to think only the U.S. will play by the rules of free trade, regardless of disadvantage to our citizens; or, on the other hand, taking extreme unilateral actions that may look good politically but that, in the long run, will provoke severe reaction and deprive us of market opportunities. We need just the right amount of leverage to open more doors, not have them slammed in our face.

VI. Conclusion

The months and years ahead must not be dominated by rigid ideologies on either side--but neither can the President or the Republican leadership be expected to cast aside the principles of Government the American people so soundly endorsed in 1980. Those principles--a more restrained Government, a freer economy, greater accountability to the American people--are as valid today as they ever were, and there is no indication that the people have changed their commitment to these same principles. Guided by these principles, we will try to work together to build on the sound foundation for recovery that has already been laid.