2-3:00
March 19
Wed.

Speak

SD-62

MAJOR GIFTS

1986 WASHINGTON MISSION

Jay Zises
Chairman
Martin Barell
Co-Chairman
Armand Lindenbaum
Co-Chairman

Joyce

10-15 min during 2-3:30

March 4, 1986

Senator Robert Dole
141 Senate Hart Office Building
Washington, D. C. 20510

Dear Senator Dole:

The Leadership of the UJA-Federation Washington Mission was delighted to hear of your participation in the bipartisan discussion of Domestic Issues to be held from 2:00-3:30 P.M. in room 628 of the Dirksen Building.

This program is an integral part of the New York UJA-Federation Washington Mission consisting of 150 top Jewish business leaders from the greater New York area.

I am fully aware of your tight schedule and that you will be available for a limited length of time. I will be in touch with you as the date grows near to review specifics. In the meantime, if you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call me at the number listed below.

Cordially,

Ira Sperling

Ira Sperling
Washington Mission

UJA-FEDERATION CAMPAIGN 130 East 59th Street • New York, New York 10022 • (212)980-1000

March 17

MAJOR GIFTS

1986 WASHINGTON MISSION

Jay Zises
Chairman
Martin Barell
Co-Chairman
Armand Lindenbaum
Co-Chairman

January 22, 1986

Senator Robert Dole
141 Senate Hart Office Building
Washington, DC 20510

where? Rm SD-628 - Panel Discussion

Dear Senator Dole:

On Wednesday, March 19th, 150 leaders from the UJA-Federation of Greater New York will be in Washington for our annual one-day Mission. The group will exchange views on domestic and international issues with select representatives of Congress and the Senate.

want you to spend 1/2 hr also on panel.

I would like to invite you to be part of a bipartisan panel of four in a moderated discussion on Domestic Issues of concern to our constituency. The session will run from 2:00 to 3:30 p.m. We would appreciate your participation in answering questions from the moderator and from the floor. The areas we expect to touch upon include: Balancing the Budget, Tax Reform, Housing, Medicaid and Social Services. The implications of the Gramm Rudman bill will surely be an issue of concern.

I would also like to invite you to host a luncheon for approximately ten of our leaders in your office from 12:15 to 1:15 p.m. We would very much appreciate your hospitality and we will provide box lunches for everyone.

want to bring box lunches to your office!!!

Maybe

These leaders of our campaign are major contributors to a philanthropic effort which has raised $130 million in 1985 to help some four million needy people in the greater New York area, in thirty other countries and in Israel. They are keenly informed business leaders who are interested in good government.

Annually the media has been invited and has shown great interest in covering our program.

Ira Sperling, who is staffing this project, will call on you shortly. I look forward to hearing that you will be joining us on Wednesday, March 19th.

Ira Sperling Staff dir.

Sincerely,

Jay Zises

Jay Zises
Integrated Resources, Inc.
Chairman
Washington Mission

March 19
Wed.

Republican
National
Committee

Richard M. Rosenbaum
Member for New York
Lincoln First Tower
Rochester, New York 14603
(716) 546-8000

February 3, 1986

The Honorable Robert F. Dole
Senate Majority Leader
Senate Hart Building, Room 141
Washington, D.C. 20510

Dear Bob:

You have recently received a letter from Jay Zises, who is Chairman of the Washington Mission for the United Jewish Appeal-Federation of Greater New York, inviting you to participate on Wednesday, March 19th in this annual one-day event.

Specifically, it requests that you be part of a bipartisan panel of four in a discussion of Domestic Issues of concern to the UJA-Federation constituency. The session will run from 2:00 to 3:30 P.M. and you would be asked to answer questions from the moderator and from the floor. The subjects to be discussed include the Budget, Tax Reform, Housing, Medicaid and Social Services, and the implications of the Gramm-Rudman Bill.

Also, if you could host a luncheon for approximately ten other leaders of this Mission in your office, from 12:15 to 1:15 P.M., it would be very much appreciated, and we would provide box lunches for everyone.

The members of the UJA-Federation who participate in this annual event are among the most philanthropic of the membership, and in 1985 raised some $130 million to help 4 million needy people in the Greater New York area, as well as some 30 other countries including Israel. They include some of the most influential leaders of the business community.

I would like to personally urge you to accept this invitation.

Thank you for your kind consideration.

Very truly yours,

Richard M. Rosenbaum

RMR/ac

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 19, 1986

TO: SENATOR

FROM: DALE

SUBJECT: UJA WASHINGTON MISSION APPEARANCE

The UJA Washington Mission is expecting you to stop by sometime between 2:00-3:15 for ten to fifteen minutes. After brief opening comments, one or two minutes, they want you to answer questions. The focus of their discussion is domestic issues, principally the budget, Gramm-Rudman-Hollings, and tax reform.

Participants in this meeting are major contributors to the UJA-Federation Campaign of New York. Most are wealthy businessmen. The Executive Committee Chairman is Jay Zises, who is Chairman and Director of Integrated Resources, Inc. and president of the National Political Action Committee and a member of the Council for a Secure America. The other two leaders are Martin Barrell, Chancellor of the University of the State of New York, and a partner in the law firm of Golenbock and Barrell; and Armand Lindenbaum, President of Onandaga Management Corp. and a founding member of the Mid-Manhattan Political Action Committee.

Attached are tax and budget talking points.

TAX REFORM EFFECTIVE DATES

- Last December the Senate passed my resolution urging that the effective date for most provisions of tax reform legislation should be January 1, 1987. The reason for making tax reform "prospective only" is to eliminate the cloud of uncertainty that pending tax reform legislation leaves over many economic decisions that are influenced by tax policy.

- The House also passed an "effective date" resolution, urging the chairman of the tax-writing committees to agree on some determination of effective dates other than the January 1, 1986 date in the House-passed bill.

- Unfortunately, since last December little progress has been made in clarifying the effective date issue. Chairman Rostenkowski has made it fairly clear that he thinks the House bill effective dates are appropriate, although he is willing to remain open to selective changes in those dates.

- Last week eleven members of the Finance Committee sent a letter to Senator Packwood urging that markup of tax reform legislation be delayed until the effective date issue is resolved. I am not sure that is the best strategy, but it is another indication of how much members are concerned about the effective date problem.

- There is still some hope that Rostenkowski, Packwood, et al. can agree on a statement to resolve some of the uncertainty on effective dates. The closer we get to Senate action on the tax bill, the more likely it becomes that Senate's decision on effective dates will be the most important signal we give to the business community of our intentions on the issue.

March 12, 1986

Tax Reform Talking Points

- The President's tax plan and the House bill are similar in concept--they both shift more of the tax burden to corporations and reduce the tax burden on individuals. But the bills are very different in how they make the change.

- Both substantially reduce tax rates for individuals (the President to a maximum of 35%; Ways and Means to 38%) and for corporations (President 33%; Ways and Means 36%). But the Ways and Means rates take effect at much lower income levels: the 35% rate clicks in at $43,000 for married couples, as opposed to $70,000 under the Reagan plan.

- Neither plan gets an A+ for the major objectives of tax reform--simplification and fairness, but the President's plan repealed many more of the overly complicated provisions of the tax code than the Ways and Means Committee effort. The House bill just modifies, but leaves in place, many complex tax rules.

- The House bill falls far short of the President's on fairness grounds. Fringe benefits and itemized deductions are major causes of differing tax liabilities, and unlike the President's proposal, the House retained the State and local tax deduction, did less to limit interest-paid deductions, and did nothing on fringe benefits. This means that taxpayers with equal incomes can still have substantially different tax liabilities.

- I have personally long favored income tax reform and, as Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, led the fight over a number of years to plug unjustified tax loopholes.

- The Senate Finance Committee now is expected to begin action on tax reform around March 19. A lot of difficult decisions await the Committee if it is to make significant progress towards the goals the President has outlined: lower tax rates, a $2,000 personal exemption for everyone, and more incentive for saving and capital investment.

- The 'Packwood draft' of tax reform goes a long way toward meeting the President's goals, including a top rate of 35% and a $2,000 personal exemption for all but the wealthiest taxpayers. Still there are many controversial points that will be closely scrutinized.

--the deduction for State and local sales and personal property taxes would be repealed, and that for income taxes would be available only through the first two brackets.

--Interest deductions would be more severely limited than in the House bill, including a $1,000/$2,000 limit on the consumer interest deduction.

--The minimum tax would have a lower rate and a broader base than in the House bill, but is still likely to be controversial.

--Excise taxes would be increased significantly including those on beer and wine.

o On the plus sides, from the viewpoint of many taxpayers--

--The nonitemizer charitable deduction would be made permanent without adopting the floor under the charitable deduction included in the House bill.

--Investment credit repeal would not take effect until March of this year.

--ACRS would remain the basic depreciation system, with a limited inflation adjustment allowed.

--The R&D credit would be made permanent.

--The amount of new equipment costs small businesses can expense would be dramatically increased.

o All in all, the Packwood draft does a better job of lowering tax rates while encouraging new investment and a productive climate for business.

THE ECONOMY IN 1986

- No one can really predict the course of the economy in 1986, although of course we have to take a stab at it to guide our budget decisions. But it is increasingly clear that the economy began picking up late last year. Leading indicators rose 0.9% in December, the eighth month in a row. Unemployment is down to 6.7%, the lowest since 1979.

- There are forces at work that improve the prospects for strong growth this year. One of these is the drop in oil prices, which acts like a tax cut for energy users and helps moderate inflationary pressures that might build as a result of the dollar's decline. Coupled with the monetary stimulus the Federal Reserve provided in the last six months of 1986, and the prospect for improvement in our balance of trade later in the year (as the effects of the dollar decline are felt), this means we have a good chance for healthy growth in 1986.

- Clearly the number one threat to maintaining a healthy economy remains the U.S. budget deficit. If it's not reduced sharply this year, we won't meet the commitment we made to our trading partners to secure their agreement to ease the dollar down. What's more, we would put an unconscionable burden on the Federal Reserve to keep the recovery going by pumping more money out in order to keep interest rates down. That's a sure recipe for inflation.

- We've created 9 million jobs with a near record economic recovery. We've got inflation down to the lowest levels in two decades. Let's not throw it all a way by punting on the deficit issue. The fact is that <u>all</u> the economic pundits we've been hearing in recent years have been wrong: the economy is more resilient than many believed, but not so strong as to be able to sustain huge deficits this late in the recovery. It's time for everyone to "give" a little in the interest of a deficit-reduction plan that will steer us safely through the potentially treacherous waters ahead.

<u>Gramm-Rudman, the Dollar, and Inflation</u>

- Gramm-Rudman should help us meet the commitment we made last September to our trading partners: to reduce the deficit as part of our effort to moderate the value of other dollar.

- By the same token, the risk of inflation should be reduced if we bring down the deficit under Gramm-Rudman, because the pressure to pump up the money supply to keep interest rates down will ease considerably.

<u>Gramm-Rudman: Challenge to the Established Fiscal Order</u>

- The first actions in response to the new Gramm-Rudman deficit control reform will be taken early in 1986. For those of you who missed it, late last year the Congress imposed a new fiscal straightjacket on itself. The new law sets firm deficit targets for each of the new five years, and mandates automatic across the board spending cuts if the deficit exceeds the target. The first round of automatic cuts under the proposal will take effect March 1 unless Congress comes up with a better way to meet the target.

- In addition, President Reagan's budget for fiscal year 1987 is due to Congress by February 5. So we will have reconsideration of the 1986 budget proceeding simultaneously with our first shot at the 1987 budget.

That is a tall order, but is one we ought to be able to fill. Difficult as it seems, we should remember that the Gramm-Rudman law contains new procedures designed to make it easier to <u>meet</u> the deficit targets. We explicitly bring loan programs and other 'off-budget' items into the budget process; set a point of order against legislation from committees that have not met their budget savings allocation; and rule out of order legislation inconsistent with the deficit targets.

<u>Possible Problems</u>. We know there will be a rocky road ahead in implementing Gramm-Rudman. Congressmen Synar and others already have won the first round in their suit claiming it is unconstitutional, and the Reagan Administration also has some problems with the role of the Congress' General Accounting Office in mediating the deficit forecasts. The Supreme Court will have to give us a final ruling on all that in a few months. Even more important, what Congress can legislate, Congress can back out of. That's why we need a constitutional mandate for budgetary restraint, as well as a statutory one.

- So Gramm-Rudman hasn't made our options any easier: but if it works as planned, it will force us--and the President--to make some decisions and choose among the various deficit-reduction options. That means everyone's cherished spending programs will be put to the test of fiscal responsibility.

Spending the Key. Finally, let me emphasize that Gramm-Rudman is a device for reducing Federal spending. It is not a tax increase plan, or a subterfuge for one. If we fail on the spending front, we can look at other options. But the sooner we entertain any revenue options, you can bet the pressure for spending cuts will drop fast.

The Deficit and the Average American

- Unless we follow a deficit reduction path like that mandated under Gramm-Rudman, American families will face either higher interest rates or higher inflation: not to mention the risk of a disastrous new recession throwing millions of breadwinners out of work. That is what the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings initiative is all about.

- Most economists believe that enactment of deficit reduction measures that eliminate the deficit by the end of the decade will produce a drop of at least 1 percent in interest rates over the short run and 2 to 3 percentage points over the long term: relative to what they otherwise would be.

  -- With a 2% drop in interest rates, the monthly payment on a median priced home ($80,000) would go down by about $100 a month.

  -- Conversely, if we don't reduce the deficit to keep rates as low as they are now, homeowners could face that large an increase--or more-- in monthly payments.

  -- A 2% drop in interest rates would mean an additional $4,000 in income for the average wheat farmer with a 1,000 acre operation.

  -- In 1985, the Federal Government will overspend close to $1,000 for every man, woman, and child in America.

  -- This $1,000 per head of additional federal debt will be one more burden for our children to repay in higher taxes or higher inflation in the future.

Interest on the Debt

The massive increase in debt has itself created one of the largest and fastest growing components of Federal spending--interest on the debt. Constant deficits have put fiscal policy on an endless treadmill of paying for the irresponsibility of previous decades:

- In 1965, interest on the national debt cost $9 billion and consumed 1.4% of GNP. By 1980, annual interest costs rose to $52 billion--2% of GNP. But the worst was yet to come.

- In 1985, interest on the national debt cost taxpayers $130 billion--almost three times the level of five years ago. this represents 3.8% of GNP, 13.5% of the entire 1985 budget, and a 1,450% increase in costs over 1965.

- $130 billion is equal to the sum total of all Federal spending from 1789--the founding of the republic--to 1936. It also equals total Federal outlays in 1966, the entire defense budget in 1980, and twice the level of medicare funding today.

But _if_ we can adhere to the deficit-reduction goals we've set for ourselves, I am very, very optimistic about the course of the economy. I think we take too much for granted what we have achieved so far: strong growth _without_ inflation. We can keep that going if we reduce the deficit substantially. The way is open to economic performance unprecedented in the postwar period if we have the will to find it.