

Los Angeles Area  
Chamber of Commerce  
404 South Bixel Street  
Los Angeles, California 90017-1487  
(213) 629-0711

*Speak*

*April 9  
Wed.*



February 10, 1986

*Joyce*

*in Hart Bldg.*

Ms. Betty Meyers  
Executive Assistant & Personal Secretary  
to Senator Robert Dole  
SH-141 Hart Senate Office Building  
Washington, D.C. 20510

*704  
Dole  
Hart*

Dear Betty:

I am writing to follow up on the request originally tendered to you by Barbara Stemple in Senator Wilson's office for Senator Dole to join him for a breakfast with the Board of Directors of the Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce on Wednesday, April 9, 1986 from 8:30 a.m. - 10:00 a.m. in room #708 of the Hart Senate Office Building. You may recall that we attempted a similar event last year but were unsuccessful. I am extremely pleased that our directors will be able to meet with the Senator this year.

I have attached a copy of the Board of Directors to give you an indication of who comprises our group and will send you a list of participants next month when it has been developed.

If I can be of any assistance to you please feel free to contact me at (213) 629-0657.

Sincerely,

*Greg Fletcher*  
R. Greg Fletcher  
Director  
Governmental Relations

*3/21 Advised Greg Fletcher Sen.  
would barring any last minute  
conflicts*

RGF/jv

cc: Barbara Stemple

*2/19 Interim ltr.*

*same as Headliner speech except we  
added state and local topics.*

LOS ANGELES AREA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS - 1986

- 1 -

CERS:

CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD AND CEO

ROY A. ANDERSON  
Chairman of the Executive Committee  
Lockheed Corporation  
2555 N. Hollywood Way  
Burbank 91520  
(818) 847-6452

DAVID R. CARPENTER  
Chairman, President & CEO  
Transamerica Occidental Life Insurance Co.  
1150 South Olive Street  
Los Angeles 90015  
742-2131

PRESIDENT

RAY REMY  
Los Angeles Area Chamber of Commerce  
404 South Bixel Street  
Los Angeles 90017  
629-0625

H. FREDERICK CHRISTIE  
President  
Southern California Edison Company  
2244 Walnut Grove Avenue  
Rosemead 91770  
(818) 302-1077

IMMEDIATE PAST CHAIRMAN

DAVID E. ANDERSON  
President  
General Telephone Company  
of California  
One GTE Place, RC-1000  
Thousand Oaks 91362-3811  
(805) 372-6302

ALBERT A. DORMAN  
Chairman of the Board and CEO  
Daniel, Mann, Johnson & Mendenhall  
3250 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles 90010  
381-3663

FIRST VICE CHAIRMAN

THOMAS P. KEMP  
President, Grocery Group  
Beatrice Grocery Group  
1645 West Valencia Drive  
Fullerton 92633  
(714) 680-1011

GERALD D. FOSTER  
Region Vice President  
Pacific Bell  
1010 Wilshire Blvd., Room 1630  
Los Angeles 90017  
975-7442

SECOND VICE CHAIRMAN

CHARLES D. MILLER  
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer  
Avery International  
150 North Orange Grove Boulevard  
Pasadena 91103  
(818) 304-2158

JAMES P. MISCOLL  
Executive Vice President  
Bank of America NT & SA  
555 South Flower Street  
Los Angeles 90071  
228-3060

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBERS

JOHN C. ARGUE  
Senior Partner  
Argue Preston Pearson Harbison & Myers  
801 South Flower Street  
Los Angeles 90071  
622-3100

JOSEPH J. PINOLA  
Chairman of the Board & CEO  
First Interstate Bancorp  
707 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles 90017  
614-3004

WALDO H. BURNSIDE  
President & Chief Operating Officer  
Carter Hawley Hale Stores, Inc.  
550 South Flower Street  
Los Angeles 90071  
239-6601

RICHARD L. WEISS  
Partner  
DIXCO  
11740 San Vicente Boulevard, Suite 209  
Los Angeles 90049-5006  
820-8838

PHILLIP L. WILLIAMS  
Executive Vice President  
Times Mirror  
Times Mirror Square  
Los Angeles 90053  
972-3833



OF DIRECTORS - 1986

HER DIRECTORS:

CAROLINE LEONETTI AHMANSON  
(Mrs. Howard Ahmanson)  
Chairman of the Board  
Caroline Leonetti, Ltd.  
9500 Wilshire Boulevard  
Beverly Hills 90212  
275-4282

BYRON ALLUMBAUGH  
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer  
Ralphs Grocery Company  
P.O. Box 54143  
Los Angeles 90054  
605-4024

SHELDON I. AUSMAN  
Managing Partner  
Arthur Andersen & Company  
911 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles 90017  
614-6602

CAROLINE BAKER  
Chairman of the Board  
Los Angeles Junior Chamber  
of Commerce  
404 South Bixel Street  
Los Angeles 90017  
(818) 796-6399

HARRY G. BUBB  
President & Chief Operating Officer  
Pacific Mutual Life Insurance Company  
700 Newport Center Drive  
Newport Beach 92660  
(714) 640-3625

STUART D. BUCHALTER  
Chairman of the Board and  
Chief Executive Officer  
Standard Brands Paint Company  
4300 West 190th Street  
Torrance 90509-2956  
214-2411

MANUEL R. CALDERA  
President  
The Caldera Company  
11111 Santa Monica Blvd., Suite 1111  
Los Angeles 90025  
479-4400

BYRON C. CAMPBELL  
President and Publisher  
Los Angeles Daily News  
14539 Sylvan Street  
Van Nuys 91411  
(818) 997-4303

J. NICHOLAS COUNTER III  
President  
Alliance of Motion Picture  
and Television Producers  
14144 Ventura Boulevard  
Sherman Oaks 91423  
(818) 995-3600

JAMES E. CROSS  
Partner  
O'Melveny & Myers  
400 South Hope Street  
Los Angeles 90071-2899  
669-6571

SUZANNE DE PASSE  
President  
Motown Productions, Inc.  
6255 Sunset Boulevard, 18th Floor  
Los Angeles 90028  
461-9954

ROYCE DIENER  
Chairman of the Board  
American Medical International, Inc.  
414 North Camden Drive  
Beverly Hills 90210  
205-6010

RICHARD J. FLAMSON, III  
Chairman of the Board  
Security Pacific National Bank  
333 South Hope Street (H54-1)  
Los Angeles 90071  
613-5790

DONALD L. GATES  
Vice President and Division Manager  
Safeway Stores, Inc.  
12200 Bellflower Blvd.  
Downey 90241  
922-9226

BOARD OF DIRECTORS - 1986

JOHN V. GIOVENCO  
Executive Vice President - Finance  
Hilton Hotels Corporation  
9880 Wilshire Blvd.  
Beverly Hills 90210  
278-4321

DONALD L. HANLEY  
Senior Vice President  
Unocal Refining & Marketing Division  
Western Region  
UNOCAL Corporation  
911 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1410  
Los Angeles 90017  
977-6683

RUSSELL L. HANLIN  
President & Chief Executive Officer  
Sunkist Grower, Inc.  
14130 Riverside Drive  
Sherman Oaks 91423  
(818) 986-4800

JOHN F. HARRIGAN  
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer  
Union Bank  
445 South Figueroa Street  
Los Angeles 90071  
236-7417

ROBERT M. HOLMES  
Chief Executive Officer  
Oltmans Construction Company  
1005 Mission Mill Road  
Whittier 90608-0985  
948-4242

DR. RAY R. IRANI  
President & Chief Operating Officer  
Occidental Petroleum Corporation  
10889 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles 90024  
208-8800

STEVEN G. LAUTSCH  
Assistant Vice President - Sales  
Southern Pacific Transportation Co.  
610 South Main Street, #314  
Los Angeles 90014  
629-6868

LILLY LEE  
President  
Lilly Enterprises, Inc.  
Lilly Property Management Co.  
9171 Wilshire Blvd., #525  
Beverly hills 90210  
271-6177

THOMAS L. LEE  
President & Chief Operating Officer  
The Newhall Land and Farming Company  
23823 Valencia Boulevard  
Valencia 91355  
(805) 255-4020

FRANK W. LYNCH  
President & Chief Operating Officer  
Northrop Corporation  
1840 Century Park East  
Los Angeles 90501  
556-4556

ROBERT M. McINTYRE  
Chairman of the Board & CEO  
Southern California Gas Company  
810 South Flower Street  
Los Angeles 90017  
689-3800

ROBERT F. MAGUIRE III  
Co-Managing Partner  
Maguire Thomas Partners  
1299 Ocean Avenue, Suite 1000  
Santa Monica 90401  
394-7620

JAMES S. MORRISON  
Executive Vice President  
Atlantic Richfield Company  
515 South Flower Street  
Los Angeles 90071  
486-1794

WINSTON V. MORROW  
President & Chief Executive Officer  
Ticor  
6300 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles 90048  
852-6313



OF DIRECTORS - 1986

-4-

JWEN F. MURPHY  
Regional Vice President  
Chevron U.S.A. Inc.  
700 South Flower Street, Suite 1426  
Los Angeles 90017  
489-4133

WILLIAM G. MYERS  
President  
Ojai Ranch & Investment Company, Inc.  
2376 Gridley Road - Ladera Ranch  
Ojai 93023  
(805) 646-8195

PATRICIA S. NETTLESHIP  
Chairman and Chief Executive Officer  
North Pacific Construction Management  
2665 Main Street  
Santa Monica 90405  
392-8585

THOMAS H. NIELSEN  
President  
The Irvine Company  
550 Newport Center Drive  
Newport Beach 92660  
(714) 720-2206

ROBERT D. PAULSON  
Managing Director, L.A. Office  
McKinsey & Company, Inc.  
400 South Hope Street  
Los Angeles 90071  
624-1414

ALLEN QUESTROM  
Chairman & Chief Executive Officer  
Bullock's Department Stores, Inc.  
800 South Hope Street  
Los Angeles 90017  
612-5933

DONALD B. RICE  
President & Chief Executive Officer  
The Rand Corporation  
1700 Main Street  
Santa Monica 90406-2138  
393-0411

JOHN J. ROSCIA  
Senior Vice President and  
Assistant to the Chairman  
Rockwell International Corporation  
2230 East Imperial Highway  
El Segundo 90245  
647-5106

JAMES M. ROSSER  
President  
California State University, Los Angeles  
5151 State University Drive  
Los Angeles 90032  
224-3201

GEORGE P. RUTLAND  
President & Chief Executive Officer  
CalFed, Inc.  
5670 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles 90036  
932-2100

GLENN T. SAKAI  
President  
Pacific Partners, Inc.  
9944 Santa Monica Boulevard  
Beverly Hills 90212-1691  
556-6780

FRANK M. SANCHEZ  
Owner/Operator (local franchise)  
McDonald's Restaurant  
5545 Whittier Boulevard  
Los Angeles 90022  
727-0747

BETSY SANDERS  
Vice President  
Nordstrom  
3333 Bristol  
Costa Mesa 92626  
(714) 549-8300 ext. 1500

WILLIAM D. SCHULTE  
Managing Partner  
Peat, Marwick, Mitchell & Co.  
725 South Figueroa Street  
Los Angeles 90017  
972-4000

BOARD OF DIRECTORS 1986

LEONARD H. STRAUS  
Chairman  
Thrifty Corporation  
3424 Wilshire Boulevard  
Los Angeles 90010  
251-2345

DANIEL D. VILLANUEVA  
President & General Manager  
KMEX-TV Channel 34  
5420 Melrose Avenue  
Los Angeles 90038  
466-3434

HAROLD S. VOEGELIN  
Partner  
Finley, Kumble, Wagner, Heine  
707 Wilshire Boulevard, 44th Floor  
Los Angeles 90017  
612-3100

LINDA WACHNER  
Managing Director  
Adler & Shaykin  
16000 Ventura Boulevard, Suite 902  
Encino 91436  
(818) 990-7272

BILL WHITE  
Vice President &  
General Manager  
KTTV  
5746 Sunset Boulevard  
Los Angeles 90028  
462-7111

DONALD H. WHITE  
President  
Hughes Aircraft Company  
7200 Hughes Terrace  
Los Angeles 90045-0066  
568-6200

JOHN A. WRIGHT  
President & Chief Operating Officer  
Fluor Corporation  
3333 Michelson Drive  
Irvine 92730  
(714) 975-2000



April 7, 1986

STATE AND LOCAL TAX DEDUCTION

- o I know a number of you are concerned about the possible loss of the state and local tax deduction. And you probably are also concerned that I have been reported as saying we should not take the state and local deduction "off the table" as the Senate considers tax reform.
- o I want to assure you that I have no interest in singling out this deduction. Nor do I have a "hidden agenda" to reduce government activity at the state and local level.
- o However I am a realist. If we are going to accommodate the President and reduce tax rates, we must find revenue sources which will make rate reduction possible. We cannot do it solely by raising corporate taxes. The President originally proposed raising corporate taxes by \$131 billion over 5 years, but he still needed to repeal the state and local tax deduction to reach his goals for individual rate reduction.
- o In contrast, the House did not repeal or modify the deduction, but they had to add a 38 percent bracket and they had to compress the tax rate brackets substantially so that individuals would reach higher brackets sooner. In addition, they had to put interest in tax exempt bonds in the minimum tax. They also would raise corporate taxes by \$141 billion over five years. These changes certainly are not without controversy either.
- o If we are going to try to act on the President's request to improve on the rate structure designed by the House, we will have to address the items that reduce taxable income for individuals. That list is short--itemized deductions and fringe benefits. The only significant itemized deductions from a revenue standpoint are interest paid, charitable contributions and state and local taxes. Similarly, the only significant fringe benefits are group health insurance and group term life insurance.

Packwood Proposal

- o The Packwood proposal seems to strike a reasonable compromise on the State and local tax deduction. Under his plan no deduction would be available for State and local sales and personal property taxes. State and local income taxes would remain fully deductible, except in the 35% bracket, where tax deduction would be available only up to 25% (the next highest bracket).

-2-

- o The Packwood proposal does not single out the state and local tax deduction. It would apply the 25% bracket limitation to all the other itemized deductions except for the charitable contributions, home mortgage interest, and real property taxes. In addition, the proposal limits the itemized deduction for interest paid, except for home mortgage interest, to \$1,000 for single taxpayers and \$2,000 for joint filers.



April 7, 1986

### BUDGET TALKING POINTS

o One piece of good budget news is that on Monday President Reagan signed the budget reconciliation bill that will yield more than \$18 billion in savings over the next three years. It was a long time getting here but certain worth it.

### OVERVIEW

o The Senate Budget Committee reported out a fiscal 1987 budget by a 13-9 vote. 7 Republicans and 6 Democrats voted for the resolution.

o I salute Chairman Domenici, and the rest of the members of the Budget Committee for their diligence and the speed with which the produced the budget.

o It is the first step in the process. It is my intention to begin a series of meetings with my colleagues this week to see if we can develop a consensus on budget strategy. We're already somewhat behind the schedule set out in the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings measure. But we're certainly far ahead of the House, which has chosen to do nothing to date.

### IMPLICATIONS OF FAILURE TO MEET DEADLINES

o Missing the April 15 deadline would make it even more questionable that the reconciliation process necessary to achieve savings would be completed by June 15.

o Missing the April 15 deadline would further complicate and delay tax-reform legislation this year, since a major issue of revenue increases or neutrality in tax reform would remain an open issue.

o Procedurally, the failure to adopt a resolution by April 15 means that appropriation bill mark-ups would proceed with no general blueprint for FY 1987 spending.

o Assuming no resolution is adopted by May 15, then House appropriation bills would likely proceed to be reported, passed, and sent to the Senate. No point of order (Section 303) would lie against such bills in the House, but would lie in the Senate. The Senate could waive the point-of-order by a majority vote, voting on a resolution by the SBC. It is not clear that the SBC would be able to report such a resolution and such a resolution would likely be objected to by Minority Leader Byrd if it were reported using a poll.

#### DETAILS OF BUDGET RESOLUTION

o From my perspective the resolution approved by the Budget Committee leaves something to be desired. First, I believe that the defense spending authority for next year is too low. And second, that the increase in revenues -- close to \$75 billion over three years -- is much too high. I'm not alone in this thinking. Just before Congress adjourned for the Easter recess, I received a letter signed by 24 Republican senators expressing the same concerns.

o However, I understand the problem Senator Domenici faced in getting a resolution out of the committee -- the delicate balance between enough for defense, but not too much, enough cuts in domestic programs, but not too much, and enough revenues to meet the \$144 billion deficit figure in Gramm-Rudman-Hollings.

o The total deficit reduction in the resolution is \$38.8 billion in fiscal 1987; \$58.9 billion in 1988; and \$74.4 billion in 1989.

o The Committee's budget resolution contains \$18.7 billion in additional revenues in fiscal 1987 and a total of \$74.3 billion from fiscal 1987-89. Revenue effects from spending measures assumed in the budget, such as retirement reforms and the sale of CONRAIL, plus revenue from reconciliation would account for \$6.1 billion, \$22.3 billion over three years. And the president's budget contained \$5.9 billion in FY 87 revenue increases, \$21.6 over three years.

o Defense spending under the resolution would call for \$295.1 billion in FY 87 budget authority and \$280 billion in outlays. The President requested \$320.4 billion in budget authority, outlays, \$282.2 billion. According to the Budget Committee, the amounts included in the resolution allows for 2.8 % growth in budget authority from the FY 86 post-sequester budget authority level. In FY 1988 and 1989 there would be a 1% real growth rate.



o The budget resolution would reduce non-defense spending in FY 87 by \$17.3 billion in outlays, and by more than \$70 billion from FY 87-89, mostly through freezes and reductions. However, \$2.3 billion in additional FY 87 spending would be allocated for critical programs such as embassy security, space shuttle construction, a farm credit initiative (\$400 million over 3 years), IRS, Head Start and key education programs.

Social Security, military and civil service pensions and all other indexed programs would receive a cost-of-living adjustment. All civilian and military personnel would receive a 3% pay raise.

o Agriculture: The budget resolution assumes the enactment of the tobacco price support program contained in reconciliation with projected reduced budget authority and outlays of \$100 million in fiscal 1987 and \$600 million over three years; It assumes \$ 300 million in savings over three years from enactment of the 1985 farm bill; and it increases budget authority by \$150 million in each of the next three years and \$130 million in fiscal 1987 for farm credit programs.

o Committee vote: For the resolution: Andrews, Boschwitz, Danforth, Domenici, Gorton, Grassley, Kassebaum, Chiles, Exon, Hollings, Johnston, Metzenbaum, Riegle.

Against: Armstrong, Hatch, Kasten, Quayle, Symms, Hart, Lautenberg, Moynihan, Sasser.

#### TAX REFORM EFFECTIVE DATES

- o Last December the Senate passed my resolution urging that the general date for 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.
- o 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.
- o Unfortunately, since last December only modest progress has been made in clarifying the effective date issue other than in the tax exempt bond area. Last week Senator Packwood, Senator Long, Congressman Rostenkowski, Congressman Duncan and Secretary Baker released a joint statement that certain of the tax-exempt bond provisions should not go into effect before September first.
- o Senator Packwood has also released his package of tax reform with a general effective date of January 1, 1987 although, some items such as the repeal of the investment tax credit would be effective March 1, 1986 and other items such as the rate reductions would be delayed until mid-1987.
- o I also understand, however, that Senator Packwood's proposal to include all tax-exempt interest as a preference item for the corporate and individual minimum tax is causing some of the same uncertainty for the bond market as the effective date problem.
- o At our first markup session I joined 17 of my colleagues on the Committee in agreeing not to sign any tax reform conference report unless the effective dates substantially followed those in the Senate bill. We also agreed not to negotiate a conference agreement on substantive issues until the effective date issue was resolved.



March 27, 1986

Tax Reform Talking Points

- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o The Senate Finance Committee has begun action on tax reform and will have a full schedule after the Easter recess. A lot of difficult decisions await the Committee if it is to maintain momentum 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.
- o 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.

-2-

- 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.



### 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:

- o 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.
- o 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.
- o \$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.

### Gramm-Rudman, the Dollar, and Inflation

- o 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.
- o 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.

### Gramm-Rudman: Challenge to the Established Fiscal Order

- o 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.
- o 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 meet 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.

Possible Problems. 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.



- o 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

- o 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.
- o 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.

## THE ECONOMY IN 1986

- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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.
- o 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 all 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.



CONTRA AID

Senate vote

-- MAJOR TURNAROUND FROM YEAR AGO:

-- STRONG CONSENSUS FOR \$100 MILLION IN AID,  
INCLUDING MILITARY AID.

-- SENATE VOTE DECISIVE:

-- TWO ATTEMPTS TO GUT PROGRAM DEFEATED 2-1.

-- SENATE VOTE BIPARTISAN:

 TWO DEMOCRATIC COSPONSORS (BENTSEN AND HOLLINGS)

-- 11 DEMOCRATIC VOTES (A QUARTER OF DEMOCRATS)

Time for House to act

-- SANDINISTAS GAVE RESPONSE TO EARLIER HOUSE VOTE AGAINST  
PRESIDENT BY INVASION INTO NICARAGUA.

-- INCREDIBLE THAT SOME OPPONENTS OF PRESIDENT RESPOND  
BY SAYING: "NO BIG DEAL. THEY'VE INVADED 300 TIMES  
BEFORE." THOSE 300 INVASIONS ARE THE PROBLEM.

-- HOUSE SHOULD ACT NOW, DECISIVELY, TO SUPPORT PRESIDENT.

-- O'NEILL MADE COMMITMENT TO DEAL WITH ISSUE.

-- NO REASON TO WAIT UNTIL APRIL 15 OR ATTACH TO  
SUPPLEMENTAL.

-- OBVIOUS POLITICAL PLOY TO PRESSURE PRESIDENT TO  
ACCEPT EXTRA SPENDING ON SUPPLEMENTAL.

-- PROPER VEHICLE IS S. J. RES. 283, PASSED BY SENATE.

-2-

Further compromise?

- MANY OF CONCERNS EXPRESSED BY HOUSE MEMBERS:
  - ALREADY ADDRESSED BY WHITE HOUSE.
  - INCORPORATED INTO LAW IN S. J. RES. 283.

New Contadora effort?

- US HASN'T ABANDONED CONTADORA.
- IF YESTERDAY'S PRESS REPORTS ACCURATE, CENTRAL AMERICAN DEMOCRACIES RIGHTLY OBJECTING TO UNREASONABLE DEMANDS OF SANDINISTAS THAT US UNILATERALLY ABANDON ALLIES AND FRIENDS IN REGION.
- SANDINISTAS DON'T WANT CONTADORA TO WORK. THEY WANT TO USE IT TO FURTHER OWN AIMS IN CENTRAL AMERICA.
  - ESPECIALLY FORCED WITHDRAWAL OF US FROM REGION.
- HARD TO UNDERSTAND HOW WE'RE BLAMED FOR BLOCKING A REGIONAL SETTLEMENT WHEN IT'S SANDINISTAS WHO HAVE ATTACKED AND INVADED NEIGHBORS HUNDREDS OF TIMES.

Bilateral negotiations

- WE'RE WILLING ON ONLY ONE VERY REASONABLE CONDITION: SANDINISTAS TALK TO CONTRAS, TOO.
  - SAME DEAL DUARTE OFFERING IN EL SALVADOR.
- DON'T DENY THERE ARE SOME BILATERAL PROBLEMS WORTH TALKING ABOUT.
- IT'S SANDINISTAS WHO TAKE RIDICULOUS POSITION THEY HAVE NOTHING TO TALK TO CONTRAS ABOUT.



## TERRORISM

### Libyan threat/US response

- CLEAR KADDAFI USES TERRORISM AS ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF HIS FOREIGN POLICY.
- LIKE MOST AMERICANS, I'M FED UP WITH KADDAFI.
- UNACCEPTABLE THAT TERRORISM SHOULD:
  - LIMIT US POLICIES OR ABILITY TO PURSUE OUR INTERESTS.
  - MAKE AMERICANS AFRAID TO TRAVEL.
- US MUST RESPOND SWIFTLY AND DECISIVELY WHEN IT IS CLEAR THAT KADDAFI (OR ANYONE ELSE) BEHIND TERRORIST ACT.
- OBVIOUSLY CAN'T TIP HAND ON SPECIFIC RESPONSE BUT
  - MUST BE EQUAL TO PROVOCATION.
  - MUST BE PREPARED TO USE FORCE.

### Berlin bombing

- IF IT TURNS OUT KADDAFI BEHIND BERLIN BOMBING, HE SHOULD PAY.

### Terrorism bill

- WORKING WITH HOUSE REPUBLICAN STUDY COMMITTEE ON POSSIBLE ANTI-TERRORISM LEGISLATION.
- WOULD CLARIFY PRESIDENT'S AUTHORITY AND STRENGTHEN HIS HAND IN DEALING WITH TERRORISM.
- WILL DEFINE TERRORISM AS ACT OF AGGRESSION AGAINST US (NOT JUST ANOTHER DOMESTIC CRIME) AND GIVE PRESIDENT AUTHORITY TO RESPOND IN KIND.
- WILL HAVE FULL SAFEGUARDS:
  - WILL NOT GIVE PRESIDENT ANY AUTHORITY IN US OR AFFECT ANY CITIZENS' RIGHTS.

-2-

-- NOT AIMED AT BROADENING PRESIDENT'S POWER AS  
COMMANDER IN CHIEF OR IN CONDUCTING FOREIGN POLICY.

-- JUST SHARPEN ABILITY TO RESPOND TO  
TERRORISM.

-- WILL HAVE REPORTING REQUIREMENT: PRESIDENT WILL  
HAVE TO CITE SPECIFIC TERRORIST ACT/THREAT TO WHICH  
HE IS RESPONDING.

-- HOPE TO HAVE IT READY BY NEXT WEEK.

Tighten security

-- OBVIOUSLY ONE ELEMENT OF OUR POLICY MUST BE DEFENSIVE.

-- END OF MONTH FOREIGN RELATIONS WILL BE DEALING WITH  
EMBASSY SECURITY PACKAGE.

-- ALSO TIGHTENING UP OUR OWN SECURITY.

-- ORDERED SENATE SECURITY FORCES TO BE PREPARED.



April 7, 1986

STATE AND LOCAL TAX DEDUCTION

- o I know a number of you are concerned about the possible loss of the state and local tax deduction. And you probably are also concerned that I have been reported as saying we should not take the state and local deduction "off the table" as the Senate considers tax reform.
- o I want to assure you that I have no interest in singling out this deduction. Nor do I have a "hidden agenda" to reduce government activity at the state and local level.
- o However I am a realist. If we are going to accommodate the President and reduce tax rates, we must find revenue sources which will make rate reduction possible. We cannot do it solely by raising corporate taxes. The President originally proposed raising corporate taxes by \$131 billion over 5 years, but he still needed to repeal the state and local tax deduction to reach his goals for individual rate reduction.
- o In contrast, the House did not repeal or modify the deduction, but they had to add a 38 percent bracket and they had to compress the tax rate brackets substantially so that individuals would reach higher brackets sooner. In addition, they had to put interest in tax exempt bonds in the minimum tax. They also would raise corporate taxes by \$141 billion over five years. These changes certainly are not without controversy either.
- o If we are going to try to act on the President's request to improve on the rate structure designed by the House, we will have to address the items that reduce taxable income for individuals. That list is short--itemized deductions and fringe benefits. The only significant itemized deductions from a revenue standpoint are interest paid, charitable contributions and state and local taxes. Similarly, the only significant fringe benefits are group health insurance and group term life insurance.

Packwood Proposal

- o The Packwood proposal seems to strike a reasonable compromise on the State and local tax deduction. Under his plan no deduction would be available for State and local sales and personal property taxes. State and local income taxes would remain fully deductible, except in the 35% bracket, where tax deduction would be available only up to 25% (the next highest bracket).

-2-

- o The Packwood proposal does not single out the state and local tax deduction. It would apply the 25% bracket limitation to all the other itemized deductions except for the charitable contributions, home mortgage interest, and real property taxes. In addition, the proposal limits the itemized deduction for interest paid, except for home mortgage interest, to \$1,000 for single taxpayers and \$2,000 for joint filers.