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Mr. Millikin, from the Committee on Finance, submitted the following

## REPORT

[To accompany H. R. 3950]
The Committee on Finance, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 3950) to reduce individual income-tax payments, having had the same under consideration, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

## I. GENERAL STATEMENT

The provisions of H. R. 3950 are identical with those of H. R. 1 as agreed to in conference and as passed by both Houses, except that H. R. 3950 ':ecomes effective January 1, 1948. H. R. 1, as agreed to in conference, was passed by both Houses but was vetoed by the President, and the veto was sustained by the House of Representatives.

Because of the effect on the revenue, some Members of both Houses urged that tax reduction be deferred until January 1, 1948. This bill achicves that result.

The desirability of the proposed tax reduction must be weighed in connection with estimated revenues, expenditures, and debt reduction. It was estimated that H. R. 1 as agreed to in conference would have reduced collections in fiscal year 1948 by $\$ 3.3$ billion. H. R. 3950 will reduce collections in that year by only $\$ 1.5$ billion.

Three appropriation bills have been signed by the President and involve reductions in appropriations for the fiscal year 1948 of $\$ 1.136$ billion. Six bills are pending in the Senate or in conference involving reductions in appropriations by the House for the fiscal year 1948 of $\$ 1.526$ billion. The total reductions in appropriations for fiscal year 1948 on this basis would be $\$ 2.662$ billion.

The reduction in expenditures, as distinguished from appropriations. will be substantially larger. In the President's budget it was indicated that 1948 appropriations would be about 86 percent of expendtures in that fiscal year. This percentage relationship meana that
a reduction of $\$ 2.7$ billion in appropriations is the equivalent of a cut of $\$ 3.1$ billion in expenditures. Recognizing that there may be certain increases in appropriations and also reductions, by way of recisions, cut-backs, eliminations or transfers of expenditure items from one year to another, it seems reasonable to estimate expenditure reduction of not less than $\$ 3$ billion, reducing total expenditures from the budget estimate of $\$ 37.5$ billion to approximately $\$ 34.5$ billion.

On the income side, the experience in the past few months justifies the contention that the revenue estimate of $\$ 41.4$ billion used by the linance Committee in connection with H. R. 1 was a conservative one. That estimate was based upon the assumption that income payments in the fiscal year 1948 would be $\$ 170$ billion. Income payments are now running at the rate of $\$ 178$ billion a year. It is clear that even if income payments were to fall substantially below this level, they could hardly be expected to average less than the $\$ 170$ billion used by the committee in its revenue estimate for the fiscal year 1948.

With receipts of $\$ 41.4$ billion and expenditures of $\$ 34.5$ billion, there will be a surplus of $\$ 6.9$ billion. The loss of collections of $\$ 1.5$ billion resulting from the enactment of $\mathrm{H} . \mathrm{R} .3950$ will leave $\$ 5.4$ billion for debt retirement and contingencies. This should provide ample reassurance, even to those with the most pessimistic fiscal views, that this proposed tax reduction is fully warranted.

## II. SUMMARY OF CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

This bill brings reductions to all individual income-tax payers, effective January 1, 1948. The reductions are summarized in table I.

Table I.-Tax reduction provided by H. R. 8950

| Surtax net income | Tentative tax | Reduction in tentative tax under your committee's bill | Actual tax reduction under your committee's bill |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 to \$1,000................. | \$0 to \$200.. | 33.5 percent.................. | 30 percent. |
| \$1,000 to \$1,400 1......... | \$200 to \$279.17. | \$67...... | 30 to 20 percent. |
| \$1,400 1 to \$130,700 ${ }^{2} \ldots$ | \$279.17 to \$100,000. |  | 20 percent. |
| \$136,700 ${ }^{2}$ to \$302,400 ${ }^{\text {\% }}$. | \$100,000 to \$250,000.... | $\$ 24,000$ plus $191 / 4$ percent of excess in tentative tax over \$100,000. | $\$ 19,000$ plus 15 percent of excess tax under present law over $\$ 95,000$. |
| \$302,400 ${ }^{3}$ and over....... | \$250,000 and over....... | $\$ 52,875$ plus 15 percent of excess in tentative tax over $\$ 250,000$. | $\$ 40,375$ plus 10.5 percent 4 of excess tax under presant law over $\$ 237,500$. |

1 The exact breaking point in surtax net income as provided in H. R. 3950 is $\$ 1,305.83$.
2 The exact breaking point in surtax net income as provided in H. R. 39:4 is $\$ 133,719.10$.
The exact breaking point in surtax net income as provided in H. R. 3050 is $\$ 302,395.60$.
4 'The exact percentage reduction on surtax net incomes in excess of $\$ 302,395.60$ is between 10.52 and 10.63 percent.

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.
The largest percentage of tax reduction under your committee's bill is 30 percent. This goes to the 26 million taxpayers with surtax net incomes of $\$ 1,000$ or less. This group represents 53 percent of the total number filing tax returns. It includes single persons with incomes, before deductions and exemptions, up to $\$ 1,667$ per year; married couples with incomes up to $\$ 2,222$ per year; and married couples with two dependents with incomes up to $\$ 3,333$ per year.

The next largest reduction goes to taxpayers with surtax net incomes between $\$ 1,000$ and about $\$ 1,400$. The 7 million taxpayers in this group will each receive a flat reduction of $\$ 67$, including the 5 percent reduction allowed under existing law.

Taxpayers whose surtax net incomes are between $\$ 1,400$ and approximately $\$ 136,700$ will receive a 20 -percent reduction. There are about $16 \frac{1}{2}$ million taxpayers in this group.

Taxpayers with surtax net incomes between $\$ 136,700$ and approximately $\$ 302,400$ receive a 20 -percent reduction on that part of their tax which is attributable to surtax net income up to $\$ 136,700$ and a 15 -percent reduction on the excess. There are about 4,000 taxpayers in this group.

The remaining 577 taxpayers with surtax net incomes above $\$ 302,700$ receive the same reduction as the previous group on that part of their tax attributable to their surtax net income up to $\$ 302,700$. On that part of the tax attributable to surtax net income in excess of that amount, a reduction of $101 / 2$ percent is provided.

In addition to the rate reductions discussed above, H. R. 3950 provides an additional $\$ 500$ exemption for each person who has attained the age of 65 or over before the end of the taxable year. This exemption will bencfit $3,700,000$ taxpayers and will remove $1,400,000$ from the tax rolls.

## III. ESTIMATED REVENUE EFFECT OF TAX REDUCTION

With an income payment level of 170 billion dollars in the fiscal year 1948, individual income-tax liabilities under your committee's bill are estimated at about 13.7 billion dollars. This represents a liability reduction from present law of about 4.1 billion dollars. Table II shows, by selected net income classes, the number of individual in-come-tax returns, the amount of tax liabilities under present law, and the reductions in tax liability provided by H. R. 3950.

Table II.-Distribution of tax returns, tax under present law, and tax reduction under H. R. 3950 (with income payments of $\$ 170$ billions)

| Net income class (000 omitted) | Taxable returns |  | Tax under present |  | Reduction provided by H. R. 3950 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Percent of total | Amount | Percent of total | Amount | Percent of total |
| \$0 to \$3. | 30, 710, 430 | 79.9 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Millions } \\ \$ 6,479 \end{gathered}$ | 36.5 | Millions $\$ 1,800$ | 44.1 |
| * to \$5. | 8,012, 673 | 16.2 | 3, 520 | 10.8 | 772 | 18.9 |
| Total under \$5. | 47, 723, 103 | 96.1 | 9, 999 | 56.3 | 2, 572 | 63.0 |
| \$5 to \$10, | 1, 265, 839 | 2.5 | 1,453 | 8. 2 | 307 | 7.5 |
| \$10 to \$25... | 530,578 151,643 | 1.1 | 1,125 4,178 | 12.0 23.5 | 428 774 | 10.5 19.0 |
| \$25 and over | 151,643 | . 3 | 4,178 | 23.5 | 774 | 19.0 |
| Total over \$5..: | 1,948,060 | 3.9 | 7,756 | 43.7 | 1,609 | 37.0 |
| Grand total... | 49, 671, 163 | 100.0 | 17,755 | 100.0 | 4,081 | 100.0 |

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.
The proposed tax reduction of about $\$ 4.1$ billion expressed on a liability basis indicates the decrease in the obligations incurred by taxpayers during the first 12 months the tax reduction is effective.

The reduction of $\$ 1.5$ billion expressed on a collection basis indicates the actual loss in the receipts of the Government during the fiscal year 1948. The liability estimate as distinguished from the collection estimate is useful in illustrating the ultimate effect of the reduction. The collection estimate as distinguished from the liability estimate is necessary to determine the immediate effect of the reduction on the Federal budget.

## IV. FISCAL EXPERIENCE OF THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN 1947 AND THE OUTLOOK FOR 1948

The experience of the fiscal year 1947 which has just closed is summarized in table III. This table reveals that receipts were underestimated by the Treasury throughout the year. Even as late as April 1947 the estimate was $\$ 800$ million below the actual figure. The receipts realized made possible a surplus of $\$ 800$ million in spite of the fact that expenditures were $\$ 7.4$ billion higher than originally estimated by the Budget-Bureau in January 1946.
Table III.-Receipts and expenditures of the Federal Government; official estimates and' actual experience in the fiscal year 1947


Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.
The forecast for the fiscal year 1948 is summarized in the following table, using the estimate of receipts presented in the Senate Finance Committee report on H. R. 1 and the estimate of expenditures presented in the President's budget of January 1947:
[Ln billions of dollars]


On the assumption of a reduction of $\$ 3$ billion in expenditures, the following results:
[In billions of dollars)

|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Prosent } \\ \text { Law } \end{gathered}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Receipts | 41.4 34.5 | ${ }_{34.8}^{39.8}$ |
| Surplus | 6.9 | 8.1 |

The surplus of $\$ 5.4$ billion remaining after the enactment of H. R. 3950 should provide amply for debt retirement and contingencies.

If it were assumed that the present levels of employment and output would continue, receipts in the fiscal year 1948 would approximate $\$ 43$ billion, as contrasted with your committee's conservative estimate of $\$ 41.4$ billion.

## F. WHY THE TYPE OF TAX REDUCTION PROVIDED IN THIS BILL SHOULD BE MADE

There is at the present time an acute need for investment capital for the establishment and maintenance of smaller businesses. Also, it is exceedingly short-sighted and foolhardy to assume that the wartime accumulated surpluses, on which our larger industries are maintaining their present high level of production, will continue indefinitely without the help of outside venture capital. This bill gives a stimulus to risk-taking by increasing the investor's retained share of any resulting profits.

As is the case with risk capital, managerial incentive finds discouragement in the present marginal rates; that is, the rates on the top dollar of income received.

Table IV.-Comparison between the marginal rates of the individual income tax under present law and H. R. 3950

| Surtax net income |  | Marginal rates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| From- | To- | Present law | $\underset{3050}{\mathbf{H}, \mathbf{R}} .$ |
| \% 0 | \$1,000. | 19.0 | 13.3 |
| \$1,000. | \$1,400 ${ }^{1}$ | 19.0 | (3) |
| \$1,400 ${ }^{1}$ | \$2,000.. | 19.0 | 15.2 |
| \$2,000... | \$4,000. | 20.9 | 16.7 |
| \$1,000.. | \$6,000. | 24.7 | 19.8 |
| \$6,000. | \$8,000.. | 28. 5 | 22.8 |
| \$8,000- | \$10,000. | 32.3 | 25.8 |
| \$10,000. | \$12,000. | 36.1 | 28.9 |
| \$12,000.. | \$14,000. | 40.9 | 32.7 |
| \$14,000. | \$16,000. | 44.7 | 35.7 |
| \$16,000. | \$18,000. | 47.5 | 38.0 |
| \$18,000. | \$20,000. | 80.4 | 40.3 |
| \$20,000. | \$22,000. | 63.2 | 42.6 |
| \$22,000. | \$26,000. | 56.1 | 44.8 |
| \$20,000. | \$32,000.. | 68.9 | 47.1 |
| \$32,000 | \$38,000.. | 61.8 | 49.4 |
| \$38,000 | \$44,000... | 65.6 | 82. ${ }^{-}$ |
| \$44,000. | \$50,000.. | 68.4 | 84.7 |
| \$50,000. | \$60,000.. | 71.8 | 87.0 |
| \$60,000. | \$70,000.- | 74.1 | 59.3 |
| \$70,000. | \$80,000.. | 77.0 | 61.6 |
| \$80,000. | \$90,000.. | 79.8 | 63.8 |
| \$90,000.. | \$100,000.. | 82.7 | 66.1 |
| \$100,000. | \$136,700 ${ }^{3}$ | 84.6 | 67.6 |
| \$136,700 ${ }^{3}$ | \$150,000.. | 84.6 85.5 | 71.9 |
| \$150,000.. | \$200,000 | 88.5 86.5 | 72.7 73.6 |
| \$200,000............... | \$302,400 ${ }^{\text {² }}$ | 86.5 86.5 | 73.5 77.8 |
| \$302,400 4 and over ${ }^{\text {b }}$-.. |  | 86.5 | 77.3 |

[^0]If under existing law a person with an income of $\$ 10,000$ has an opportunity to earn an additional $\$ 1,000$ by new investment, or by increased salary from acceptance of added responsibility, he must bear in mind, in deciding whether to accept the opportunity, the fact that 36 percent of the additional income will be taken from him by the Government through the individual income tax. i person with an income of $\$ 50,000$ who receives an additional $\$ 1,000$ must pay 71 percent of this to the Government. A person with an income of $\$ 100,000$ obtaining an extra $\$ 1,000$ must pay $84 \frac{1}{2}$ percent of this to the Government.

If the investors of the country are unwilling to take the risks of developing new enterprises and the managers do not have the incentive to put forth increased effort, the level of business activity will decline, to the detriment of all persons in our society. While the extent of the reduction in marginal rates provided by H. R. 3950 is necessarily limited, it represents a substantial improvement over the present law.

Another means of indicating the severity of the existing incometax rates is to consider the number of days which the individuals with various net incomes must now work to pay their income taxes. A married person, without dependents and with income before exemptions of $\$ 1,200$, works 11 days a year to pay his income tax. A single person with income of $\$ 7,000$ works 1 day out of 5 for the Government. If his income were increased to $\$ 20,000$, it becomes 1 day out of 3 . If-he-receives an income of $\$ 50,000$, every other day must be spent in the employ of the tax collector. If he receives $\$ 200,000$, he must spend 3 out of every 4 days working for the Federal Government.
Both H. R. 1 and H. R. 3950 reduce the taxes of those with incomes, after deductions and exemptions, of $\$ 1,000$ or less by 30 percent. Furthermore, only those persons whose incomes, after deductions and exemptions, are $\$ 1,400$ or less will receive a reduction of more than 20 percent. On the other hand, such income between $\$ 136,700$ and $\$ 302,400$ is given a tax reduction of only 15 percent, and the tax on such income in excess of $\$ 302,400$ is reduced by only $10 \frac{1}{2}$ percent.

Under both H. R. 1 and H. R. 3950 those with net incomes, after deductions and before excmptions, of $\$ 5,000$ or less receive a reduction of $\$ 2,571,285,000$ out of a total reduction of $\$ 4,081,492,000$. This group receives 63 percent of the total tax reduction provided by your committee's bill. Persons with incomes of $\$ 3,000$ or less receive more than 44 percent of the reduction. Thus the enactment of H. R. 3950 is clearly desirable from the point of view of taxpayers in the lowerincome brackets.

The additional exemption of $\$ 500$ for persons aged 65 or over is a recognition of their special need. The heavy concentration of small incomes among such persons reflects the fact that, as a group, they are handicapped at least in an coconomic sense. They have suffered unusually as a result of the rise in cost of living and the changes in the tax system which occurred since the beginning of the war. Unlike younger persons, they have been unable to compensate for these changes by accepting full-time jobs at prevailing high wages. Furthermore, this general exemption appears to be a better method of bringing relief than a piecemeal extension of the system of exclusions for the benefi's of particular types of income received primarily by aged persons.

## VI. STATISTICAL DATA SHOWING TAX BURDENS UNDER PRESENT LAW AND COMMIITEE BILL

Table V shows for various net-income levels (after deductions but before exemptions) the amount of tax payable under present law and your committee's bill for persons under age 65. It also shows the amount and percent of the decrease from present law provided by your committec's bill for such persons. Part A of the table relates to a single person with no dependents; part B , to a married person with no dependents; and part C , to a married person with two dependents.

Since individuals of age 65 and over receive not only the tax-rate reduction but also an additional $\$ 500$ exemption, their tax burden cannot be derived from table V. Table VI shows for such persons the same type of information shown in table $V$ for persons under age 65. Part A relates to a single person with no dependents; and part B, to a married person (both husband and wife 65 or over) with no dependents.

Table VII compares for various net-income classes the individual income-tax liability under present law and H. R. 3950 and shows the decrease in tax liability. resulting from the enactment of your committee's bill. The data shown are based on a full year's operation of H. R. 3950 and assume an income-payment level of $\$ 170$ billion.
.Table V-A-Comparison of individual income tax under present law and under H. R. 3950

SINGLE PERSON-NO DEPENDENTS-UNDER AGE 65

| Net income before personal exemption | Amount of tax |  | Reduction in tax under <br> H. R. 39:50 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Present law | I. R. 3050 | Amount | Percent |
| \$500. |  |  |  |  |
| \$600. | \$19.00 | \$13.30 | \$5. 0 | 30.00 |
| \$700 | 38.00 | 26. 60 | 11.40 | 30.00 |
| \$750 | 47.50 | 33.25 | 14. 25 | 30.00 |
| \$800 | 67.00 | 39.90 | 1\%.10 | 30.00 |
| \$900. | 76.00 | 53. 20 | 22.80 | 30.00 |
| \$1,000 | 95.00 | 66. 50 | 28.50 | 30.00 |
| \$1,200 | 133.00 | 93.10 | 39.90 | 30.00 |
| \$1,500 | 190.00 | 133.00 | 57.00 | 30.00 |
| \$1,600. | 209.00 | 153.00 | 56.00 | 26. 79 |
| \$1,700. | 228.00 | 173.00 | 65. 00 | 24. 12 |
| \$1,800 | 247.00 | 193.00 | 54.00 | 21.86 |
| \$1,900. | 266.00 | 212.80 | 53.20 | 20.00 |
| \$2,000 | 285.00 | - 222.00 | 57.00 | 20.00 |
| \$2,500 | 380.00 | 304.00 | 76.00 | 20.00 |
| \$3,000. | 484. 60 | 387.60 | 90.90 | 20.00 |
| \$4,000 | 693.50 | 554.80 | 138.70 | 20.00 |
| \$5,000 | 921.50 | 737. 20 | 184. 30 | 20.00 |
| \$6,000 | 1,168. 50 | 934.80 | 233.70 | 20.00 |
| \$7,010 | 1, 434.50 | 1, 147.60 | 286.90 | 20.00 |
| \$8,000 | 1,710. 60 | 1, 375.60 | 343.90 | 20.00 |
| \$9,000 | 2, 023. 50 | 1, 618.80 | 404. 70 | 20.00 |
| \$10,000 | 2,316.50 | 1, 877. 20 | 469.30 | 20.00 |
| \$11,000 | 2,688. 60 | 2, 150.80 | 537. 70 | 20.00 |
| \$12,000 | 3, 019.80 | 2, 439.60 | 609.80 | 20. 00 |
| \$15,000. | 3, 131. 25 | 2,747. 40 | 686.85 | 20.00 |
| \$14,000 | 3, 812.75 | 3, 074. 20 | 768. 65 | 20.00 |
| \$15,000 | 4,270. 25 | 3,416. 20 | 854.05 | 20.00 |
| \$20,000 | 6,615. 25 | 5,316. 20 | 1,329.05 | 20. 00 |
| \$25,000. | 9,362. 25 | 7,489.80 | 1,872.45 | 20.00 |
| \$30,000 | 12, 261. 50 | 9, 811.60 | 2,452.00 | 20. 00 |
| \$40,000 | 18, 425.25 | 14, 740.20 | 3, 685. 05 | 20.00 |
| \$50,000- | 25, 137.00 | 20, 109. 60 | 5, 027.40 | 20.00 |
| $\$ 60,090$ $\$ 10,000$ | $32,247.75$ $39,643.50$ $47,324$. | $25,708.20$ $31,714.80$ | $6,440.55$ | 20.00 20.00 |
| \$ $\$ 80,000$. | $39,643.80$ $47,324.25$ | $31,714.80$ $37,859.40$ | $7,928.70$ $9,464.85$ | 20.00 20.00 |

## Table V-A.-Comparison of individual income tax under present law and under H. R. 3950-Continued <br> ! <br> SINGLE PERSON-NO DEPENDENTS-UNDER AGE 66-Continued

| Net income before personal exemption | Amount of tax |  | Reduction in tax under <br> H. R. 3950 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Present law | H. R. 3950 | Amount | Percent |
| 890,000. | \$55, 290. 00 | \$44, 232.00 | \$11,058.00 | 20.00 |
| \$100,000 | $\begin{array}{r}63,640.75 \\ 105,806.25 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $60,832.60$ $85,185.31$ | 12, 708.15 | 20. 00 |
| \$200,000- | 148, 651.50 | 121, 518.78 | 27, 032.72 | 18. 20 |
| \$250,000 | 191, 771.75 | 158, 255.99 | 33, 615. 76 | 17.48 |
| \$300,000 | 234, 996. 75 | 194, 997. 24 | 39, 990.51 | 17.02 |
| \$400,000 | 321,446.75 | 222, 236.25 | 49, 211. 50 | 15.31 |
| $\$ 500,000$ $\$ 750,000$ | 624, 021.75 | 542, 660.25 | 81, 8801.50 | 12. 93 |
| \$1,000,000 | 840, 146. 75 | $736,335.25$ | 103, 811.50 | 12. 36 |
| \$2,000,000 | 1,704, 646.75 | 1,509, 835. 25 | 194, 811.60 | 11.43 |
| \$5,000,000 | 4, 275, 000.00 | 3, 825, 000.00 | 450,000.00 | 10. 43 |

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.
Table V-B.-Comparison of individual income tax under present law and under H. R. 3950

MARRIED PERSON-NO DEPENDENTS-UNDER AGE 65

| Net income before personal exemption | Amount of tax |  | Reduction in tax under <br> H. R. 3950 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Present law | H. R. 3950 | Amount | Percent |
| \$1,000. |  |  |  |  |
| \$1,200. | \$38.00 | \$26.60 | \$11.40 | 30.00 |
| \$1,500. | 95.00 | 66. 50 | 28.60 | 30.00 |
| \$1,800 | 152.00 100.00 |  | 45.60 57.00 | 30.0) |
| \$2,100 | 209.00 | 153.00 | 56.00 | 22. 79 |
| \$2,200 | 228.00 | 173.00 | 55. 00 | 24.12 |
| \$2,300. | 247.00 | 193.00 | 54.00 | 21.85 |
| \$2,400. | 286.00 | 212.80 | 53.20 | 20.00 |
| \$2,300. | 285.00 | 228.00 | 57.00 | 20.10 |
| \$3,000 | 380.00 | 304.00 | 7e. 00 | 20.00 |
| \$4,000. | 589.10 | 471.20 | 117.80 | 20.00 |
| \$5,000. | 798.00 | 638.40 | 159.60 | 20.00 |
| \$6,000. | 1,045.00 | 836.00 | 209.00 | 20.00 |
| \$7,000. | 1,292.00 | 1,033.60 | 258.40 | ${ }^{20.00}$ |
| \$89,000 | 1, $1,862.00$ | $1,261.60$ $1,489.60$ | 315.40 372.40 | 20.00 20.00 |
| \$10,000. | 2, 135.00 | 1,748.c0 | 437.00 | 20.00 |
| \$11,000. | 2, 508.00 | 2,006. 40 | 501.60 | 20.00 |
| \$12,000. | 2,369.00 | 2, 295. 20 | 573.80 | 20.00 |
| \$13,000. | 3, 230.00 | 2,584.00 | 646.0n | 20.00 |
| \$14,000. | 3,638. 50 | 2,910.80 | 727.70 | 20.00 |
| \$15,000. | 4, 047. 00 | 3, 237.60 | 809.40 | 20.00 |
| \$20,000. | 6,393. 50 | 5,114.80 | 1,273. 70 | 20.00 |
| \$25,000. | 9,082.00 | 7.265 .60 $0,576.00$ | 1, 816. 40 | 20. 00 |
| \$40,000. | 18,097. 50 | 14,478.00 | 3, ¢19. 50 | 20.00 |
| \$ 80,000 | 24, 795.00 | 19, 836.00 | 4,959.00 | 20). 00 |
| \$ $960,000$. | 31, 891.50 | 25, 513. 20 | 6,378. 30 | 20.00 |
| \$70,000. | 39, 272.00 | 31,418.40 | 7, 854. 60 | 20.00 |
| \$80,000. | 46, 039.50 | 37, 551.c0 | 9, 387. 90 | 20.00 |
| \$90,000 | 51, 891.00 | 43, 912. 80 | 10, 978.20 | 20.00 |
| \$100,000. | $63,127.50$ $105,383.50$ | 50, 502.00 | 12, 625. 50 | 20.00 |
| \$200,000. | 148, 124.00 | 121, 155.40 | 20, 2568.53 | 19.61 |
| \$250,000. | 191, 339.50 | 157, 888. 58 | 20, $83,450.92$ | 17.48 |
| \$300,000. | 234, 564.50 | 194, 629.83 | 39, 034 , 17 | 17.03 |
| \$400,000. | 321, 014. 50 | 271, 848. 50 | 49,166. 00 | 15.32 |
| \$500,000. | 407, 464. 50 | 349, 108. 50 | 68, 266.00 | 14.30 |
| \$750,000. | 6i23, 589.50 | 542, 573. 50 | 81, 016.00 | 12.89 |
| \$1,000,000.. | 839, 714.50 | 735, 948.50 | 103, 760.00 | 12.36 |
| \$5,000, 1000 | $1,714,214.50$ $4,275,000.00$ | 1, $3,825,000.00$ | $194,766.00$ $450,000.00$ | 11.43 |
|  |  |  | 40,000.00 | 10.63 |

[^1]Table V-C.-Comparison of individual income tax under present law and undor H. R. 9950

MARRIED PERSON-TWO DEPENDENTG-UNDER AGE 68

| Net income before personal exemption | Amount of tax |  | Reduction in tax under$\text { H. R. } 3950$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Present law | H. R. 3950 | Amount | Percent |
| \$2,000. |  |  |  |  |
| \$2,500 | \$95.00 | \$68. 50 | \$28. 50 | \$30.00 |
| \$3,000 | 190.00 | 133.00 | 57.00 | 30.00 |
| \$3,100 | 209.00 | 153.00 | 56.00 | 26.79 |
| \$3,200 | 228.00 | 173.00 | 55.00 | 24. 12 |
| \$3,300 | 247.00 | 193.00 | 54.00 | 21.86 |
| \$3,400 | 266.00 | 212.80 | 63.20 | 20.00 |
| \$3,500 | 285.00 | 228.00 | 67.00 | 20.00 |
| \$4,000 | 380.00 | 304.00 | 76.00 | 20.00 |
| \$5,000 | 589.00 | 471.30 | 117.80 | 20.00 |
| \$8,000 | 798. 00 | 638.40 | 159.60 | 20.00 |
| \$7,000. | 1,045.00 | 836.00 | 209.00 | 20.00 |
| \$8,000 | 1, 292.00 | 1,033.60 | 258.40 | 20.00 |
| \$9,000 | 1,577.00 | 1,261.60 | 315. 40 | 20.00 |
| \$10,000 | 1,862.00 | 1, 489.60 | 372.40 | 20.00 |
| \$11,000 | 2, 185. 00 | 1,748.00 | 437.00 | 20.00 |
| \$12,000 | $2,508.00$ | 2, 016. 40 | 501.60 | 20.00 |
| \$13,000. | 2,869.00 | 2.295. 20 | 673.80 | 20.00 |
| \$14,000. | 3,230. 00 | 2,584.00 | 646.00 | 20.00 |
| \$15,000. | 3, 633. 50 | 2,910.80 | 727.70 | 20.00 |
| \$20,000. | $5,890.00$ | 4,712.00 | 1, 178.00 | 20.00 |
| \$25,000 | 8,521. 50 | 6, 817. 20 | 1, 704. 30 | 20.00 |
| \$30,000 | 11, 381.00 | $9,104.80$ | 2,276. 20 | 20.00 |
| \$40,000. | 17, 442.00 | 13, 953. 60 | 3, 488. 40 | 20.00 |
| \$50,000 | 24, 111.00 | 19,288. 80 | 4,822. 20 | 20.00 |
| \$60,000 | 31, 179.00 | 24, 943.20 | 6, 235. 80 | 20.00 |
| \$70,000 | 38, 532.00 | 30, 825. 60 | 7, 706, 40 | 20.00 |
| \$80,000 | 46, 170. 00 | 36, 936. 00 | 9, 234.00 | 20.00 |
| \$90,000 | 54, 093. 00 | 43, 274, 40 | 10, 818. 60 | 20.00 |
| \$100,000 | 62, 301. 00 | 49, 840. 80 | 12, 460. 20 | 20.00 19. 54 |
| \$150,000 | $104,538.00$ | $84,107.30$ | $20,430.70$ $28,840.35$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19.54 \\ & 19 \end{aligned}$ |
| $\$ 200,000$ $\$ 250,000$ | $147,269.00$ | $120,428.65$ | $28,840.35$ $33,321.25$ | 18.23 17.49 |
| \$250,000. | $190,475.00$ $233,700.00$ | $157,153.75$ $193,895.00$ | $33,321.25$ $39,805.00$ | 17.49 17.03 |
| \$300,000.. | $233,700.00$ $320,150.00$ | $193,895.00$ | $39,805.00$ $49,075.00$ | 17.03 16.33 |
| \$ $\mathbf{\$ 4 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ | $320,150.00$ $406,600.00$ | $\begin{aligned} & 271,075.00 \\ & 348,425.00 \end{aligned}$ | $49,075.00$ $58,175.00$ | 15.33 |
| \$750,000 | 622, 725.00 | $541,800.00$ | 80, 925. 00 | 13.00 |
| \$1,000,000 | $838,850.00$ | 735, 175.00 | 103, 675.00 | 12. 36 |
| \$2,000,000 | 1, 703, 350.00 | 1, 508, 675.00 | 104, 675.00 | 11.43 |
| \$5,000,000. | 4, 275,000.00 | 3, 825, 000.00 | 450, 000.00 | 10.83 |

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Table VI-A.-Comparison of individual income tax under present law and under H. R. 9950 for persons aged 65 or over

SINGLE PERSON AGE 65 OR OVER-NO DEPENDENTS

| Net income before personal exemption | Amount of tax |  | Reduction in tax undar <br> H. R. 3950 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Present law | H. R. 3950 | Amount | Percent |
| \$500. |  |  |  |  |
| \$000. | \$19.00 | .-...-.-..... | \$19.00 | 100.00 |
| \$800. | 38.00 57.00 |  | 38.00 57.00 | 100.00 100.00 |
| \$900. | 76.00 |  | 76.00 | 100.00 |
| \$1,000. | 95.00 |  | 85.00 | 100.00 |
| \$1,200. | 133.00 | \$26. 60 | 100.40 | 80.00 |
| \$1,500 | 190.00 | 66.50 | 123.50 | 65.00 |
| \$1,800. | 247.00 | 100. 40 | 140.60 | 56.92 |
| \$2,000. | 235.00 | 133.00 | 152.00 | 53. 33 |
| \$2,500. | 380.00 484.50 | 228.00 304.00 | 152.00 <br> 180 | 40.00 37.25 |
| \$4,000 | 693.50 | 471.20 | 222.30 | 32.05 |
| \$5,000 | 921.50 | 638.40 | 283.10 | 30.72 |
| \$6,000. | 1,163. 50 | 830. 00 | 332.50 | ${ }^{28.46}$ |
| \$8,00). | 1,719.50 | 1, 2031.60 | 457.90 | 27.93 |
| \$9,000 | 2, 023.50 | 1,480. 60 | 533.90 | 26.38 |
| \$10,000 | 2, 316.50 | 1,7:18.00 | 598.50 | 23.51 |
| \$12,000 | 3,010.50 | 2, 295.20 | 6854. 30 | 24.73 |
| \$13,000. | 3,434. 25 | 2,534.00 | 850.25 | 24.76 |
| \$14,000. | 3,812.75 | 2,910.80 | 931.05 | 24.25 |
| \$15,000 | 4,270.25 | 3,237. 60 | 1,032.65 | 24.18 |
| \$20,000. | 6, 015.25 | 5,114.80 | 1,530.45 | 23.03 |
| \$25,000. | 9,362.25 | 7,265.60 | 2,096. 05 | 22.39 |
| \$30,000. | 12,264. 50 | 9, 576. 00 | 2, 688. 50 | 21.92 |
| \$40,000. | 18,425.25 | 14,478.00 | 3, 9477.25 | 21.42 |
| \$50,000 | 25, 3137.00 | 19,836.00 | 5,301.00 | $\stackrel{21.09}{ }$ |
| \$70,000 | 39, 313.50 | 31, 418.40 | 8,225. 10 | 20.85 20.75 |
| \$80,050 | 47, 324.25 | 37, 551.60 | 9,772.65 | 20.65 |
| \$90,000. | 55, 290.00 | 43, 912.80 | 11,377. 20 | 20.68 |
| \$100,000. | 63, 540. 75 | 50, 502.00 | 13, 033.75 | 20. 52 |
| \$150,000 | 105, 806.25 | 84, 825. 97 | 20, 080.28 | 19.83 |
| \$200,000 | 148, 551.60 | 121, 155.40 | 27, 306. 10 | 18.44 |
| \$250,000. | 191, 771.75 | 157, 888. 58 | 33, 8.33 .17 | 17.67 |
| \$300,000. | 231, 996. 75 | 191, 629.83 | 40, 366. 92 | 17. 18 |
| \$100,000 | 321,440.75 | 271, 819.50 | 40, 508. 25 | 15. 43 |
| \$750,000. | 624, 021.75 | 542, 573.50 | 81, 448.25 | 14.39 13.05 |
| \$1,000,000. | 840, 148.75 | 735, 948.50 | 104, 198. 25 | 12. 40 |
| \$2,000,000. | 1,704, 646.75 | 1,509, 448. 50 | 195, 198. 25 | 11. 45 |
| \$5,000,000. | 4, 275,000.00 | 3, 825, 000.00 | 450, 000.00 | 10. 53 |

Bource: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Table VI-B.-Comparison of individual income tax under present law and under H. R. 3950 for persons aged 65 or over

MARRIED PERSON (BOTH HUSBAND AND WIFE 65 OR OVER)-NO DEPENDENTS

| Net income before personal exemption | Amount of tax |  | Reduction in tax under H. R. 3050 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Present law | H. R. 3050 | Amount | Percent |
| \$1,000. |  |  |  |  |
| \$1,200. |  |  | \$38.00 | 100.00 |
| \$1,500.. | 95.00 |  | 95.00 | 100.00 |
| \$1,800.. | 152.00 $193)$ |  | 152.00 | 100.00 |
| \$2,500 | 285.00 | \$36. 50 | ${ }^{1900.00}$ | 100.00 |
| \$3,000. | 380.00 | 133.00 | 247.00 | 65.00 |
| \$4,000. | 589.00 | 304.00 | 285.00 | 48.39 |
| \$5,000. | 798.00 | 471.20 | 326.80 | 40.95 |
| \$0,000. | 1, 045.00 | 638.40 | 406.60 | 38.91 |
| \$7,000. | 1, 292.00 | 836.00 | 456.00 | 35. 29 |
| \$8,000. | 1, $1,577.00$ $1,862.00$ | 1, $1,333.60$ | 543.40 | 34.46 |
| \$10,010. | 2, 185.00 | 1, 489.60 | 6005.40 680 | 32.24 31.83 |
| \$11,000 | 2,503.00 | 1,748.00 | 760.00 | 30.30 |
| \$12,000. | 2, 869.00 | 2, 006.40 | 862.60 | 30.07 |
| \$13,000. | 3, 230.00 | 2.295 .20 | ${ }^{034.80}$ | 28.94 |
| \$14,000- | 3. 638.50 | 2, 584.00 | 1, 054.50 | 28.98 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \$ 15,000 \\ & \$ 20,000 \end{aligned}$ | 4, 047.00 | 2, 010. 80 $4,712.00$ | $1,130.20$ $1,681.50$ | 28.08 26.30 |
| \$25,000. | 9,082.00 | 6,817. 20 | 2, 264. 80 | 24. 04 |
| \$30,000 | 11,970.00 | 9, 104.80 | 2,865. 20 | 23.94 |
| \$40,000. | 18.097. 50 | 13, 053,60 | 4,143.00 | 22.00 |
| \$50,000 | 24, 795. 00 | 19,288.80 | 5,503). 20 | 22.21 |
| \$60,000. | 31, 891. 50 | 24, 943. 20 | 6, 948. 30 | 21.79 |
| \$70,000. | 30, 273.00 | 30, 825.60 | 8, 447. 40 | 21. 51 |
| \$80,000) | 46, 939.50 | 36.936. 00 | 10,003. 50 | 21. 31 |
| \$90,0K) | 64, 6391.00 | $43,274.40$ $49,840.80$ | $11,616.60$ $13,280.70$ | 21.16 21.05 |
| \$150,006. | 105, 383.60 | 84, 107. 30 | 21, 276.20 | 20. 19 |
| \$200,000. | 148, 121.00 | 120, 428.65 | 27, 645.35 | 18.70 |
| \$250,000. | 191, 339.50 | 157, 153.75 | 34, 185. 75 | 17.87 |
| \$300, (00). | 234, 501.50 | 193, 895. 00 | 40, 669.50 | 17.34 |
| \$400,020 | $321,014.50$ | 271, 075. 00 | 49, 939. 60 | 15. 56 |
| \$500,000 | 407, 464. 60 | 348, 425.00 | 59, 039. 50 | 14. 49 |
| \$750,000 | 623,589. 60 | 541, 800.00 | 81,789.50 | 13.12 |
| \$1,000,000. | $\begin{array}{r}839,714.50 \\ \hline 1704 \\ \hline 1\end{array}$ |  | 104, 539.50 | 12.45 |
| \$2,000,000. | $1,704,214.50$ $4,275,000.00$ | $1,508,675.00$ $3,825,090.00$ | 195, 539.600000000 | 11.47 10.53 |
| \$5,000,000.. | 4,275, 000.00 | 3, 825, 090.00 | 450,000.00 | 10.53 |

Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

Table VII.-Comparison of the individual income-tax liability under present law and under H. R. $\$ 950$ in a full year of operation, with income payments of $\$ 170$ billion
[In thousands of dollars]

| Net income class | Estimated yield of $\rightarrow$ |  | Decrease from present law provided by H. R. 3950 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | H. R. 3950 | Present law |  |
| \$0 to 11 | \$250, 919 | \$365, 191 | \$114, 272 |
| \$1 to \$2. | 1,877, 376 | 2, 746, 037 | 868, 661 |
| \$2 to \$2.6. | 1, 056,083 | 1, 492, 032 | 435,949 |
| \$2.5 to 3 . | 1, 495, 407 | 1, 876, 084 | 380, 677 |
| \$3 to 84. | 1, 853, 180 | 2, 383,750 | 630, 670 |
| \$4 to \$5. | 894, 424 | 1, 135, 580 | 241, 166 |
| Total under ${ }^{\text {\% }}$. | 7, 427, 389 | 9,998, 674 | 2,571,285 |
| \$5 to \$10. | 1, 146, 377 | 1,453, 203 | 306, 826 |
| \$10 to \$25. | 1, 1 997, 000 | 2, 124, 827 | 427, 827 |
| \$25 to \$50 | 1, 204, 518 | 1, 501, 072 | 296, 654 |
| \$50 to \$100 | 1, 115, 125 | 1,385, 437 | 270, 312 |
| \$100 to \$300. | 701, 733 | 856, 595 | 154, 862 |
| \$300 to \$500.. | 136, 937 | 161, 146 | 24, 209 |
| \$500 to \$1,000... | 128,180 1180 | 145,263 128,613 | 17,083 12,633 |
|  |  |  |  |
| Total over \$5. | 6, 245, 050 | 7,756, 156 | 1,510,206 |
| Grand total. | 13, 673, 339 | 17, 754, 830 | 4, 081, 492 |

[^2]
[^0]:    ${ }^{1}$ The exact breaking point in surtax net income under the bill is $\$ 1,395.83$.
    2 Incomes in this bracket recelve a flat reduction of 867 from the tentative tax.
    The exact breaking point in surtax net income under the bill is $\$ 136,719.10$.

    - The exact breaking point in surtax net income under the bili is $\$ 302,395.60$.
    - It should be borne in mind that the tax is subject to a ceiling of $851 / 2$ percent of net income under existmg law and 76.5 percent under the bill.
    Source: Stafl of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenae Taxation.

[^1]:    Source: Staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

[^2]:    Source: Staff of Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation.

