Table B-9 (continued)

a. Includes minor arbitrary amounts used for convenience in programming the Federal and state-local levels in the same way. Source: Derived from Tables B-6 and B-8.

Table B-10
Allocated Federal, State and Local Expenditure Benefits by Income Class, 1961
(Millions)

|  | Income class (Money income after personal taxes) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\$ 2,000$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 2,000 \\ t, 599 \\ 2,599 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,000 \\ \text { to } \\ 3,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 4,000 \\ & 4,599 \\ & \text { te } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 5,000 \\ & 5,40 \\ & 5,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\$ 6,000$ 7,499 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 7,500 \\ & \text { to } 9,589 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000 \\ \mathbf{t e} \\ \text { tes9e } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 15,000 \\ & \text { and } \\ & \text { ander } \end{aligned}$ | TOTAL |
| Federal |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General benefit expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| National defense and international affairs | \$4,405 | \$ 4,002 | \$ 4,689 | \$ 5,772 | \$ 6,394 | \$8,559 | \$ 8,964 | \$ 5,821 | \$ 2,819 | \$51,426 |
| Half on number of families | 3,654 | 2,825 | 2,945 | 3,241 | 3,263 | 3,905 | 3,526 | 1,842 | - 511 | 25,713 |
| Half on money income | - 751 | 1,177 | 1,744 | 2,531 | 3,131 | 4,654 | 5,438 | 3,979 | 2,308 | 25,713 |
| Other general benefit expenditures(a) | - 794 | 721 | : 845 | - 1,040 | 1,152 | 1,543 | -1,616 | 1,049 | 508 | 9,268 |
| Half on number of families | - 659 | 509 | 531 | 584 | 588 | 704 | - 636 | 332 | 92 | 4,634 |
| Half on money income | - 135 | 212 | 314 | 456 | 564 | 839 | - 980 | 717 | 416 | 4,634 |
| Elementary \& secondary education | - 15 | 24 | 31 | 44 | 47 | 61 | 52 | 25 | 6 | 305 |
| Higher education | 3 | 4 | 7 | 14 | 21 | 33 | 44 | 53 | 31 | 211 |
| Public assistance \& other welfare | 1,424 | 710 | 232 | 153 | 147 | -81 | 50 | - 64 | 1 | 2,862 |
| Labor | 6 | 18 | 34 | 62 | 80 | -121 | 141 | 98 | 36 | 595 |
| Veterans benefits | 558 | 712 | 965 | 716 | 690 | 972 | 804 | 534 | 192 | 6,143 |
| Highways | 89 | 141 | 224 | 313 | 377 | 532 | 561 | 368 | 123 | 2,738 |
| Half on auto operation expenditures | 26 | 61 | 113 | 164 | 198 | 282 | 286 | 183 | 56 | 1,369 |
| Half on total consumption | 63 | 80 | 111 | 149 | 179 | 250 | 275 | 185 | 77 | 1,369 |
| Agriculture | 221 | 343 | 463 | 441 | 501 | 578 | 603 | 456 | 375 | 3,980 |
| Net interest | 307 | 635 | 637 | 568 | 527 | 735 | 1,047 | 945 | 965 | 6,366 |
| Social insurance benefits(b) | 2,987 | 2,786 | 2,405 | 1,346 | 1,288 | 1,303 | 1,089 | 658 | 87 | 13,948 |
| Total, standard assumption | 10,809 | 10,096 | 10,533 | 10,469 | 11,224 | 14,517 | 14,970 | 10,070 | 5,154 | 97,842 |
| Total, all general benefits allocated on number of families | 14,235 | 12,042 | 11,949 | 11,308 | 11,379 | 13,633 | 12,714 | 7,548 | 3,034 | 97,842 |
| Total, excluding general benefits | 5,610 | 5,373 | 4.999 | 3,657 | 3.678 | 4.416 | 4,390 | 3,200 | 1,827 | 37,148 |
| Total, exciuding social insurance | 7,822 | 7,311 | 8,128 | 9,123 | 9,936 | 13,214 | 13,882 | 9.412 | 5,067 | 83,894 |
|  |  |  | (contì | ed) |  | 20. | [ata |  |  |  |

Table B-10 (Continued)

|  | Income class (Money Income after persenal taxes) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & \$ 2,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 2,000 \\ \text { te }, 599 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 3,000 \\ & \text { 3,99s } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 74,000 \\ 4,999 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 5,000 \\ \hline \mathbf{t a} \\ \hline, 999 \end{gathered}$ | $\$ 6,000$ 70,499 | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 7,500 \\ & \mathbf{t 9} \\ & 9,999 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000 \\ \text { to } \\ 14,999 \end{gathered}$ |  |  | total |
| State and Local(c) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General benefit expenditures(a) | \$ 1,515 | \$ 1,376 | \$ 1,613 | \$ 1,985 | 2,199 | \$ 2,943 | \$ 3,083 | \$ 2,002 | \$ |  | \$ 17,686 |
| Half on number of families | 1,257 | 972 | 1,013 | 1,115 | 1,122 | 1,343 | 1,213 | 634 |  | 176 | 8,843 |
| Half on money income | . 258 | 404 | 599 | 871 | 1,077 | 1,600 | 1,870 | 1,368 |  | 794 | 8,843 |
| Elementary \& secondary education | 823 | 1,306 | 1,651 | 2,328 | 2,539 | 3,254 | 2,784 | 1,320 |  | 317 | 16,321 |
| Higher education | 41 | 61 | 101 | 196 | 296 | 464 | 609 | 748 |  | 434 | 2,951 |
| Public assistance \& other welfare | 1,105 | 551 | 180 | 118 | 114 | 63 | 39 | 49 |  | 1 | 2,222 |
| Streets and highways | 204 | 323 | 514 | - 719 | 864 | 1,221 | 1,290 | 846 |  | 307 | 6,289 |
| Half on auto operation expenditures | 59 | - 139 | 259 | 377 | 454 | 647 | 658 | 421 |  | 130 | 3,144 |
| Half on total consumption | 145 | 184 | 255 | 342 | 410 | 574 | - 632 | 425 |  | 177 | 3,145 |
| Agriculture | 29 | 45 | 61 | 58 | 66 | 76 | 79 | 60 |  | 49 | 524 |
| Net interest | 37 | 76 | 7 77 | 68 | 63 | 88 | 126 | 114 |  | 116 | 766 |
| Social insurance benefits(b) | 909 | 848 | 732 | 410 | 392 | 396 | 331 | 200 |  | 27 | 4,244 |
| Total, standard assumption | 4,674 | 4,601 | 4,948 | 5,896 | 6,548 | 8,526 | 8,359 | 5,350 |  | 2,224 | 51,126 |
| Total, all general benefits allocated on number of families | 5,672 | 5,168 | 5,360 | 6,141 | 6,593 | 8,269 | 7,702 | 4,615 |  | 1,606 | 51,126 |
| Total, excluding general benefits | 3,159 | 3,225 | 3,335 | 3,911 | 4,349 | 5,583 | 5,276 | 3,348 |  | 1,254 | 33,440 |
| Total, excluding social insurance | 3,765 | 3,753 | 4,216 | 5,487 | 6,156 | 8,130 | 8,028 | 5,150 |  | 2,197 | 46,882 |
| All Governments |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total, standard assumption | 15,483 | 14,697 | 15,480 | 16,365 | 17,772 | 23,044 | 23,336 | 15,420 |  | 7,378 | 148,968 |
| Total, all general benefits allocated on number of families | 19,907 | 17,210 | 17,310 | 17,448 | 17,972 | 21,902 | - 20,416 | 12,163 |  | 4,640 | 148,968 |
| Total, excluding general benefits | 8,768 | 8,598 | 8,333 | 7,567 | 8,027 | 9,999 | 9,667 | 6,548 |  | 3,081 | 70,588 |
| Total, excluding social insurance | 11,587 | 11,064 | 12,344 | 14,609 | 16,091 | 21,344 | 21,910 | 14,562 |  | 7,264 | 130,776 |

a. Consists of general government (excluding interest), transportation (excluding highways), commerce and finance, housing and community development, health and sanitation, civilian safety, and miscellaneous.
b. Unemployment insurance classified as a state-local program.
c. After deduction of Federal grants-in-aid.

Source: Derived from Tables B-7 and B-8.

Table B-11
Allocated Income and Output by Income Class, 1961
(Millions)

|  | Income class (wemey incame after perseasi taxes) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Under | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 2,000 \\ & \text { t, } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 3,600 \\ & \text { then } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Ste00 } \\ & \text { the } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 5,000 \\ & \mathbf{t}, 0 \\ & 5,0 e 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 8,000 \\ & 7,489 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 7,500 \\ & 6,990 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000 \\ 14,909 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 15,000 \\ \text { aiver } \end{gathered}$ | total |
| BLS money income before personal taxes | \$10,170 | \$15,928 | \$23,613 | \$34,260 | \$42,389 | \$63,001 | -\$73,620 | \$53,863 | \$31,239 | \$348,083 |
| Net national product, factor income distribution | 8,223 | 17,022 | 29,607 | 45,746 | 58,450 | 87,504 | 102,263 | 77,076 | 48,973 | 474,865 |
| Net national product, product side | 24,743 | 29,081 | 38.802 | 51.380 | 60.905 | 84,981 | 93,106 | 63,016 | 28,851 | 474,865 |
| Personal income | 12,062 | 18,862 | 27,805 | 40,4E1 | 50,470 | 75,902 | 88,575 | 64,704 | 37,942 | 416,814 |
| Personal income adjusted to NNP Ievel | 13,742 | 21,489 | 31,678 | 46,131 | 57.499 | 86,474 | 100,911 | 73,715 | 43,226 | 474,865 |
| Source: Derived from Tables B-4, B-5, and B-8. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Chart B-1
PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF WAGES AND SALARIES AND TOTAL CURRENT CONSUMPTION BY INCOME CLASS 1961


Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Survey of Consumer Expenditures 1960-61.

## Appendix C

## Readjustment of Income Class Distribution for Changes in the Definition of Income

The basic data used in this study (from BLS Survey of Consumer Expenditures) are published only in the form of income distributions with families grouped by size of money income after personal taxes. A size distribution in terms of income before personal income taxes would be more appropriate for most purposes and more understandable by the general public.

However, short of going back to the original BLS questionnaire returns, there is no accurate way to transform the assorted data on types of expenditures and kinds of income from a money-income-after-tax-size classification to a money-income-before-tax classification.

This appendix will illustrate how the results of the study might be affected by such a reclassification. A general problem is involved because several definitions of income are used in this study. How would the estimates in the study be affected if the classifi-
cations of families by income size classes were altered for every change in the definition of income? If the original return data were available, a computer program could be written to reclassify families for every change in the definition of income. However, it appears that this would be an expensive job for a small gain in results.

The effect of such a reclassification can be set out in general terms and illustrated by certain BLS data which have been reclassified by the Treasury Department. The Treasury reclassification grouped BLS Survey data by adjusted gross income classes. This is roughly equivalent to a shift to a before-tax income class basis although other differences between family money income and adjusted gross income were also taken into account.

This regrouping of families by adjusted gross income classes, as shown by Table C-1,

## Table C-1

## Effective Rates of Personal Taxes to Family Money Income By Money-Income-After-Tax Classes and By Adjusted Gross Income Classes-1961

|  |  | Personal <br> $\operatorname{taxes}(a)$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Enfective } \\ \text { trate } \end{gathered}$ |  |  | Persanal taxes and | $\begin{gathered} \text { Efoetive } \\ \substack{\text { etate } \\ \text { rate }} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (millions) |  |  |  | (millions) |  |  |
| Under \$2 | \$ 10,170 | \$ 251 | 2.5\% | Under \$2 | \$ 21,699(b) | \$ 264 | 1.2\% |
| \$ $2 \cdot 3$ | 15,928 | 662 | 4.2 | \$ 2 - 3 | 13,464 | 485 | 3.6 |
| $3 \cdot 4$ | 23,613 | 1,412 | 60 | 3-4 | 19,284 | 1,096 | 5.7 |
| $4 \cdot 5$ | 34,260 | 2,928 | 8.5 | 4-5 | 25,504 | 2,001 | 7.8 |
| 5 | 42,389 | 3,895 | 9.2 | 5 - 6 | 32,373 | 2,996 | 9.3 |
| $6 \cdot 7.5$ | 63,001 | 6,585 | 10.5 | . 7.5 | 52,188 | 5,261 | 10.1 |
| 7.5-10 | 73,620 | 8,730 | 11.9 | 7.5 - 10 | 73,000 | 8,436 | 11.6 |
| $10 \cdot 15$ | 53,863 | 7,266 | 13.5 | $10 \cdot 15$ | 64,181 | 8,631 | 13.4 |
| 15 \& over | 31,239 | 6,880 | 22.0 | 15 \& over | 46,330 | 9,442 | 20.4 |
| Total | 348,083 | 38,609 | 11.1 | Total | 348,022 | 38,613 | 11.1 |

a. Federal, state and local income taxes, poll taxes, and taxes on personal property.
b. The amount of money income in this class is substantially greater in an adjusted gross income classification than in a money income classification because more than half of money income at this level consists of social security benefits and other kinds of money income not included in adjusted gross income. As a result, many more families have adjusted gross incomes of less than $\$ 2,000$ than have money incomes of less than $\$ 2,000$.
Source: Appendix Table B-8 and unpublished Treasury Department data.
produced a slight increase in the extent of progression in effective rates of personal taxes to money income before personal taxes over most of the range of income. On a money-income-after-personal-taxes distribution, effective rates of personal taxes (largely income taxes) ranged from 2.5 percent for families with incomes below $\$ 2,000$ to 22.0 percent for families with incomes of $\$ 15,000$ and over. On an adjusted gross income class distribution, the effective rates for the same basic data and family units ranged from 1.2 percent for those with adjusted gross incomes under $\$ 2,000$ to 20.4 percent for those with adjusted gross incomes of $\$ 15,000$ and over. The largest changes were in the lowest and the highest income classes.

The changes in the data resulting from such a reclassification can be broken down into three parts as follows:
(1) A change in the topmost income class limit from $\$ 15,000$ after tax to $\$ 15,000$ before tax enlarges the numbers of families in this class because more families have incomes before tax of $\$ 15,000$ or more than have incomes after tax of this amount. For this reason the average effective rate in this class is significantly lowered.
(2) Fewer people have incomes before tax
of $\$ 2,000$ than have incomes after tax of $\$ 2,000$. A reclassification to a before-tax basis would narrow the lowest income class and tend to reduce the average effective rate.
(3) For all other income classes, a shift from an after-tax to a before-tax classification narrows the range of the class because of the progressive character of the tax. Thus, the difference between the upper class limit on a before- and an after-tax basis would be greater than the difference between the lower class limit on the two bases. In addition, a shift to a before-tax classification results in taking a piece of the income distribution slightly further down the income scale. Thus the effective rates in each class with the same nominal class limits would be lowered.

However, the Treasury Department reclassification to an adjusted gross income class basis shows that except for the lowest and the highest income classes, the effective rates of personal taxes to money income in the BLS Survey showed very little change.
Larger changes in effective rate patterns might result for other changes in the definition of income, but such changes would still probably be small in comparison with those resulting from changes in the assumptions of incidence or in the definition of the income basis.

## Appendix D

## The Tax Burden: A Comparison with Gillespie's Study ${ }^{1}$

A comparison with a recently published Brookings study is presented here to illustrate further some of the problems in estimating tax burdens by income class. Estimates of expenditure benefits are not comparec as the points to be made are amply shown by the differences in the tax burden estimates.

Although the tax allocations developed here are similar to those in Gillespie's study, his effective tax rates showed less progression, or more regression, in various elements of the tax system than indicated by the present study (Table D-1). In order to explain these differences, three major factors must be considered: assumptions of incidence, bases of allocation, and the income base.

Gillespie generally used the same assumptions of tax incidence as this study except for corporate income taxes and Federal social security contributions from employers. This study assumed that half the corporate income tax was paid by consumers and that the other half was paid by stockholders; Gillespie assumed that one-third was paid by consumers and two-thirds by stockholders. It was assumed in this study that the burden of all employer social insurance contributions was shifted to the consumer. Gillespie assumed that only half of the burden was shifted to the consumer; the other half he assumed was shifted back to the employee. However, the net effect of these differences in assumptions of incidence is slight.

The differences in the bases of allocation were more significant. The latest data on family expenditures by type and by income class available to Gillespie were from the LIFE

Study of Consumer Expenditures (Tinc, Inc.) published in 1957 and containing data for 1955. By various methods Gillespie adjusted these data to 1960 income levels. The present study had the benefit of the more recent and detailed BLS Survey of Consumer Expenditures 1960-61.

The most significant statistical difference in bases of allocation was in the distribution of total current consumption expenditures. As shown by Table D-2, the distribution of consumption expenditures in relation to money income by income class in Gillespie's study was such as to give a considerably more regressive burden for portions of the tax burden allocated on the basis of consumption.
T.ee largest differences in effective rates are due to differences in the definition of the income base. Gillespie's "broad income concept" excludes government transfer payments and consequently is relatively small at low income levels where transfer payments are an important part of family money income. It is largely for this reason that Gillespie's tax rates show less progression or more regression than the effective rates in the present study. Here the "standard case" is based in the aggregate on net national product, but on a distribution by income class that corresponds to the distribution of personal income, which includes transfer payments.

However, there are substantial differences in the distribution of income in the two studies even for approximately comparable definitions of income. This reflects both differences in assumptions concerning the appropriate imputations of non-money income and differences in the statistical sources and bases of allocation.

[^0]Table D-1
Effective Total Tax Rates by Income Class in Tax Foundation's and Gillespie's Studies 1960-1961( ${ }^{(2)}$

|  | Income Cisass (b) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\$ 2,00$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 2,000 \\ & 2,00 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,000 \\ \mathbf{6}, 699 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \$ 4,000 \\ +9,090 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 5,000 \\ & 7,400 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 7,500 \\ & \mathbf{6 , 5 0 9} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10,000 \\ \text { over } \\ \text { wher } \end{gathered}$ | TOTML |
| Total taxes as a percentage of alternative income |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| bases |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Gillespie |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Broad income concept(0) | 64\% | 67\% | 52\% | 46\% | 33\% | 23\% | 32\% | 34\% |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Tax Foundation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NNP, personal income distribution | 27 | 26 |  | 29 | 29 | 29 | 36 | 30 |
| NNP, factor income distribution(0) | 46 |  | 32 | 29 | 29 | 28 | 33 | 30 |
| NNP, product side distribution(1) | 15 | 19 |  | 26 | 28 | 31 | 46 | 30 |

a. Calendar year 1960 in Gillespie's study; calendar year 1961 in Tax Foundation's study.
b. Income classes in terms of money income before taxes in Gillespie's study; In money income after personal taxes in Tax Foundation's study.
b. Income classes in income concert" consists of family money income plus capital pains, retained profits, the unshiffed portion of corporate profits taxes, the backward Giliespie's "broad income concept", consists of family money income plus capital gains, retained profits, the unshifted portion of corporate profits taxes, ths
shifted portion of employers social insurance contributions, and certain other items of non-money income, ess governe broad income concept" is equal to the broad income concept less tax payments plus government expenditures.
e. The "broad income concept" is most comparable to net national product, factorincome distribution.
f. The "adjusted broad income concept" is most comparable to net national product, product side distribution.

Source: Tax Foundation Appendix Tables B-9 and B-11; W. I. Gillespie, "Effect of Public Expenditures on the Distribution of Income," in R. A. Musgrave, ed.,
Essays in Fiscal Federalism (Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution, 1965), pp. 174, 176.

Table D-2
Relative Distribution of Total Current Consumption and Family Money Income In Tax Foundation's and Gillespie's Studies 1960-1961 (a)

a. Calendar year 1960 in Gillespie's study; calendar year 1961 in Tax Foundation's study.
b. Income classes in terms of money income before taxes in Gillespie's study; in money income after personal taxes in Tax Foundation's study.

Source: Tax Foundation income data, Appendix Table B-8; W. I. Gillespie, "EFfect of Public Expenditures on the Distribution of Income," in R. A. Musgrave, ed., Essays

Table D-3

## Allocated Taxes and Income by Income Class in Tax Foundation's and Gillespie's Studies

 1960-1961 (2)(Amounts in millions)

| LINE |  | Income Class(b) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Under } \\ & \$ 2,000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 2,000 \\ 10,000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 3,000 \\ 10 \\ 4.000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 4,000 \\ & \mathbf{t o} \\ & \hline, 000 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \$ 5,000 \\ & 7,500 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 7,500 \\ t 0 \\ 10.000 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \$ 10.000 \\ \text { and } \\ \text { over } \end{gathered}$ | TOTAL |
| Total taxes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (1) | Tax Foundation, standard assumption | \$ 3,745 | \$ 5,658 | \$ 9,321 | \$13,410 | \$ 41,664 | \$ 28,998 | \$ 41,840 | \$144,634 |
| (2) | Gillespie | 4,040 | -6,743 | 8,353 | 13,419 | -35,449 | 17,684 | 48,457 | 134,147 |
| (3) | Line (2) $\div$ - line (1) | - 108\% | 119\% | 90\% | 100\% | 85\% | . $61 \%$ | 116\% | 93\% |
| Income base Tax Foundation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (4) | NNP, personal income distribution | \$13,742 | \$21,489 | \$31,678 | \$46,131 | \$143,973 | \$100,912 | \$116,943 | \$474.868 |
| (5) | NNP, factor income distribution | 8,223 | 17,022 | 29,607 | 45,746 | 145,954 | 102,263 | 126,050 | 474,868 |
| (6) | NNP, product side distribution | 24,743 | 29,081 | 38,802 | 51,380 | 145,887 | 93,107 | 91,869 | 474,868 |
| Gillespie |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (7) | Broad income concept(c) <br> Adjusted broad income concept(d) | $\begin{array}{r} 6,302 \\ 13,420 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 10,034 \\ & 17,525 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 16,187 \\ 19,504 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 29,493 \\ & 28,827 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 106,799 \\ & 103,224 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77,475 \\ & 78,314 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 151,700 \\ & 131,711 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 397,998 \\ & 392,530 \end{aligned}$ |
| (8) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (9) | Line (7) - line 4 | 46\% | $=.47 \%$ | 51\% | . $64 \%$ | 74\% | 77\% | 130\% | 84\% |
| (10) | - Line (7) - line (5)(e) | 77 | 59 | 55 | 64 | 73 | 76 | 120 | 84 |
| (11) | Line (8) $\div$ - line (6)(t) | $\therefore 54$ | ¢ 60 | - 50 | 56 | 71 | 84 | 143 | 83 |

a. Calendar year 1960 in Gillespie's study; calendar year 1961 in Tax Foundation's study.
b. Income classes in terms of money income before taxes in Gillespie's study; in money income after personal taxes in Tax Foundation's study.
c. Gillespie's "troad income concept" consists of family money income plus capital gains, retained profits, the unshifted portion of corporate profits taxes, the backward
c. Gillespie's, sroad income concepti, consists of family money income plus capital gains, retained profits, the unshitted portion of corporate profits taxes, the b
d. "Adjusted troad income concept" is equal to the broad income concept less tax payments plus government expenditures.
e. The "troad income concept" is most comparable to ret national product, factor income distribution.
f. The "adjusted broad income concept" is most comparable to net national product, product side distribution.

Source: Tax Foundation Appendix Tables B-9 and B-10; W. I. Gillespie, "Effect of Public Expenditures on the Distribution of Income," in R. A. Musgrave, ed., Essays in Fiscal Federalism (Washington, D.C. The Brookings Institution, 1965), Dp. 174, 176.

By Income Class in Previous Studies


## Table E-1 (Continued)



Bases for the Allocation of the Benefits of Government Expenditures By Income Class in Previous Studies


Table E-1 (Continued)

| ITEM | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (1) } \\ & \text { Alder (1947/48) } \\ & \text { All fevels of } \\ & \text { goverument } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Tucker (1948) } \\ & \text { TuIf levels of } \\ & \text { goverament } \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (5) } \\ & \text { ciilespie (1960) } \\ & \text { All feveis of } \\ & \text { government } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { (6) } \\ & \text { Tax Foundation } \\ & \text { (1961 \& 1965) } \\ & \text { All Ievels of } \\ & \text { government } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Public welfare | inversely to income below $\$ 4,000$ | welfare recipients | income below $\$ 3,000$ | per capita | public assistance payment | welfare payments |
| Education | per capita | income of families with children under 18 | income of families with school age children | per capita, and income of families with children in school | number of students and wages and salaries | number of children under 18 and education expenses |
| Utility and liquor | income | income | n.a. | per capita | consumption <br> expenditures, homeowners and renters, and expenditures on public transportation | fuel. light. refrigeration and water expenses |

Note: The definition of income is not the same for all studies. The above descriptions are condensations in many cases of more elaborate techniques.
Sources: John H. Adler, "The Fiscal System, The Distribution of Income, and Public Welfare," in Kenyon E. Poole, ed., Fiscal Policies and the AmerJohn H. Adler, "The Fiscal System, The Distribution of income, and Public Weifare, in Kenyon E. Pooie, ed., Fiscal Persing and Benefits and Discussion,"'American Economic Review, Papers and Procéedings. Vol. 48, No. 2, May, 1953, pp. $518-543$; Richard A. Musgrave and Darwin W, Daicoff, "Who Pays the Michigan Taxes?" Michigan Tax Study Staff Papers, (Anin Arbor: Univ. of Mich., 1958), pp. 131-183; O. H. Brownlee, Estimated Distribution of Minnesota Taxes and Public Expenditure Benefits, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press,
1960): Irwin W. Gillespie, "The Effect of Public Expenditures on The Distribution of Income: An Empirical Investigation," in R. A. Mus1960); Irwin W. Gillespie, "The Effect of Public Expenditures on The Distribution of Income:
grave, ed., Essays in Fiscal Federalism (Washington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1965).


[^0]:    1. W. Irwin Giliesple, "Effect of Public Expenditures on the Distribution of Income," in R. A. Musgrave, ed., Essays in Fiscal Federallsm, (Waihington, D. C.: The Brookings Institution, 1965), pp. 122-156.
