



1728 Connecticut Ave, NW  
2<sup>nd</sup> Floor  
Washington, DC 20009  
202.525.5717  
admin@rstreet.org

*Free markets. Real solutions.*

---

## **Cutting the Corporate Tax Rate Means Cutting Corporate Taxes**

*Ike Brannon*

America has the highest corporate tax rate in the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, or OECD. But it wasn't always so.

In 1986 the U.S. cut its corporate tax rate close the current rate of 35 percent as a part of a broad, comprehensive tax reform at both the corporate and personal level. The reform gave the U.S. one of the lower corporate tax rates among the developed world, but since then we have slowly become a high corporate tax rate country through stasis: literally every single country in the OECD has reduced its corporate tax rate in the last twenty years, with many having done so multiple times. Except for the U.S.

There are no shortage of people on both sides of the aisle dissatisfied with this state of affairs: in the past year members of both parties, as well as the Obama Administration, have offered support for reducing corporate tax rates—but all insist that such reform must be done so that the loss in tax revenue from a reduced rate is “paid for” by increasing the tax revenue collected from corporations in other ways, such as eliminating certain tax deductions or tax credits made available to corporations.

However, such a constraint on any corporate rate reduction would doom tax reform to have a very slight effect on economic growth, as evidenced not just by a bevy of economic models but also the experience of the other OECD countries. Corporate tax cuts may not pay for themselves, but the money collected via the corporate tax rate ranks among the least efficient and most costly revenue a government collects in terms of foregone economic growth. The other governments in the developed world realize this, and as a result *the vast majority of corporate tax rate reductions that have occurred in the OECD in the last decade have not been paid for.*

The result has been more economic growth as well as more robust corporate tax revenue gains than would have otherwise been the case.

## Accelerating Corporate Tax Cuts

The move towards a lower corporate tax rate has gained steam across the globe in the last decade. The average effective corporate tax rate among the other OECD nations has fallen from 37 to 30 percent since 2002 and shows no signs of stopping. In the last decade **every other** OECD country lowered their corporate tax rates by at least one percentage point a combined **85 times**—while the U.S. corporate tax rate has remain unchanged. Some of these cumulative reductions have been significant: For instance, Canada’s corporate income tax rate has gone from 28 to 15 percent in the last 11 years, while Germany’s has fallen from fifty percent to under thirty during that time span. In the first half of 2012 alone Japan, Chile, Canada and Finland reduced their tax rates, and six countries reduced rates in 2011 as well.

What is telling is that the vast majority of the tax cuts *were not offset* by higher taxes elsewhere. Of the 85 OECD corporate tax cuts, only **16** were accompanied by an increase in either the personal income tax, value-added tax, or the elimination of tax expenditures to offset the rate decrease.

Most of these countries recognize the high opportunity cost of the tax in terms of foregone economic growth. As the world economy becomes more tightly integrated and capital becomes more mobile, the opportunity cost of the corporate income tax has only increased.

What’s more, reducing the top tax rate while jettisoning the various investment incentives that constitute the bulk of the tax expenditures produces only modest gains in efficiency. Simultaneously increasing the cost of investment in one place and then decreasing in another accomplishes little, studies have found.<sup>1</sup>

Why hasn’t the U.S. participated in the trend towards lower corporate taxes? For starters, reducing the corporate income tax is freighted with symbolism. The left, in particular, tends to paint potential reductions in income taxes as a sop to the rich, despite a near consensus among economists that workers end up bearing the brunt of the tax through lower wages, as high corporate tax rates dampen investment and productivity as well, in turn depressing wages.<sup>2</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Jane Gravelle and Thomas Hungerford, “Corporate Tax Reform: Issues for Congress” Congressional Research Service Report, December 16<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

<sup>2</sup> For a more detailed discussion on the inefficiency of the corporate income tax see Ike Brannon, Doug Holtz-Eakin and Elizabeth Lowell, “How Reform of the Corporate Income Tax Code can create Short- and Long-Term Economic Growth.” [American Action Forum Report](#), July 2011.

Opponents of corporate tax reform insist that our corporate income tax burden is in line with that of other countries once the various deductions, credits, and other expenditures are fully taken into account, although the data dispute this. For instance, Philip Dittmer of the Tax Foundation analyzes over a dozen studies that estimate an effective corporate tax rate for the U.S. as well as the other OECD countries,<sup>3</sup> finding that, even by this metric, the U.S. is anywhere from five to fifteen points above the OECD average.<sup>4</sup>

In 2012 the Obama administration set forth the broad principles of a revenue-neutral tax reform that would lower rates while making up the lost revenue via the elimination of the bulk of the various credits and deductions.<sup>5</sup> Ways and Means chairman Dave Camp also released a corporate tax reform proposal that was revenue neutral and paid for by the elimination of various tax expenditures,<sup>6</sup> and the Senate Finance Committee Chairman, Max Baucus, has also suggested that revenue-neutral corporate tax reform is his intention.<sup>7</sup>

While the corporate tax code does indeed have a plethora of credits, deductions, and exclusions that allow corporations to reduce their tax bill, eliminating all of these and dedicating the revenue generated to “pay for” a lower corporate tax rate does not buy that much of a tax rate reduction—perhaps less than the 25% rate promised by House Ways and Means Chairman Dave Camp. A corporate tax reform not constrained to be revenue-neutral could have a significant long-term benefit to productivity, wages, and economic growth.

The United States is no longer immune from the economic forces that buffet the rest of the world: it is time we got our economic house in order and created a tax system that looks like it was designed on purpose. Reducing the corporate tax rate so as to make it competitive with the other developed nations would do much more for economic growth, employment, and wages than any amount of “stimulus” spending from the government. Making economic growth the focus for tax reform may be a novel concept for this country but we can no longer subordinate growth to more plebian political objectives and get away with it.

*Ike Brannon is director of research for the R Street Institute, a non-profit, non-partisan public policy research institution in Washington, D.C.*

---

<sup>3</sup> Calculating an effective tax rate requires making a variety of assumptions about the size of the business, the type of business, its capital expenditures, and the like.

<sup>4</sup> Dittmer, Philip: “U.S. Corporations Suffer High Effective Tax Rates by International Standards.” *The Tax Foundation Report*, September, 2011, Table 1.

<sup>5</sup> The President’s Framework for Business Tax Reform, [Whitehouse.gov](http://Whitehouse.gov), February 2012

<sup>6</sup> Ways and Means [Discussion Draft](#), October 26<sup>th</sup>, 2011.

<sup>7</sup> Baucus, Max and Dave Camp, “Tax Reform is very much Alive and Doable,” [The Wall Street Journal](#), 7 April 2013.