Senate Bills 8, 336, 625, 714,715, 824 & 883
Providing Reductions in Capital Gains Tax

Jody Wiser Testimony for Senate Revenue 3.23.2011

Being competitive, that's what brings us here today.

Recent talking points on Oregon's capital gains tax rate have shifted from the argument that "folks move to Washington." While that is obviously true, it really doesn't hold much water when then over 8000 full year filers with income above half a million stay in Oregon, and pay almost all of the $300-700 million in capital gains tax we receive each year. Further, these individuals know that our top tax rate will be not 11% but 9.9% in only nine months.

"Capital won't come to Oregon," is a more recent argument. But in fact one is taxed on capital gains based not on where you invest but on where you live -- whether that's at California's 10.9% top rate or Nevada's 0%. Thus our income tax rates have no effect on outside investors.

In fact, since we raised our top rates, venture capital investing is way up in Oregon.

Another argument is that "businessmen and businesses won't come here." But we know where Oregon's job creators are, they are here already. And largely they'll stay where they start. Oregon's resident companies created 209,000 jobs between 1998 and 2008, while our nonresident companies were net job losers, dropping 10,000 jobs during the same 10 years.[1]

So surely, if your policy goal is to drive capital investment in Oregon, any tax break should be targeted specifically to the gains made on NEW investments in OREGON based businesses.

None of the bills before you today quite does that. SB 824 and SB 8 approach, with SB 824 the preferred bill. Each targets Oregon investment, but gives the break as investment is placed into an Oregon company rather than when it is taken out. Better policy doesn't care whether the income is earned, inherited, from under the mattress, or capital freed up by sale of assets--whether at a profit or loss. The source isn't the point, the point is to bring or keep capital in Oregon's business landscape. Rather than offering the tax break only upon sale of an old investment, we'd offer the tax break at the future point of sale of a new investment in an Oregon business. Thus the General Fund will participate not in risk but in profitable enterprises that have succeeded in creating jobs and enterprise in our economy.

---

[1] National Establishment Time Series / YourEconomy.org

SB 336 is intriguing. It reduces the capital gains rate to the pre-66/67 level and commits all capital gains revenue to the Rainy Day Fund. Had SB 336 been in place in 2003, when we started coming out of the last recession, we would have begun this downturn with roughly six times more money in rainy day accounts than we had. [2]

Even if we go to a zero capital gains tax rate, as in SB 715, changing Oregon's economic landscape by reducing our capital gains tax is unlikely to convince wealthy outsiders to move here and start new companies. Certainly not enough to make up the $300-$700 million a year in lost revenue. LRO estimates that even just a 1% rate cut will cost $76 million a biennium. But only if we go to zero will you convince the tax adverse to stay here when they are going to sell their companies. Cutting that kind of revenue could mean ending entirely our commitment to higher education.

If we thought a reduction in capital gains tax cut would convince Oregon businesses to increase all wages by 10%, we'd be all over it. But that's as likely as convincing 9% of Oregonians to move away. We need to do one or the other of these to bring our per capita income up to national averages. The solution to the differences between Washington and Oregon isn't in a radical change in our tax structure.

---

[2] We'd suggest diverting only a portion of capital gains income to Rainy Day, and increase the cap for this fund from 7 ½% to at least 12%. With the 5% cap on the Education Stabilization Fund and the 7.5% cap on the RDF, the most we would have had in savings prior to this recession at 12.5% is $1.8 billion. But conceptually, the idea is certainly worthy of discussion.

Tax Fairness Oregon is a near all-volunteer citizens group advocating for fair, stable and adequate taxes

Senate Bills 8, 336, 625, 714,715, 824 & 883
Providing Reductions in Capital Gains Tax

Jody Wiser Testimony for Senate Revenue 3.23.2011

Being competitive, that's what brings us here today.

Recent talking points on Oregon's capital gains tax rate have shifted from the argument that "folks move to Washington." While that is obviously true, it really doesn't hold much water when then over 8000 full year filers with income above half a million stay in Oregon, and pay almost all of the $300-700 million in capital gains tax we receive each year. Further, these individuals know that our top tax rate will be not 11% but 9.9% in only nine months.

"Capital won't come to Oregon," is a more recent argument. But in fact one is taxed on capital gains based not on where you invest but on where you live -- whether that's at California's 10.9% top rate or Nevada's 0%. Thus our income tax rates have no effect on outside investors.

In fact, since we raised our top rates, venture capital investing is way up in Oregon.

Another argument is that "businessmen and businesses won't come here." But we know where Oregon's job creators are, they are here already. And largely they'll stay where they start. Oregon's resident companies created 209,000 jobs between 1998 and 2008, while our nonresident companies were net job losers, dropping 10,000 jobs during the same 10 years.[1]

So surely, if your policy goal is to drive capital investment in Oregon, any tax break should be targeted specifically to the gains made on NEW investments in OREGON based businesses.

None of the bills before you today quite does that. SB 824 and SB 8 approach, with SB 824 the preferred bill. Each targets Oregon investment, but gives the break as investment is placed into an Oregon company rather than when it is taken out. Better policy doesn't care whether the income is earned, inherited, from under the mattress, or capital freed up by sale of assets--whether at a profit or loss. The source isn't the point, the point is to bring or keep capital in Oregon's business landscape. Rather than offering the tax break only upon sale of an old investment, we'd offer the tax break at the future point of sale of a new investment in an Oregon business. Thus the General Fund will participate not in risk but in profitable enterprises that have succeeded in creating jobs and enterprise in our economy.

[1] National Establishment Time Series / YourEconomy.org

SB 336 is intriguing. It reduces the capital gains rate to the pre-66/67 level and commits all capital gains revenue to the Rainy Day Fund. Had SB 336 been in place in 2003, when we started coming out of the last recession, we would have begun this downturn with roughly six times more money in rainy day accounts than we had. [2]

Even if we go to a zero capital gains tax rate, as in SB 715, changing Oregon's economic landscape by reducing our capital gains tax is unlikely to convince wealthy outsiders to move here and start new companies. Certainly not enough to make up the $300-$700 million a year in lost revenue. LRO estimates that even just a 1% rate cut will cost $76 million a biennium. But only if we go to zero will you convince the tax adverse to stay here when they are going to sell their companies. Cutting that kind of revenue could mean ending entirely our commitment to higher education.

If we thought a reduction in capital gains tax cut would convince Oregon businesses to increase all wages by 10%, we'd be all over it. But that's as likely as convincing 9% of Oregonians to move away. We need to do one or the other of these to bring our per capita income up to national averages. The solution to the differences between Washington and Oregon isn't in a radical change in our tax structure.

[2] We'd suggest diverting only a portion of capital gains income to Rainy Day, and increase the cap for this fund from 7 ½% to at least 12%. With the 5% cap on the Education Stabilization Fund and the 7.5% cap on the RDF, the most we would have had in savings prior to this recession at 12.5% is $1.8 billion. But conceptually, the idea is certainly worthy of discussion.

Tax Fairness Oregon is a near all-volunteer citizens group advocating for fair, stable and adequate taxes

Senate Bills 8, 336, 625, 714,715, 824 & 883
Providing Reductions in Capital Gains Tax

Jody Wiser Testimony for Senate Revenue 3.23.2011

Being competitive, that's what brings us here today.

Recent talking points on Oregon's capital gains tax rate have shifted from the argument that "folks move to Washington." While that is obviously true, it really doesn't hold much water when then over 8000 full year filers with income above half a million stay in Oregon, and pay almost all of the $300-700 million in capital gains tax we receive each year. Further, these individuals know that our top tax rate will be not 11% but 9.9% in only nine months.

"Capital won't come to Oregon," is a more recent argument. But in fact one is taxed on capital gains based not on where you invest but on where you live -- whether that's at California's 10.9% top rate or Nevada's 0%. Thus our income tax rates have no effect on outside investors.

In fact, since we raised our top rates, venture capital investing is way up in Oregon.

Another argument is that "businessmen and businesses won't come here." But we know where Oregon's job creators are, they are here already. And largely they'll stay where they start. Oregon's resident companies created 209,000 jobs between 1998 and 2008, while our nonresident companies were net job losers, dropping 10,000 jobs during the same 10 years.[1]

So surely, if your policy goal is to drive capital investment in Oregon, any tax break should be targeted specifically to the gains made on NEW investments in OREGON based businesses.

None of the bills before you today quite does that. SB 824 and SB 8 approach, with SB 824 the preferred bill. Each targets Oregon investment, but gives the break as investment is placed into an Oregon company rather than when it is taken out. Better policy doesn't care whether the income is earned, inherited, from under the mattress, or capital freed up by sale of assets--whether at a profit or loss. The source isn't the point, the point is to bring or keep capital in Oregon's business landscape. Rather than offering the tax break only upon sale of an old investment, we'd offer the tax break at the future point of sale of a new investment in an Oregon business. Thus the General Fund will participate not in risk but in profitable enterprises that have succeeded in creating jobs and enterprise in our economy.

---

[1] National Establishment Time Series / YourEconomy.org

SB 336 is intriguing. It reduces the capital gains rate to the pre-66/67 level and commits all capital gains revenue to the Rainy Day Fund. Had SB 336 been in place in 2003, when we started coming out of the last recession, we would have begun this downturn with roughly six times more money in rainy day accounts than we had. [2]

Even if we go to a zero capital gains tax rate, as in SB 715, changing Oregon's economic landscape by reducing our capital gains tax is unlikely to convince wealthy outsiders to move here and start new companies. Certainly not enough to make up the $300-$700 million a year in lost revenue. LRO estimates that even just a 1% rate cut will cost $76 million a biennium. But only if we go to zero will you convince the tax adverse to stay here when they are going to sell their companies. Cutting that kind of revenue could mean ending entirely our commitment to higher education.

If we thought a reduction in capital gains tax cut would convince Oregon businesses to increase all wages by 10%, we'd be all over it. But that's as likely as convincing 9% of Oregonians to move away. We need to do one or the other of these to bring our per capita income up to national averages. The solution to the differences between Washington and Oregon isn't in a radical change in our tax structure.

[2] We'd suggest diverting only a portion of capital gains income to Rainy Day, and increase the cap for this fund from 7 ½% to at least 12%. With the 5% cap on the Education Stabilization Fund and the 7.5% cap on the RDF, the most we would have had in savings prior to this recession at 12.5% is $1.8 billion. But conceptually, the idea is certainly worthy of discussion.

Tax Fairness Oregon is a near all-volunteer citizens group advocating for fair, stable and adequate taxes

Senate Bills 8, 336, 625, 714,715, 824 & 883
Providing Reductions in Capital Gains Tax

Jody Wiser Testimony for Senate Revenue 3.23.2011

Being competitive, that's what brings us here today.

Recent talking points on Oregon's capital gains tax rate have shifted from the argument that "folks move to Washington." While that is obviously true, it really doesn't hold much water when then over 8000 full year filers with income above half a million stay in Oregon, and pay almost all of the $300-700 million in capital gains tax we receive each year. Further, these individuals know that our top tax rate will be not 11% but 9.9% in only nine months.

"Capital won't come to Oregon," is a more recent argument. But in fact one is taxed on capital gains based not on where you invest but on where you live -- whether that's at California's 10.9% top rate or Nevada's 0%. Thus our income tax rates have no effect on outside investors.

In fact, since we raised our top rates, venture capital investing is way up in Oregon.

Another argument is that "businessmen and businesses won't come here." But we know where Oregon's job creators are, they are here already. And largely they'll stay where they start. Oregon's resident companies created 209,000 jobs between 1998 and 2008, while our nonresident companies were net job losers, dropping 10,000 jobs during the same 10 years.[1]

So surely, if your policy goal is to drive capital investment in Oregon, any tax break should be targeted specifically to the gains made on NEW investments in OREGON based businesses.

None of the bills before you today quite does that. SB 824 and SB 8 approach, with SB 824 the preferred bill. Each targets Oregon investment, but gives the break as investment is placed into an Oregon company rather than when it is taken out. Better policy doesn't care whether the income is earned, inherited, from under the mattress, or capital freed up by sale of assets--whether at a profit or loss. The source isn't the point, the point is to bring or keep capital in Oregon's business landscape. Rather than offering the tax break only upon sale of an old investment, we'd offer the tax break at the future point of sale of a new investment in an Oregon business. Thus the General Fund will participate not in risk but in profitable enterprises that have succeeded in creating jobs and enterprise in our economy.

---

[1] National Establishment Time Series / YourEconomy.org

SB 336 is intriguing. It reduces the capital gains rate to the pre-66/67 level and commits all capital gains revenue to the Rainy Day Fund. Had SB 336 been in place in 2003, when we started coming out of the last recession, we would have begun this downturn with roughly six times more money in rainy day accounts than we had. [2]

Even if we go to a zero capital gains tax rate, as in SB 715, changing Oregon's economic landscape by reducing our capital gains tax is unlikely to convince wealthy outsiders to move here and start new companies. Certainly not enough to make up the $300-$700 million a year in lost revenue. LRO estimates that even just a 1% rate cut will cost $76 million a biennium. But only if we go to zero will you convince the tax adverse to stay here when they are going to sell their companies. Cutting that kind of revenue could mean ending entirely our commitment to higher education.

If we thought a reduction in capital gains tax cut would convince Oregon businesses to increase all wages by 10%, we'd be all over it. But that's as likely as convincing 9% of Oregonians to move away. We need to do one or the other of these to bring our per capita income up to national averages. The solution to the differences between Washington and Oregon isn't in a radical change in our tax structure.

[2] We'd suggest diverting only a portion of capital gains income to Rainy Day, and increase the cap for this fund from 7 ½% to at least 12%. With the 5% cap on the Education Stabilization Fund and the 7.5% cap on the RDF, the most we would have had in savings prior to this recession at 12.5% is $1.8 billion. But conceptually, the idea is certainly worthy of discussion.

Tax Fairness Oregon is a near all-volunteer citizens group advocating for fair, stable and adequate taxes

Senate Bills 8, 336, 625, 714,715, 824 & 883
Providing Reductions in Capital Gains Tax

Jody Wiser Testimony for Senate Revenue 3.23.2011

Being competitive, that's what brings us here today.

Recent talking points on Oregon's capital gains tax rate have shifted from the argument that "folks move to Washington." While that is obviously true, it really doesn't hold much water when then over 8000 full year filers with income above half a million stay in Oregon, and pay almost all of the $300-700 million in capital gains tax we receive each year. Further, these individuals know that our top tax rate will be not 11% but 9.9% in only nine months.

"Capital won't come to Oregon," is a more recent argument. But in fact one is taxed on capital gains based not on where you invest but on where you live -- whether that's at California's 10.9% top rate or Nevada's 0%. Thus our income tax rates have no effect on outside investors.

In fact, since we raised our top rates, venture capital investing is way up in Oregon.

Another argument is that "businessmen and businesses won't come here." But we know where Oregon's job creators are, they are here already. And largely they'll stay where they start. Oregon's resident companies created 209,000 jobs between 1998 and 2008, while our nonresident companies were net job losers, dropping 10,000 jobs during the same 10 years.[1]

So surely, if your policy goal is to drive capital investment in Oregon, any tax break should be targeted specifically to the gains made on NEW investments in OREGON based businesses.

None of the bills before you today quite does that. SB 824 and SB 8 approach, with SB 824 the preferred bill. Each targets Oregon investment, but gives the break as investment is placed into an Oregon company rather than when it is taken out. Better policy doesn't care whether the income is earned, inherited, from under the mattress, or capital freed up by sale of assets--whether at a profit or loss. The source isn't the point, the point is to bring or keep capital in Oregon's business landscape. Rather than offering the tax break only upon sale of an old investment, we'd offer the tax break at the future point of sale of a new investment in an Oregon business. Thus the General Fund will participate not in risk but in profitable enterprises that have succeeded in creating jobs and enterprise in our economy.

[1] National Establishment Time Series / YourEconomy.org

SB 336 is intriguing. It reduces the capital gains rate to the pre-66/67 level and commits all capital gains revenue to the Rainy Day Fund. Had SB 336 been in place in 2003, when we started coming out of the last recession, we would have begun this downturn with roughly six times more money in rainy day accounts than we had. [2]

Even if we go to a zero capital gains tax rate, as in SB 715, changing Oregon's economic landscape by reducing our capital gains tax is unlikely to convince wealthy outsiders to move here and start new companies. Certainly not enough to make up the $300-$700 million a year in lost revenue. LRO estimates that even just a 1% rate cut will cost $76 million a biennium. But only if we go to zero will you convince the tax adverse to stay here when they are going to sell their companies. Cutting that kind of revenue could mean ending entirely our commitment to higher education.

If we thought a reduction in capital gains tax cut would convince Oregon businesses to increase all wages by 10%, we'd be all over it. But that's as likely as convincing 9% of Oregonians to move away. We need to do one or the other of these to bring our per capita income up to national averages. The solution to the differences between Washington and Oregon isn't in a radical change in our tax structure.

[2] We'd suggest diverting only a portion of capital gains income to Rainy Day, and increase the cap for this fund from 7 ½% to at least 12%. With the 5% cap on the Education Stabilization Fund and the 7.5% cap on the RDF, the most we would have had in savings prior to this recession at 12.5% is $1.8 billion. But conceptually, the idea is certainly worthy of discussion.

Tax Fairness Oregon is a near all-volunteer citizens group advocating for fair, stable and adequate taxes

Senate Bills 8, 336, 625, 714,715, 824 & 883
Providing Reductions in Capital Gains Tax

Jody Wiser Testimony for Senate Revenue 3.23.2011

Being competitive, that's what brings us here today.

Recent talking points on Oregon's capital gains tax rate have shifted from the argument that "folks move to Washington." While that is obviously true, it really doesn't hold much water when then over 8000 full year filers with income above half a million stay in Oregon, and pay almost all of the $300-700 million in capital gains tax we receive each year. Further, these individuals know that our top tax rate will be not 11% but 9.9% in only nine months.

"Capital won't come to Oregon," is a more recent argument. But in fact one is taxed on capital gains based not on where you invest but on where you live -- whether that's at California's 10.9% top rate or Nevada's 0%. Thus our income tax rates have no effect on outside investors.

In fact, since we raised our top rates, venture capital investing is way up in Oregon.

Another argument is that "businessmen and businesses won't come here." But we know where Oregon's job creators are, they are here already. And largely they'll stay where they start. Oregon's resident companies created 209,000 jobs between 1998 and 2008, while our nonresident companies were net job losers, dropping 10,000 jobs during the same 10 years.[1]

So surely, if your policy goal is to drive capital investment in Oregon, any tax break should be targeted specifically to the gains made on NEW investments in OREGON based businesses.

None of the bills before you today quite does that. SB 824 and SB 8 approach, with SB 824 the preferred bill. Each targets Oregon investment, but gives the break as investment is placed into an Oregon company rather than when it is taken out. Better policy doesn't care whether the income is earned, inherited, from under the mattress, or capital freed up by sale of assets--whether at a profit or loss. The source isn't the point, the point is to bring or keep capital in Oregon's business landscape. Rather than offering the tax break only upon sale of an old investment, we'd offer the tax break at the future point of sale of a new investment in an Oregon business. Thus the General Fund will participate not in risk but in profitable enterprises that have succeeded in creating jobs and enterprise in our economy.

[1] National Establishment Time Series / YourEconomy.org

SB 336 is intriguing. It reduces the capital gains rate to the pre-66/67 level and commits all capital gains revenue to the Rainy Day Fund. Had SB 336 been in place in 2003, when we started coming out of the last recession, we would have begun this downturn with roughly six times more money in rainy day accounts than we had. [2]

Even if we go to a zero capital gains tax rate, as in SB 715, changing Oregon's economic landscape by reducing our capital gains tax is unlikely to convince wealthy outsiders to move here and start new companies. Certainly not enough to make up the $300-$700 million a year in lost revenue. LRO estimates that even just a 1% rate cut will cost $76 million a biennium. But only if we go to zero will you convince the tax adverse to stay here when they are going to sell their companies. Cutting that kind of revenue could mean ending entirely our commitment to higher education.

If we thought a reduction in capital gains tax cut would convince Oregon businesses to increase all wages by 10%, we'd be all over it. But that's as likely as convincing 9% of Oregonians to move away. We need to do one or the other of these to bring our per capita income up to national averages. The solution to the differences between Washington and Oregon isn't in a radical change in our tax structure.

[2] We'd suggest diverting only a portion of capital gains income to Rainy Day, and increase the cap for this fund from 7 ½% to at least 12%. With the 5% cap on the Education Stabilization Fund and the 7.5% cap on the RDF, the most we would have had in savings prior to this recession at 12.5% is $1.8 billion. But conceptually, the idea is certainly worthy of discussion.

Tax Fairness Oregon is a near all-volunteer citizens group advocating for fair, stable and adequate taxes

Senate Bills 8, 336, 625, 714,715, 824 & 883
Providing Reductions in Capital Gains Tax

Jody Wiser Testimony for Senate Revenue 3.23.2011

Being competitive, that's what brings us here today.

Recent talking points on Oregon's capital gains tax rate have shifted from the argument that "folks move to Washington." While that is obviously true, it really doesn't hold much water when then over 8000 full year filers with income above half a million stay in Oregon, and pay almost all of the $300-700 million in capital gains tax we receive each year. Further, these individuals know that our top tax rate will be not 11% but 9.9% in only nine months.

"Capital won't come to Oregon," is a more recent argument. But in fact one is taxed on capital gains based not on where you invest but on where you live -- whether that's at California's 10.9% top rate or Nevada's 0%. Thus our income tax rates have no effect on outside investors.

In fact, since we raised our top rates, venture capital investing is way up in Oregon.

Another argument is that "businessmen and businesses won't come here." But we know where Oregon's job creators are, they are here already. And largely they'll stay where they start. Oregon's resident companies created 209,000 jobs between 1998 and 2008, while our nonresident companies were net job losers, dropping 10,000 jobs during the same 10 years.[1]

So surely, if your policy goal is to drive capital investment in Oregon, any tax break should be targeted specifically to the gains made on NEW investments in OREGON based businesses.

None of the bills before you today quite does that. SB 824 and SB 8 approach, with SB 824 the preferred bill. Each targets Oregon investment, but gives the break as investment is placed into an Oregon company rather than when it is taken out. Better policy doesn't care whether the income is earned, inherited, from under the mattress, or capital freed up by sale of assets--whether at a profit or loss. The source isn't the point, the point is to bring or keep capital in Oregon's business landscape. Rather than offering the tax break only upon sale of an old investment, we'd offer the tax break at the future point of sale of a new investment in an Oregon business. Thus the General Fund will participate not in risk but in profitable enterprises that have succeeded in creating jobs and enterprise in our economy.

[1] National Establishment Time Series / YourEconomy.org

SB 336 is intriguing. It reduces the capital gains rate to the pre-66/67 level and commits all capital gains revenue to the Rainy Day Fund. Had SB 336 been in place in 2003, when we started coming out of the last recession, we would have begun this downturn with roughly six times more money in rainy day accounts than we had. [2]

Even if we go to a zero capital gains tax rate, as in SB 715, changing Oregon's economic landscape by reducing our capital gains tax is unlikely to convince wealthy outsiders to move here and start new companies. Certainly not enough to make up the $300-$700 million a year in lost revenue. LRO estimates that even just a 1% rate cut will cost $76 million a biennium. But only if we go to zero will you convince the tax adverse to stay here when they are going to sell their companies. Cutting that kind of revenue could mean ending entirely our commitment to higher education.

If we thought a reduction in capital gains tax cut would convince Oregon businesses to increase all wages by 10%, we'd be all over it. But that's as likely as convincing 9% of Oregonians to move away. We need to do one or the other of these to bring our per capita income up to national averages. The solution to the differences between Washington and Oregon isn't in a radical change in our tax structure.

---

[2] We'd suggest diverting only a portion of capital gains income to Rainy Day, and increase the cap for this fund from 7 ½% to at least 12%. With the 5% cap on the Education Stabilization Fund and the 7.5% cap on the RDF, the most we would have had in savings prior to this recession at 12.5% is $1.8 billion. But conceptually, the idea is certainly worthy of discussion.

Tax Fairness Oregon is a near all-volunteer citizens group advocating for fair, stable and adequate taxes