



HB 2604 Maintains inequitable tax preference for business owners

Testimony for the House Committee on Revenue – John Calhoun – 2.25.2021

Tax Fairness Oregon, a network of volunteers who support a rational and equitable tax code, has always opposed a preferential tax treatment for business owners. It is a perfect example of giving to the rich and taking from the poor using our tax code. Oregon workers paid minimum wage get to the second highest state tax bracket of 8.75% on income under \$10,000 while the bosses they work for are currently paying only 7%. Under HB 2604, this rate would drop to 6% on the first \$75,000 and 6.5% up to \$150,000.

For those who claim that business owners take more risk and work harder, I suggest they go into the fields to pick crops, work as roofer risking their life, or work in kitchens scrubbing pots and pans and tell me that they deserve lower tax rates than the workers who do that every workday for a lifetime.

I was a small business owner for 25 years without this tax benefit and somehow managed to survive, create jobs, and add to my wealth. I owned businesses that were C Corps and later partnerships/pass throughs without these preferences. So did all Oregon business owners until the law was changed in 2013.

This preferential rate is sometimes defended in comparison to C corporation rates which are lower than our personal income tax rates. My response is that those who want those rates should organize their businesses as C corporations. Of course, then they would have to pay both the corporate rate and also the personal income tax rate for any dividend payments they made to themselves.

The pass-through/partnership structure allows owners to avoid paying taxes twice. It does not need a lowered rate in any circumstance.

We have been informed that HB 2604 has been designed to be revenue neutral. As a result, we oppose it because it maintains this tax preference for some taxpayers over others. A similar bill in the Senate, SB 139, does not eliminate these preferences but it does substantially shrink it. As a result, we support SB 139. We hope this committee will take a close look at what comes out of the Senate.

We read the bills and follow the money