

briefing notes

IFS

# A SURVEY OF UK TAX SYSTEM

---

*Stuart Adam and James Browne*

# A Survey of the UK Tax System

Updated by Stuart Adam and James Browne\*  
December 2006

Institute for Fiscal Studies

## *Acknowledgements*

This Briefing Note is a revision of earlier versions by Stuart Adam, James Browne, Lucy Chennells, Andrew Dilnot, Christine Frayne, Greg Kaplan, Nikki Roback and Jonathan Shaw, which substantially revised and updated the UK chapter by A. Dilnot and G. Stears in K. Messere (ed.), *The Tax System in Industrialized Countries*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1998. The original Briefing Note can be downloaded from [www.ifs.org.uk/bns/taxsurvey2000.pdf](http://www.ifs.org.uk/bns/taxsurvey2000.pdf). The paper was funded by the ESRC Centre for the Microeconomic Analysis of Public Policy at the Institute for Fiscal Studies. The authors would like to thank Andrew Leicester, David Phillips, Jonathan Shaw and Luke Sibieta for their help and advice during revision of the Briefing Note, and Judith Payne for copy-editing. All remaining errors are the responsibility of the authors.

\*Addresses for correspondence: [stuart.adam@ifs.org.uk](mailto:stuart.adam@ifs.org.uk), [james\\_browne@ifs.org.uk](mailto:james_browne@ifs.org.uk)

# Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Revenue raised by UK taxes.....	3
3. The tax system.....	4
3.1. Income tax.....	4
3.2. National Insurance contributions.....	8
3.3. Value added tax (VAT).....	11
3.4. Other indirect taxes.....	13
3.5. Capital taxes.....	16
3.6. Corporation tax.....	19
3.7. Taxation of North Sea production.....	21
3.8. Council tax.....	21
3.9. Business rates.....	22
4. Summary of recent trends.....	23
4.1. How did we get here?.....	23
4.2. Personal income taxes.....	27
4.3. Taxation of saving.....	33
4.4. Personal indirect taxes.....	34
4.5. Taxes on companies.....	37
4.6. Local taxation.....	38
5. Conclusions.....	38

## **1. Introduction**

This paper provides an overview of the UK tax system. It describes how each of the main taxes works and examines their current form in the context of the past 25 years. We begin, in Section 2, with a brief assessment of the total amount of revenue raised by UK taxation and the contribution made by each tax to this total. In Section 3, we describe the structure of each of the main taxes: income tax; National Insurance contributions; value added tax and other indirect taxes; capital taxes such as capital gains tax and inheritance tax; corporation tax; taxes on North Sea production; council tax; and business rates. The information given in these sections relates, where possible, to the tax system for the fiscal year 2006–07.

In Section 4, we set the current system in the context of reforms that have taken place over the last 25 years. The section examines the changing structure of income tax and National Insurance contributions and developments in the taxation of saving, indirect taxation, taxes on companies and local taxes. More information on historical tax rates can be found on the IFS website at [www.ifs.org.uk/ff/indextax.php](http://www.ifs.org.uk/ff/indextax.php).

Much of the information contained in this Briefing Note is taken from the HM Revenue and Customs website ([www.hmrc.gov.uk](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk)). Information relating to tax receipts is from the 2006 Budget, [www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/budget/budget\\_06/bud\\_bud06\\_index.cfm](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/budget/budget_06/bud_bud06_index.cfm). Occasionally, sources can be inconsistent because of the different timing of publications or minor definitional disparities.

## **2. Revenue raised by UK taxes**

Total government receipts are forecast to be £516.4 billion in 2006–07, or 40.3% of UK GDP. This is equivalent to roughly £10,500 for every adult in the UK, or £8,500 per person. Table 1 summarises the breakdown of UK government revenue. Income tax, National Insurance contributions and VAT are easily the largest sources of revenue for the government, together accounting for 60.1% of total receipts.

**Table 1: Sources of government revenue, 2006–07 forecasts**

Source of revenue	Forecast 2006–07 (£bn)	Proportion of total (%)
Income tax (gross of tax credits)	144.0	27.9
National Insurance contributions	89.6	17.4
Value added tax	76.5	14.8
Other indirect taxes		
Fuel duties	24.0	4.6
Tobacco duties	8.0	1.5
Alcohol duties	8.1	1.6
Betting and gaming duties	1.4	0.3
Vehicle excise duty	5.1	1.0
Air passenger duty	1.0	0.2
Insurance premium tax	2.4	0.5
Landfill tax	0.8	0.2
Climate change levy	0.7	0.1
Aggregates levy	0.3	0.1
Customs duties and levies	2.2	0.4
Capital taxes		
Capital gains tax	3.8	0.7
Inheritance tax	3.6	0.7
Stamp duties	12.2	2.4
Company taxes		
Corporation tax	49.0	9.5
Petroleum revenue tax	1.9	0.4
Business rates	21.4	4.1
Council tax (net of council tax benefit)	22.0	4.3
Other taxes and royalties	13.6	2.6
Interest and dividends	5.7	1.1
Gross operating surplus, relevant tax credits, other receipts and adjustments	19.0	3.7
<b>Current receipts</b>	<b>516.4</b>	<b>100.0</b>

Note: Figures may not sum exactly to totals because of rounding.

Source: HM Treasury, *Financial Statement and Budget Report*, 2006 ([http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/budget/budget\\_06/bud\\_bud06\\_index.cfm](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/budget/budget_06/bud_bud06_index.cfm)).

### 3. The tax system

#### 3.1. Income tax

##### *Income tax liabilities*

Around 29.5 million individuals pay income tax in the UK, but not all income is subject to tax. The primary forms of taxable income are earnings from employment, income from self-employment and non incorporated businesses, jobseeker's allowance, retirement pensions, income from property, bank and building society interest and dividends on shares. Incomes from most means-tested social security benefits are not liable to income tax. Many non-means-tested benefits are taxable (e.g. the basic state pension), but some (notably child benefit) are not. Income tax is also not paid on employer or employee pension contributions (up to a limit) or on income

from certain savings products, such as National Savings Certificates and Individual Savings Accounts.

Income tax is forecast to raise £144.0 billion in 2006–07.

### *Allowances, bands and rates*

Income tax in the UK operates through a system of allowances and bands of income. Each individual has a personal allowance, which is deducted from total income before tax to give *taxable* income. Taxpayers under 65 years old receive a personal allowance of £5,035, while older people are entitled to higher personal allowances (see Table 2).

**Table 2: Personal allowances, 2006–07**

Type of allowance	Allowance (£ per year)
Aged under 65	5,035
Aged 65–74	7,280 <sup>a</sup>
Aged 75 or over	7,420 <sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>For higher-income individuals, these are gradually reduced to the level of the under-65s' allowance, as described in the text.

Source: HM Revenue and Customs, [www.hmrc.gov.uk/rates/it.htm](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/rates/it.htm).

In the past, married couples were also entitled to a married couple's allowance (MCA). This was abolished in April 2000, except for those already aged 65 or over at that date (i.e. born before April 1935). For these remaining claimants, the MCA no longer acts to increase the personal allowance; instead, it simply reduces final tax liability, by £606.50 in 2006–07 (£613.50 for those aged 75 or over). Couples may choose which of them claims the MCA, or they can claim half each.

If income for those aged 65 or over exceeds a certain limit (£20,100 in 2006–07), then first the higher personal allowance and then (where appropriate) the MCA are gradually reduced. The personal allowance is reduced by 50 pence for every pound of income above the £19,500 threshold, gradually reducing it to a minimum level equal to the allowance for the under-65s for those with incomes above £24,590 (£24,870 for those aged 75 or over). Above this latter threshold, those entitled to MCA have it reduced by five pence for every additional pound of income until it reaches a minimum level of £235.00 for those with incomes above £32,020 (£32,440 for those aged 75 or over).

Taxable income is subject to different tax rates depending upon the 'tax band' within which income falls. The first £2,150 of taxable income (i.e. income above the personal allowance) is taxed at the starting rate of 10%. The next £31,150 is subject to the basic rate of 22%. Taxable income above the basic-rate limit of £33,300 is subject to the higher rate of 40%. Table 3 summarises these marginal tax rates and bands.

**Table 3: Tax bands and rates, 2006–07**

<b>Taxable income (£ per year)</b>	<b>Rate of tax (%)</b>
0–2,150 (starting-rate band)	10
2,150–33,300 (basic-rate band)	22
Over 33,300 (higher-rate band)	40

Source: HM Revenue and Customs, [www.hmrc.gov.uk/rates/it.htm](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/rates/it.htm).

Savings and dividend income are subject to slightly different rates of tax. Interest on savings is taxed at 10% in the starting-rate band and 40% in the higher-rate band, like other income; but savings income in the basic-rate band is taxed at a lower rate of 20% instead of the 22% basic rate. Dividend income is taxed at 10% up to the basic-rate limit and 32.5% above that. However, this is offset by a dividend tax credit, which reduces the effective rates to 0% and 25% respectively. This means that, for basic-rate taxpayers, company profits paid out as dividends are taxed once (via corporation tax on the company profits) rather than twice (via both corporation tax and income tax). When calculating which tax band different income sources fall into, dividend income is treated as the top slice of income, followed by savings income, followed by other income.

Table 4 shows the income tax liabilities of starting-, basic- and higher-rate taxpayers. Of a UK adult population of 48.2 million, it is estimated that there will be 29.5 million taxpayers in 2006–07. Of them, 14% will pay tax at only the starting rate (or at the lower savings or dividend rate), 74% at the basic rate and 12% at the higher rate.

**Table 4: Projected income tax liabilities of starting-, basic- and higher-rate taxpayers, 2006–07**

<b>Group of taxpayers</b>	<b>Number (000s)</b>	<b>Tax revenue (£m)</b>	<b>Tax revenue as a percentage of total (%)</b>
Starting-rate taxpayers <sup>a</sup>	4,210	1,350	1.0
Basic-rate taxpayers	22,000	59,800	45.6
Higher-rate taxpayers	3,290	70,000	53.4
Total	29,500	131,150	100.0

<sup>a</sup>Includes those whose only income above the starting-rate limit is from either savings or dividends and whose income is below the basic-rate limit.

Note: Figures may not sum exactly because of rounding.

Sources: HM Revenue and Customs, [http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/income\\_tax/table2\\_1.pdf](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/income_tax/table2_1.pdf) and [http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/income\\_tax/table2\\_5.pdf](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/income_tax/table2_5.pdf).

Bands and allowances are increased at the start (in April) of every tax year in line with statutory indexation provisions, unless Parliament intervenes. Their increase is announced at the time of the annual Budget, and is in line with the percentage increase in the retail price index (RPI) in the year to the previous September. Increases in personal allowances and the starting-rate limit are rounded up to the next

multiple of £10. The increase in the basic-rate limit is rounded up to the next multiple of £100.

### ***Taxation of charitable giving***

One deduction that can be made from income tax relates to charitable giving. There are two ways in which people can donate money to charities tax-free: Gift Aid and payroll giving schemes.

Established in 1990, Gift Aid gives individuals (and companies) tax relief on donations. Individuals make donations out of net (after-tax) income and, if the donor makes a Gift Aid declaration, the charity can claim back the basic-rate tax paid on it; higher-rate taxpayers can claim back from HM Revenue and Customs (and keep) the difference between basic-rate and higher-rate tax. Initially, donations had to be above a minimum threshold, but the threshold was abolished in April 2000, so that all donations made through the Gift Aid scheme are now tax-free.

Under a payroll giving scheme (Give-As-You-Earn), employees nominate the charities to which they wish to make donations and authorise their employer to deduct a fixed amount from their pay. This requires the employer to contract with an HMRC-approved collection agency, and tax relief is given by deducting donations from pay before calculating tax due. On its introduction in 1987, gifts made under payroll giving schemes could not exceed £120 a year, but this limit was raised over time and abolished eventually in April 2000. Until April 2004, donations made through payroll giving schemes received a 10% government supplement, but this supplement has now been abolished.

### ***Payments system***

Most income tax is deducted at source: by employers through the Pay-As-You-Earn (PAYE) system, or by banks etc. for any interest payments. The UK income tax system is cumulative in the sense that total tax payable for a particular financial year depends upon total income in that year. Thus, when calculating tax due each week or month, the employer considers income not simply for the period in question but for the whole of the tax year to date. Tax due on total cumulative income is calculated and tax paid thus far is deducted, giving a figure for tax due this week or month. For those with stable incomes, this system will be little different from a non-cumulative system (in which only income in the current period is considered). For those with volatile incomes, however, the cumulative system means that, at the end of the tax year, the correct amount of tax should have been deducted, whereas under a non-cumulative system, an end-of-year adjustment might be necessary. To enable employers to deduct the right amount of tax, HM Revenue and Customs supplies them with a 'tax code' for each employee, which describes the allowances to which the employee is entitled. If individual circumstances change (starting to receive a pension, for example), the Revenue issues a new tax code for that individual.

Most people need do nothing more: for those with relatively simple affairs, the cumulative system means that no end-of-year adjustment to the amount of tax paid is necessary. Those with more complicated affairs, however, such as the self-employed, those with very high incomes, company directors and landlords, must fill in a self-assessment tax return, setting down their incomes from different sources and any tax-privileged spending such as pension contributions or gifts to charity. Taxpayers may send their returns to HM Revenue and Customs before 30 September each year, and HM Revenue and Customs will calculate the tax owed, given the information on



income sources provided by the taxpayer. Alternatively, for those wishing to calculate their own tax bill, the deadline is the following 31 January, which is also the deadline for payment of the tax. Fixed penalties and surcharges operate for those failing to make their returns by the deadlines and for underpayment of tax.

The majority of employees still pay tax through the cumulative system and do not fill in tax returns. The number of people filling in tax returns had been steadily increasing; recently, however, the government has made efforts to counter this. New guidelines issued in April 2004 reduced by over a million the number of people needing to complete a tax return, so that it is no longer an automatic requirement for higher-rate taxpayers, for example. This reduced the number of taxpayers needing to complete a return to 9.25 million in 2005–06 (8.3 million individuals, 0.6 million partnerships, and around a quarter of a million trusts and estates which also require tax returns). Furthermore, around 1.5 million of those taxpayers who remain on self-assessment have benefited from the introduction of a simplified, four-page Short Tax Return, introduced nationwide in April 2005.

### ***Tax credits***

The last seven years have seen a move towards the use of tax credits to provide support that would previously have been delivered through the benefit system. Since April 2003, there have been two tax credits in operation: child tax credit and working tax credit. Both are based on family circumstances (apart from the married couple's allowance, the rest of the income tax system operates at the individual level) and both are refundable tax credits, meaning that a family's entitlement is payable even if it exceeds the family's tax liabilities.

Child tax credit (CTC) provides means-tested support for families with children as a single integrated credit paid on top of universal child benefit. It combines support previously provided by children's tax credit, child credits in working families' tax credit (WFTC),<sup>1</sup> child additions to most non-means-tested benefits,<sup>2</sup> and child elements (child additions and family premiums) of income support and income-based jobseeker's allowance.<sup>3</sup> Families are eligible for CTC if they have at least one child aged under 16, or aged 16–18 and in full-time education. CTC is made up of a number of elements: a family element of £545 per year (doubled for families with a child under the age of 1), a child element of £1,765 per child per year, a disabled child element worth £2,350 per child per year and a severely disabled child supplement worth £945 per child per year. Entitlement to CTC does not depend on employment status – both out-of-work families and lower-paid working parents are eligible for it – and it is paid directly to the main carer in the family (nominated by the family itself).

---

<sup>1</sup>Children's tax credit and working families' tax credit are described in Section 4.2.

<sup>2</sup>These benefits are: carer's allowance, incapacity benefit, retirement pension and widowed parent's allowance. For details of these and the other benefits mentioned here, see D. Phillips and L. Sibietta, *A Survey of the UK Benefit System*, IFS Briefing Note 13, 2006 ([www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn13.pdf](http://www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn13.pdf)).

<sup>3</sup>Families that have been claiming income support or jobseeker's allowance with these child elements since before April 2004 still receive these additions unless they apply for child tax credit instead. This is purely for administrative reasons – the amount received is the same whether paid through child tax credit or additions to out-of-work benefits – and the government intends eventually to 'migrate' all these families on to child tax credit, but the date for this migration has been continually postponed since April 2003 because of continuing uncertainty as to whether the IT system operating tax credits will be able to cope.

Working tax credit (WTC) provides in-work support for low-paid working adults with or without children. It replaces the adult and childcare elements of WFTC, disabled person's tax credit and the New Deal 50-plus employment credit, and further extends in-work support to those without children. WTC consists of a basic element worth £1,665 per year, with an extra £1,640 for couples and lone parents (i.e. everyone except single people without children) and an extra £680 for those working at least 30 hours a week (30 hours in total for couples). Families with children and workers with a disability are eligible for WTC provided at least one adult works 16 or more hours per week; for those without children or a disability, at least one adult must be aged 25 or over and working at least 30 hours per week to be eligible. All childless claimants without a disability will therefore be entitled to the 30-hour premium. There are supplementary payments for disability and for those over 50 returning to work. In addition, for families in which all adults work 16 hours or more per week, there is a childcare credit, worth 80% of eligible childcare expenditure of up to £175 for families with one child, or £300 for families with two or more children (i.e. worth up to £140 or £240). The childcare credit is paid directly to the main carer in the family. The rest of WTC is paid to a full-time worker (two-earner couples can choose who receives it); originally this was done through the pay packet where possible, but this proved rather burdensome for employers, and so since April 2006 all WTC has been paid directly to claimants.

A means test applies to child tax credit and working tax credit together. Families with pre-tax family income below £5,220 per year (£14,155 for families eligible only for child tax credit) are entitled to the full CTC and WTC payments appropriate for their circumstances. Once family income exceeds this level, the tax credit award is reduced by 37p for every £1 of family income above this level. The main WTC entitlement is withdrawn first, then the childcare element of WTC and finally the child elements of the child tax credit. The family element of the child tax credit, however, is not withdrawn unless family income exceeds £50,000 per year; above that level, it is reduced by £1 for every additional £15 of income.

HM Revenue and Customs estimates that the total tax credit entitlement of claimants in 2005–06 was £10.6 billion in CTC and £5.4 billion in WTC. However, since their introduction child and working tax credits have suffered from a major problem of overpayments: many families have been paid more than their true entitlement over the year, either because of administrative errors or because family circumstances changed to reduce their entitlement (eg income rose) and HM Revenue and Customs did not find out early enough (or did not respond quickly enough) to make the necessary reduction in payments for the rest of the year. Largely as a result of this, actual spending on tax credits, at £17.3 billion in 2005–06,<sup>4</sup> has been significantly higher than the £16 billion of total entitlements.<sup>5</sup> £4.1 billion of the £16.0 billion total entitlements is counted as negative taxation in the National Accounts, with the remaining £11.9 billion classified as public expenditure. A further £2.5 billion was paid in child additions to out-of-work benefits (see footnote 3 on p.8). As at April 2006, 6.0 million families were receiving tax credits (or the equivalent amount in out-

---

<sup>4</sup> The split in this £17.3 billion between child tax credit and working tax credit is not available.

<sup>5</sup> For more on the operational problems with tax credits and attempts to solve them, see M. Brewer, "Tax credits: fixed or beyond repair?" in R. Chote, C. Emmerson, R. Harrison and D. Miles (eds), *The IFS Green Budget: January 2006*, IFS Commentary 100, 2006 ([www.ifs.org.uk/budgets/gb2006/index.php](http://www.ifs.org.uk/budgets/gb2006/index.php))

of-work benefits): 4.1 million receiving just child tax credit, 0.3 million receiving just working tax credit, and 1.6 million receiving both.

### 3.2. National Insurance contributions

National Insurance contributions (NICs) act like a tax on earnings, but their payment entitles individuals to certain ('contributory') social security benefits.<sup>6</sup> In practice, however, contributions paid and benefits received bear little relation to each other for any individual contributor, and the link has weakened over time. Contributions are paid into the National Insurance (NI) Fund; a small, fixed proportion of this is allocated to the National Health Service, and the remainder is used to finance contributory benefits. The NI Fund is not a true fund in the sense that it has no significant balance available for investment: current contributions finance current benefits, with the fund merely being a device to prevent cash-flow problems. Officially, the fund should not fall below one-sixth of NI expenditure, to ensure there is enough money available to pay benefits. Historically, this has been achieved through a grant from central taxation, although during the mid-1980s, the high level of economic activity expanded contribution levels, resulting in the grant being abolished in 1990. The subsequent recession reduced contributions and raised the costs of benefits so that the grant had to be reintroduced in 1993–94. It subsequently declined and the fund is now in surplus.

In 2006–07, National Insurance contributions are forecast to raise £89.6 billion, the vast majority of which will be Class 1 contributions. Two groups pay Class 1 contributions: employees as a tax on their earnings (primary contributions) and employers as a tax on those they employ (secondary contributions). Since 1975, Class 1 contributions for employers and employees have been related to employee earnings (including employee, but not employer, pension contributions), subject to an earnings floor. Until 1999, this floor was the lower earnings limit (LEL). In 1999, the level at which employers start paying NI was increased to the level of the income tax personal allowance. The level set for employees increased more slowly, meaning employees and employers were no longer subject to the same earnings floor. The two floors were named, respectively, the primary threshold (PT) and the secondary threshold (ST). In April 2001, the PT and ST were aligned at the level of the income tax personal allowance, and they have remained so since. The LEL was not abolished, but became the level of income above which individuals are entitled to receive social security benefits previously requiring NI contributions. The rationale is that individuals who would have been entitled to these benefits before 1999 should not lose eligibility because of the overindexation of the NI earnings floor.

Employees have to pay NICs at a rate of 11% on any earnings between the PT (£97 per week in 2006–07) and the upper earnings limit (UEL, £645 in 2006–07), and at 1% on earnings above the UEL. Employers pay NICs for each employee who earns over the ST (also set at £97 per week in 2006–07), at a rate of 12.8% of all earnings above this level.

NICs are lower for those who have contracted out of the State Second Pension (formerly the State Earnings-Related Pension Scheme, SERPS) and instead belong to

---

<sup>6</sup>For details of contributory benefits, see D. Phillips and L. Sibieta, *A Survey of the UK Benefit System*, IFS Briefing Note 13, 2006 ([www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn13.pdf](http://www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn13.pdf)).

a recognised private pension scheme. The reduction depends on the type of pension scheme that an individual has joined. For defined benefit pensions, the percentage levied on earnings between the PT/ST and the UEL is currently reduced by 1.6 percentage points for employee contributions and by 3.5 percentage points for employer contributions. The equivalent rebates for those who have opted out into a defined contribution pension scheme depend on age. Table 5 summarises the Class 1 contribution structure for 2006–07.

**Table 5: National Insurance contribution (NIC) rates, 2006–07 (%)**

Band of weekly earnings (£)	Employee NICs		Employer NICs	
	Standard rate	Contracted-out rate	Standard rate	Contracted-out rate
0–84 (LEL)	0	0	0	0
84–97 (PT/ST)	0	0	0	0
97–645 (UEL)	11	9.4	12.8	9.3
Above 645	1	1	12.8	12.8

Notes: Rates shown are marginal rates, and hence apply to the amount of weekly earnings within each band. Contracted-out rate applies to defined benefit pension schemes, i.e. contracted-out salary-related schemes (COSRSs). The rates applying to defined contribution pension schemes – i.e. contracted-out money-purchase schemes (COMPSs) – vary according to age.

Source: HM Revenue and Customs, [www.hmrc.gov.uk/rates/nic.htm](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/rates/nic.htm).

The self-employed pay two different classes of NI contributions – Class 2 and Class 4. Class 2 contributions are paid at a flat rate (£2.10 per week for 2006–07) by those whose earnings (i.e. profits, since these people are self-employed) exceed the small earnings exception, currently £4,465 per year. Class 4 contributions are paid at 8% on any profits between the lower profits limit (£5,035 per year for 2006–07) and the upper profits limit (£33,540 per year for 2006–07), and at 1% on profits above the upper profits limit. This regime for the self-employed is much more generous than the Class 1 regime, and the self-employed typically pay far less than would be paid by employee and employer combined.

Class 3 NI contributions are voluntary and are usually made by UK citizens living abroad in order to maintain their entitlement to benefits when they return. Class 3 contributions are £7.55 per week for 2006–07.

### 3.3. Value added tax (VAT)

VAT is a proportional tax paid on all sales. Before passing the revenue on to HM Revenue and Customs, however, firms may deduct any VAT they paid on inputs into their products; hence it is a tax on the *value added* at each stage of the production process, not simply on all expenditure. The standard rate of VAT is 17.5%. In 1994–95, a reduced rate was introduced for domestic fuel and power, originally 8% but now 5%. The reduced rate has since been extended to cover women’s sanitary products, children’s car seats, contraceptives, certain residential conversions and renovations, and certain energy-saving materials. A number of goods are either zero-rated or exempt. Zero-rated goods have no VAT levied upon the final good, and firms can reclaim any VAT paid on inputs as usual. Exempt goods have no VAT levied on the

final good sold to the consumer, but firms cannot reclaim VAT paid on inputs; thus exempt goods are effectively liable to lower rates of VAT (between about 4% and 7%, depending upon the firm's cost structure and suppliers). Approximately 55% of households' expenditure is taxable at the standard rate; 12% is zero-rated, 2% is taxable at the reduced rate and 31% is on exempt items. Table 6 lists the main categories of goods that are zero-rated, reduced-rated and exempt, together with estimates of the revenue forgone by not taxing them at the standard rate.

Only firms whose sales of non-exempt goods and services exceed the VAT registration threshold (£61,000 in 2006–07) need to pay VAT. Since April 2002, small firms (defined as those with total sales below £187,500 and non-exempt sales below £150,000 in 2006–07, excluding VAT) have had the option of using a simplified flat-rate VAT scheme. Under the flat-rate scheme, firms pay VAT at a single rate on their total sales and give up the right to reclaim VAT on inputs. The flat rate, which varies between 2% and 13.5% depending on the industry, is intended to reflect the average VAT rate in each industry, taking into account recovery of VAT on inputs, zero-rating and so on. The intention was that, while some eligible firms would pay more VAT and some would pay less by using the flat-rate scheme, all would gain from not having to keep such detailed records and calculate VAT for each transaction separately. But in practice it is not clear how great the administrative savings are, since firms must keep similar records for other purposes and many now make the extra effort of calculating their VAT liability (at least roughly) under both the standard scheme and the flat-rate scheme in order to decide whether it is worth joining (or leaving) the flat-rate scheme.

VAT is expected to raise £76.5 billion in 2006–07.

**Table 6: Estimated costs of zero-rating, reduced-rating and exempting goods and services for VAT revenues, 2005–06**

	Estimated cost (£m)
Zero-rated:	
Food	10,600
Construction of new dwellings <sup>a</sup>	6,550
Domestic passenger transport	2,250
International passenger transport <sup>a</sup>	100
Books, newspapers and magazines	1,550
Children's clothing	1,200
Water and sewerage services	1,050
Drugs and medicines on prescription	1,350
Supplies to charities <sup>a</sup>	200
Ships and aircraft above a certain size	600
Vehicles and other supplies to people with disabilities	400
Cycle helmets <sup>a</sup>	5
Reduced-rated:	
Domestic fuel and power	2,000
Women's sanitary products	50
Contraceptives	5
Children's car seats	5
Energy saving materials	50
Residential conversions and renovations	150
VAT-exempt:	
Rent on domestic dwellings <sup>a</sup>	2,950
Rent on commercial properties <sup>a</sup>	150
Private education	300
Health services <sup>a</sup>	850
Postal services <sup>a</sup>	500
Burial and cremation	100
Finance and insurance <sup>a</sup>	3,900
Betting, gaming and lottery <sup>a</sup>	1,250
Businesses below registration threshold <sup>a</sup>	300
<b>Total</b>	<b>38,410</b>

<sup>a</sup> Figures for these categories are subject to a wide margin of error.

Sources: Tables A.1 and A3.1 of HM Treasury, *Financial Statement and Budget Report 2006* ([http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/20F/2F/bud06\\_cha\\_134.pdf](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/20F/2F/bud06_cha_134.pdf)); HM Revenue and Customs Statistics ([http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/tax\\_expenditures/b1\\_apr06.pdf](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/tax_expenditures/b1_apr06.pdf)).

### 3.4. Other indirect taxes

#### *Excise duties*

Excise duties are levied on five major goods: beer, wine, spirits, tobacco and fuel. They are levied at a flat rate (per pint, per litre, per packet etc.); tobacco products are subject to an additional *ad valorem* tax of 22% of the total retail price (including the flat-rate duty, VAT and the *ad valorem* duty itself). Since flat-rate duties are expressed in cash terms, they must be revalorised (i.e. increased in line with inflation) each year in order to maintain their real value. Table 7 shows the rates of duties levied in 2006–07. These excise duties are forecast to raise £40.1 billion in 2006–07.

**Table 7: Excise duties, 2006–07**

<b>Good</b>	<b>Duty (pence)</b>	<b>Total duty as a percentage of price (%)</b>	<b>Total tax as a percentage of price (%)<sup>a</sup></b>
Packet of 20 cigarettes: specific duty	210	} 66.4	} 81.3
<i>ad valorem</i> (22% of retail price)	104		
Pint of beer	29	13.5	28.4
Wine (75cl bottle)	129	38.2	53.1
Spirits (70cl bottle)	548	48.0	62.9
Ultra-low sulphur petrol (litre)	47	50.8	65.7
Ultra-low sulphur diesel (litre)	47	49.1	64.0

<sup>a</sup>Includes VAT.

Notes: Assumes beer (bitter) at 3.9% abv, wine not exceeding 15% abv, spirits (whisky) at 40% abv.

Percentages are calculated for April 2006 prices.

Sources: HM Revenue and Customs website

([customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/channelsPortalWebApp.portal?\\_nfpb=true&\\_pageLabel=pageExcise\\_InfoGuides](http://customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/channelsPortalWebApp.portal?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=pageExcise_InfoGuides)); UK Trade Info website ([www.uktradeinfo.co.uk](http://www.uktradeinfo.co.uk)); National Statistics ([www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk)); authors' calculations.

### ***Vehicle excise duty***

In addition to VAT and excise duties, revenue is raised through a system of licences. The main licence is vehicle excise duty (VED), levied annually on road vehicles. For cars and vans registered before 1 March 2001, there are two bands. VED is £110 per vehicle for vehicles with engines smaller than 1,550cc; above this size, VED is £175. Cars and vans registered on or after 1 March 2001 are subject to a different VED system based primarily on carbon dioxide emissions. For petrol cars or vans, VED ranges from zero for vehicles emitting less than 100g of carbon dioxide per kilometre to £190 for vehicles emitting more than 186g of carbon dioxide per kilometre. Vehicles registered since March 2006 that emit more than 223g of carbon dioxide per kilometre are liable for an even higher rate, £210. Different rates apply for diesel vehicles and for other types of vehicles, such as motorbikes, caravans and heavy goods vehicles. In 2006–07, VED is forecast to raise about £5.1 billion.

### ***Insurance premium tax***

Insurance premium tax (IPT) came into effect in October 1994 as a tax on general insurance premiums. It is designed to act as a proxy for VAT, which is not levied on financial services because of difficulties in implementation. IPT is payable on most types of insurance where the risk insured is located in the UK (e.g. motor, household, medical and income replacement insurance) and on foreign travel insurance if the policy lasts for less than four months. Long-term insurance (such as life insurance) is exempt. Since 1 July 1999, IPT has been levied at a standard rate of 5% of the gross premium. If, however, the policy is sold as an add-on to another product (e.g. travel insurance sold with a holiday, or breakdown insurance sold with vehicles or domestic appliances), then IPT is charged at a higher rate of 17.5%. This prevents insurance providers from being able to reduce their tax liability by increasing the price of the

insurance (which would otherwise be subject to insurance premium tax at 5%) and reducing, by an equal amount, the price of the good or service (subject to VAT at 17.5%). Insurance premium tax is forecast to raise around £2.4 billion in 2006–07.

### ***Air passenger duty***

On 1 November 1994, an excise duty on air travel from UK airports came into effect (flights from the Scottish Highlands and Islands are exempt). Currently, the air passenger duty rate on economy flights is £5 for destinations in the EU and £20 for other destinations. The rates for those travelling first or club class are £10 within the EU and £40 elsewhere. In 2006–07, air passenger duty is forecast to raise £1.0 billion.

### ***Landfill tax***

Landfill tax was introduced on 1 October 1996. It is currently levied at two rates: a lower rate of £2 per tonne for disposal to landfill of inactive waste (waste that does not decay or contaminate land) and a standard rate of £21 per tonne for all other waste. The government has announced that the standard rate will increase by at least £3 per tonne every year until it reaches a medium- to long-term rate of £35 per tonne.<sup>7</sup> The tax is forecast to raise £0.8 billion in 2006–07.

### ***Climate change levy***

The climate change levy came into effect on 1 April 2001. It is charged on industrial and commercial use of electricity, coal, natural gas and liquefied petroleum gas, with the tax rate varying according to the type of fuel used. The levy is designed to help the UK move towards the government's domestic goal of a 20% reduction in carbon dioxide emissions between 1990 and 2010. In 2006–07, the rates are 0.43 pence per kilowatt-hour for electricity, 0.15 pence per kilowatt-hour for coal and natural gas, and 0.07 pence per kilowatt-hour for liquefied petroleum gas. Energy-intensive sectors that have concluded climate change agreements that meet the government's criteria are charged a reduced rate equal to 20% of the standard climate change levy. The levy is forecast to raise around £0.7 billion in 2006–07.

### ***Aggregates levy***

Aggregates levy is a tax on the commercial exploitation of rock, sand and gravel (e.g. their removal from the originating site or their use in construction). The levy was introduced in April 2002 to reduce the environmental costs associated with quarrying. It has been charged at a rate of £1.60 per tonne since its introduction and is forecast to raise £0.3 billion in 2006–07.

### ***Betting and gaming duties***

Until relatively recently, most gambling was taxed as a percentage of the stakes laid. Since October 2001, however, general betting duty (and pool betting duty for pool betting) has been charged at 15% of gross profits for all bookmakers and the Horserace Totalisator Board (the Tote), except for spread betting, where a rate of 3% for financial bets and 10% for other bets is applied. Pool betting duty (since April 2002) and bingo duty (since October 2003) are also charged at 15% of gross profits

---

<sup>7</sup>HM Treasury, *Pre Budget Report*, 2003 ([www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/pre\\_budget\\_report/prebud\\_pbr03/report/prebud\\_pbr03\\_repindex.cfm](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/pre_budget_report/prebud_pbr03/report/prebud_pbr03_repindex.cfm)).



on those activities. In all cases, ‘gross profits’ means total stakes (and any participation fees for bingo) minus winnings paid.

Gaming duty, which replaced gaming licence (premises) duty on 1 October 1997, is based on the ‘gross gaming yield’ for each establishment where dutiable gaming takes place. The gross gaming yield is money gambled minus winnings paid: this consists of the total value of the stakes, minus players’ winnings, on games in which the house is the banker, and participation charges, or ‘table money’, exclusive of VAT, on games in which the bank is shared by players. Gaming duty is levied at marginal rates of between 2.5% and 40% according to the amount of gross gaming yield.

Duties on betting and gaming are forecast to raise £1.4 billion in 2006–07.

### 3.5. Capital taxes

#### *Capital gains tax*

Capital gains tax was introduced in 1965 and is levied on gains arising from the disposal of assets by individuals and trustees. Capital gains made by companies are subject to corporation tax. The total capital gain is defined as the value of the asset when it is sold (or given away etc.) minus its value when originally bought (or inherited etc.). As with income tax, there is a threshold below which capital gains tax does not have to be paid. In 2006–07, this ‘exempt amount’ is £8,800 for individuals and £4,400 for trusts. This is subtracted from total capital gains to give taxable capital gains. Taxable capital gains are in effect subject to income tax as if they were savings income: treated as the top slice of income, capital gains are taxed at 10% below the starting-rate limit, 20% between the starting- and basic-rate limits, and 40% above the basic-rate limit. In practice, most capital gains are subject to 40% tax.

**Table 8: The capital gains tax taper, 2006–07**

Number of complete years after 5 April 1998 for which asset held	Non-business assets		Business assets	
	Percentage of gain chargeable	Equivalent tax rate for higher-rate taxpayer	Percentage of gain chargeable	Equivalent tax rate for higher-rate taxpayer
0	100	40	100	40
1	100	40	50	20
2	100	40	25	10
3	95	38	25	10
4	90	36	25	10
5	85	34	25	10
6	80	32	25	10
7	75	30	25	10
8	70	28	25	10
9	65	26	25	10
10 or more	60	24	25	10

Source: HM Revenue and Customs, [http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/capital\\_gains/tableA-7.pdf](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/capital_gains/tableA-7.pdf).

Capital gains tax was reformed in the March 1998 Budget by the introduction of a taper system and removal of the previous indexation allowance (given to reflect

increases in the price of assets over time solely due to inflation). As Table 8 illustrates, the taper system reduces the amount of capital gains tax paid the longer an asset is held. The holding period for capital gains tax taper relief for non-business assets is 10 years. For business assets (assets used wholly or partly for trading purposes, and shares and securities in a company), the taper length is two years. It was reduced from 10 to four years in the 2000 Budget and down to its current level in the 2002 Budget. The regime is more generous (a smaller percentage of the gain is chargeable) for business assets than for non-business assets.

The key exemption from capital gains tax is gains arising from the sale of a main home. Private cars and certain types of investment are also exempt, as are transfers to a spouse or civil partner and gifts to charity. Some consecutive short-term investments, where the gains are reinvested, can be treated as a single long-term investment for the purposes of taper relief. Capital gains tax is 'forgiven' at death: the deceased's estate is not liable for tax on any increase in the value of assets prior to death, and those inheriting the assets are deemed to acquire them at their market value at the date of death. This is partly because estates may instead be subject to inheritance tax (see below).

It is estimated that in 2006–07, capital gains tax will raise £3.8 billion in revenue. Although this represents only a small proportion of total government receipts, capital gains tax is potentially important as an anti-avoidance measure, as it discourages wealthier individuals from converting a large part of their income into capital gains in order to reduce their tax liability. In 2006–07, approximately 260,000 individuals and trusts will pay capital gains tax.

### ***Inheritance tax***

Inheritance tax was introduced in 1986 as a replacement for capital transfer tax. The tax is applied to transfers of wealth on or shortly before death that exceed a minimum threshold (£285,000 in 2006–07). In Budget 2006 the Government announced that this threshold will increase by more than the likely rate of inflation over the next three years, to £300,000 in 2007–08, £312,000 in 2008–09 and £325,000 in 2009–10. Inheritance tax is charged on the part of the transfers above this threshold at a single rate of 40% for transfers made on death or during the previous three years, and is normally payable out of estate funds. Transfers made between three and seven years before death attract a reduced tax rate, while transfers made seven or more years before death are not normally subject to inheritance tax. This is set out in Table 9. Gifts to companies or discretionary trusts that exceed the threshold attract inheritance tax immediately at a rate of 20%, for which the donor is liable; if the donor then dies within seven years, these gifts are taxed again as usual but any inheritance tax already paid is deducted.

**Table 9: Inheritance tax reductions for transfers before death, 2006–07**

Years between transfer and death	Reduction in tax rate (%)	Actual tax rate (%)
0–3	0	40
3–4	20	32
4–5	40	24
5–6	60	16
6–7	80	8
7+	100	0

Sources: HM Revenue and Customs, <http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/cto/customerguide/page13-1.htm>; *Tolley's Inheritance Tax 2006–07*.

Some transfers of wealth are exempt from inheritance tax, including those between spouses and civil partners, to charities and to political parties. Other assets, particularly those associated with farms and small businesses, are eligible for relief. Relief reduces the value of the asset by 50% or 100% depending on the type of property transferred, and tax is assessed on the reduced value. The estimated number of taxpaying death estates in 2006–07 is 37,000, equivalent to around 6% of all deaths. The estimated yield from inheritance tax in 2006–07 is about £3.6 billion.

### *Stamp duties*

The main stamp duties are levied on securities (share and bond) transactions and on conveyances and transfers of land and property. They are so named because, historically, stamps on documents, following their presentation to the Stamp Office, indicated their payment. Nowadays, most transactions do not require a document to be stamped and are not technically subject to stamp duty: since 1986, securities transactions for which there is no deed of transfer (e.g. electronic transactions) have instead been subject to stamp duty reserve tax (SDRT), and since 2003, land and property transactions have been subject to stamp duty land tax (SDLT). This is essentially a matter of terminology, however: the rates are the same and the term 'stamp duty' is still widely used to encompass SDRT and SDLT as well. The buyer is responsible for paying the tax.

Table 10 gives stamp duty rates as they stand currently. For residential land and property transactions, there is a threshold of £125,000 below which no stamp duty is paid. A different threshold – £150,000 – applies to non-residential properties and to residential properties in certain designated disadvantaged areas. For land and property above this exemption threshold, a range of duty rates applies, depending on the purchase price. The appropriate rate of duty applies to the whole purchase price, including the part below the relevant threshold. As a result, a small difference in the purchase price can lead to a large change in tax liability if it moves the transaction across a threshold; this structure creates unnecessary distortions in the property market and is long overdue for reform. For shares and bonds, there is no threshold and stamp duty is levied at 0.5% of the purchase price. The total duty payable is always rounded up to the next multiple of £5.

**Table 10: Rates of stamp duty, 2006–07**

Transaction	Rate (%) <sup>a</sup>
Land and buildings:	
Up to and including £125,000 <sup>b</sup>	0
Above £120,000 but not exceeding £250,000 <sup>b</sup>	1
Above £250,000 but not exceeding £500,000	3
Above £500,000	4
Shares and bonds	0.5

<sup>a</sup>Total duty payable is rounded up to the next multiple of £5.

<sup>b</sup>The zero rate extends to £150,000 for non-residential properties and for residential properties in certain designated disadvantaged areas.

Source: HM Revenue and Customs, [http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/so/current\\_sdlr\\_rates.htm](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/so/current_sdlr_rates.htm),  
<http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/so/sdrtrates.htm>.

Total stamp duties are forecast to raise £12.2 billion in 2006–07. Approximately two-thirds of this will come from sales of land and property, and the remainder from sales of securities.

### 3.6. Corporation tax

Corporation tax is charged on the global profits of UK-resident companies, public corporations and unincorporated associations. Firms not resident in the UK pay corporation tax only on their UK profits. The profit on which corporation tax is charged comprises income from trading, investment and capital gains, less various deductions described below. Trading losses may be carried back for one year to be set against profits earned in that period or carried forward indefinitely.<sup>8</sup>

The standard rate of corporation tax in 2006–07 is 30%, with a reduced rate of 19% on profits under £300,000. For firms with profits between £300,000 and £1,500,000, a system of relief operates, such that an effective marginal rate of 32.75% is levied on profits in excess of £300,000. This acts to increase the average tax rate gradually until it reaches 30%.

**Table 11: Rates of corporation tax, 2006–07**

Profits (£ p.a.)	Marginal tax rate (%)	Average tax rate (%)
0–300,000	19	19
300,001–1,500,000	32.75	19–30
1,500,000 or more	30	30

Sources: HM Revenue and Customs, <http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/rates/corp.htm>; *Tolley's Corporation Tax 2006–07*.

<sup>8</sup>The rules for offsetting trading losses, investment losses and capital losses are complicated. More details can be found in A. Klemm and J. McCrae, *Reform of Corporation Tax: A Response to the Government's Consultation Document*, IFS Briefing Note 30, 2002 ([www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn30.pdf](http://www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn30.pdf)).

Broadly speaking, current expenditure (such as wages, raw materials and interest payments) is deductible from taxable profits, while capital expenditure (such as buildings and machinery) is not. To allow for the depreciation of capital assets, however, firms can claim capital allowances, which reduce taxable profits over several years by a proportion of capital expenditure. Capital allowances may be claimed in the year that they accrue, set against future profits, or carried back for up to three years. Different classes of capital expenditure attract different capital allowances:

- Expenditure on plant and machinery may be ‘written down’ on a 25% declining-balance basis.<sup>9</sup> A higher, 40%, allowance is available in the first year for expenditure by small and medium-sized companies; in 2006-07 this was increased to 50% for small companies for one year only.
- Expenditure on industrial buildings and hotels is written down on a straight-line basis of 4% per year.
- Expenditure on commercial buildings may not be written down at all.
- Intangible assets expenditure is written down on a straight-line basis at either the accounting depreciation rate or a rate of 4%, whichever the company prefers.
- Capital expenditure on plant, machinery and buildings for research and development (R&D) is treated more generously: under the R&D allowance, it can all be written off against taxable profits immediately.

Current expenditure on R&D, like current expenditure generally, is fully deductible from taxable profits. However, there is now additional tax relief available for current R&D expenditure. For small and medium-sized companies, there is a two-part tax credit (introduced in April 2000). The first part is called R&D tax relief and applies at a rate of 50% (allowing companies to deduct a total of 150% of qualifying expenditure from taxable profits, since R&D expenditure is already fully deductible). The second part is a refundable tax credit that is only available to loss-making firms. Firms can give up the right to offset losses equivalent to 150% of their R&D expenditure (or to offset their total losses, if these are smaller) against future profits, in return for a cash payment of 16% of the losses given up (up to a certain limit). An R&D tax credit for large companies was introduced in April 2002. This credit applies at a rate of 25%, allowing 125% of qualifying expenditure to be deducted from taxable profits.

In all cases, to claim R&D tax credit, companies must incur eligible current R&D expenditure of at least £10,000 (reduced from £25,000 in 2003) in a 12-month accounting period; but the tax credit is then payable on all eligible expenditure, not just the amount above the £10,000 threshold.

Before April 1999, firms paid their total tax bill nine months after the end of the accounting year unless profits had been distributed to shareholders in the form of dividends. In that case, firms had to pay advance corporation tax (ACT), which could

---

<sup>9</sup>The declining-balance method means that for each £100 of investment, taxable profits are reduced by £25 in the first year (25% of £100), £18.75 in the second year (25% of the remaining balance of £75) and so on. The straight-line method with a 4% rate simply reduces profits by £4 per year for 25 years for each £100 of investment.

then, in most cases, be deducted from the total due nine months after the end of the accounting year. In April 1999, ACT was abolished apart from certain transitional arrangements. Large companies are now required to pay corporation tax in four equal quarterly instalments on the basis of their anticipated liabilities for the accounting year, making the first payment six months into the accounting year. Small and medium-sized companies still pay their total tax bill nine months after the end of the accounting year.

Corporation tax will raise approximately £49.0 billion in 2006–07.

### **3.7. Taxation of North Sea production**

The current North Sea tax regime has three layers of tax: petroleum revenue tax (PRT), corporation tax and a supplementary charge.<sup>10</sup> All of these taxes are levied on measures of profit, but there are some differences in allowances and permissible deductions.

Corporation tax is the same as on the mainland, except that it is ring-fenced, so that losses on the mainland cannot be offset against profits from a continental-shelf field.

The supplementary charge is levied on broadly the same base as corporation tax, except that certain financing expenditure is disallowed. It was introduced in the 2002 Budget, and was set at a rate of 10% on all fields. This was increased to 20% in the December 2005 Pre-Budget report, effective from January 2006.

PRT is only payable on oil fields approved before March 1993. It is assessed every six months for each separate oil and gas field and then charged at a rate of 50% on the profits (less various allowances) arising in each chargeable period. PRT is forecast to raise £1.9 billion in 2006–07. It is treated as a deductible expense for both the corporation tax and the additional charge.

### **3.8. Council tax**

On 1 April 1993, the community charge system of local taxation (the ‘poll tax’, levied on individuals) was replaced by council tax, a largely property-based tax. Domestic residences are banded according to an assessment of their market value; individual local authorities then determine the overall level of council tax, while the ratio between rates for different bands is set by central government (and has not changed since council tax was introduced).<sup>11</sup>

Table 12 shows the eight value bands and the proportion of dwellings in England in each band. The council tax rates set by local authorities are usually expressed as rates for a Band D property, with rates for properties in other bands calculated as a proportion of this as shown in the Table. But since most properties are below Band D, most households pay less than the Band D rate: thus in England the average Band D rate for 2006–07 is £1,268, but the average rate for all households is only £1,056.

---

<sup>10</sup>Until January 2003, some oil fields were also subject to licence royalties, a revenue-based tax.

<sup>11</sup>Northern Ireland operates a different system: the community charge was never introduced there, and the system of domestic rates that preceded it in the rest of the UK still applies. A major reform to the system of domestic rates in Northern Ireland is due to take effect in April 2007, so that the tax is charged as a percentage of the (2005) property value rather than a percentage of market rent (last determined in 1976 based on data from the 1960s).

Property bandings in England and Scotland are currently based on assessed market values as at 1 April 1991. In Wales, a revaluation took effect in April 2005 based on April 2003 property values, and a ninth band paying  $2\frac{1}{3}$  times the Band D rate was introduced. A revaluation was also due to take effect in England in April 2007, but in September 2005 the Government postponed the revaluation pending the outcome of a broader inquiry into local government finance led by Sir Michael Lyons. The Lyons Inquiry is due to report to ministers in December 2006, but the Government has stated that no revaluation will take place in this Parliament. A similar review of local government finance in Scotland, chaired by Sir Peter Burt, reported in November 2006 and recommended that council tax be replaced by a tax on property values, abolishing the banding system. This is similar to the system being introduced in Northern Ireland in April 2007. The Burt Review recommendations are currently being considered by the Scottish Parliament and Executive.

There is a range of exemptions and reliefs from council tax, including a 25% reduction for properties with only one resident adult and a 50% reduction if the property is empty or a second home.<sup>12</sup> Properties that are exempt from council tax include student halls of residence and armed forces barracks. Low-income families can have their council tax bill reduced or eliminated by claiming council tax benefit.<sup>13</sup> Council tax, net of council tax benefit, is expected to raise £22.0 billion in 2006–07, providing around a quarter of local authority revenue.

**Table 12: Value bands for England, September 2006**

Band	Tax rate relative to band D	Property valuation as of 1 April 1991	Distribution of dwellings by band (%)
A	$\frac{2}{3}$	Up to £40,000	25.2
B	$\frac{7}{9}$	£40,001 to £52,000	19.3
C	$\frac{8}{9}$	£52,001 to £68,000	21.6
D	1	£68,001 to £88,000	15.2
E	$1\frac{2}{9}$	£88,001 to £120,000	9.5
F	$1\frac{4}{9}$	£120,001 to £160,000	5.0
G	$1\frac{2}{3}$	£160,001 to £320,000	3.6
H	2	Above £320,000	0.6

Note: Percentages may not sum exactly because of rounding.

Source: Department for Communities and Local Government, *Local Government Finance Statistics* (<http://www.local.odpm.gov.uk/finance/stats/data/ctbdwell2006.pdf>).

### 3.9. Business rates

National non-domestic rates, or business rates, are a tax levied on non-residential properties, including shops, offices, warehouses and factories. They were transferred

<sup>12</sup>Since 2003, however, councils have had the power to charge second homes up to 90% of council tax and empty homes 100%. Some empty properties are entirely exempt from council tax, e.g. those left empty by patients in hospitals and care homes.

<sup>13</sup>For details of council tax benefit, see D. Phillips and L. Sibieta, *A Survey of the UK Benefit System*, IFS Briefing Note 13, 2006 ([www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn13.pdf](http://www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn13.pdf)).

from local to national control in 1990. Companies pay a fixed proportion (currently 43.3% in England, 43.2% in Wales and 45.3% in Scotland<sup>14</sup>) of the officially estimated market rent (“rateable value”) of properties they occupy.

Some types of property qualify for reductions, including unoccupied buildings, small rural shops, and agricultural land and associated buildings. Since April 2005, lower rates have applied to small businesses in England and Scotland. Businesses with a low rateable value – below £21,500 in Greater London, £15,000 in the rest of England and £29,000 in Scotland – pay reduced rates of 42.6% (44.9% in Scotland). These rates are further reduced on a sliding scale for businesses with a rateable value below £10,000 (£11,500 in Scotland), with the liability halved for businesses with a rateable value below £5,000 (£3,500 in Scotland). There is currently no business rate relief scheme for Wales, but a scheme will begin in April 2007: all businesses with a rateable value of less than £2,000 will receive a 50% deduction from their rates bill while those with a rateable value between £2,000 and £5,000 will receive a 25% reduction.

Properties are revalued every five years. The latest revaluation took effect in April 2005, based on April 2003 rental values. Major changes in business rates bills caused by revaluation are phased in through a transitional relief scheme.

Business rates are expected to raise £21.4 billion in 2006–07.

## 4. Summary of recent trends

### 4.1. How did we get here?

In previous sections, we have concentrated on the tax system in the UK as it is now; in this section, we discuss its development over the last 25 years. We describe and assess the major trends, looking at each part of the tax system in turn. We begin with a summary of the main changes and a description of the shifting balance of revenue.

Figure 1 shows the long-term trend in government revenues over the twentieth century. There were sharp increases in government receipts at the times of the two world wars, as might be expected given the extra expenditure required; but in each case, taxation did not fall back to its pre-war level afterwards. Receipts rose sharply as a proportion of national income in the late 1960s, were highly volatile in the 1970s (partly reflecting large fluctuations in economic growth), fell steadily as a proportion of national income from the early 1980s until the mid-1990s, but have begun to rise again under the current government and now stand at just under 40% of GDP.<sup>15</sup>


---

<sup>14</sup>Northern Ireland operates a slightly different system of regional rates and locally varying district rates. The average combined rate in 2006–07 is 47.7%.

<sup>15</sup>For further information, see T. Clark and A. Dilnot, *Long-Term Trends in British Taxation and Spending*, IFS Briefing Note 25, 2002 ([www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn25.pdf](http://www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn25.pdf)).



**Figure 1: Government receipts as a proportion of GDP, 1900–2005**



Note: Figures are for general government net receipts on a calendar-year basis.

Sources: T. Clark and A. Dilnot, *Long-Term Trends in British Taxation and Spending*, IFS Briefing Note 25, 2002 ([www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn25.pdf](http://www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn25.pdf)); National Statistics series YBHA and ANBY, [www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase/tsdtimezone.asp](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase/tsdtimezone.asp).

Table 13 lists some of the most important changes seen since 1979.<sup>16</sup> It is clear that the tax system is now very different from the one that existed then. The income tax rate structure has been transformed, the taxation of saving has been repeatedly adjusted, the National Insurance contributions system has been overhauled, the VAT rate has more than doubled, some excise duty rates have risen sharply while others have fallen, the corporate income tax system has been subject to two wholesale reforms and many smaller changes, and local taxation is unrecognisable. Figure 2 shows the effect that these changes have had on the composition of aggregate government revenue.

---

<sup>16</sup>For a timeline of the main tax changes introduced in each Budget since 1979, see [www.ifs.org.uk/ff/budget\\_measures.xls](http://www.ifs.org.uk/ff/budget_measures.xls).

**Table 13: Summary of main reforms, 1979–2005**


---

<b>Income tax</b>	Basic rate 33% down to 22% Top rate 98% (unearned income), 83% (earnings) down to 40% Starting rate 25% down to 10% Independent taxation introduced Married couple's allowance abolished Children's tax credit and working families' tax credit introduced, then abolished Child tax credit and working tax credit introduced Mortgage interest tax relief abolished Life assurance premium relief abolished PEP, TESSA and ISA introduced
<b>National Insurance</b>	Employee contribution rate increased from 6.5% to 11% Employer contribution rate reduced from 13.5% to 12.8% Ceiling abolished for employer contributions Ceiling for employees raised and contributions extended beyond it 'Entry rate' abolished and floor aligned with income tax allowance Imposition of NI on benefits in kind
<b>VAT</b>	Higher rate of 12.5% abolished Standard rate increased from 8% to 17.5% Reduced rate introduced for domestic fuel and a few other goods
<b>Other indirect taxes</b>	Large real rise in duties on road fuels Smaller increase in tobacco duties Slight real decrease in duties on beer, larger decline for spirits Small real increase in duties on wine Landfill tax, climate change levy and aggregates levy introduced
<b>Corporation tax</b>	Main rate cut from 52% to 30% Small companies' rate cut to 19% Lower rate introduced, cut to 0%, then abolished R&D tax credits introduced 100% first-year allowance replaced by 25% writing-down allowance Advance corporation tax and refundable dividend tax credit abolished
<b>Local taxes</b>	Domestic rates replaced by council tax (via poll tax) Locally varying business rates replaced by national business rates

---

PEP = Personal Equity Plan; TESSA = Tax-Exempt Special Savings Account; ISA = Individual Savings Account.

**Figure 2: The structure of government receipts, 1978–79 and 1992–93 to 2006–07**



Notes: 2006–07 figures are forecasts. For 1978–79, income tax includes surtax and National Insurance includes National Insurance surcharge.

Sources: HM Treasury, *Financial Statement and Budget Report*, 1979 and 2006 ([http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/20F/42/bud06\\_chc\\_247.pdf](http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/media/20F/42/bud06_chc_247.pdf)) and various *Public Sector Finances Databank*.

The shares of revenue provided by different taxes have been remarkably stable since 1992–93. The principal change has been in the contribution of corporation tax, which has risen, fallen and then risen again. This largely reflects the changing fortunes of financial companies, whose profits were strong in the late 1990s, weaker thereafter, and have recently risen again. The share of revenue coming from indirect taxes has fallen since the late 1990s, mainly because fuel duties have been cut substantially in real terms. Revenue from capital taxes has increased – primarily because of booming stock and property markets over most of the period in combination with the introduction of higher rates of stamp duty on property – but these still account for only 3% of total revenue.

There have been much bigger changes since 1978–79. The most dramatic shifts have been a doubling of the share of revenue flowing from VAT and a substantial reduction in revenue from other expenditure taxes. This pattern is mirrored across the developed world, with governments moving away from indirect taxes levied on specific goods towards general consumption taxes such as VAT. The proportion of taxes raised locally has halved, largely because business rates have moved from local to national

control. The shares of revenue from income tax and National Insurance contributions have remained virtually unchanged, despite radical structural changes.

## 4.2. Personal income taxes

There are two principal personal income taxes in the UK: income tax and National Insurance contributions. Capital gains tax, which has existed as a tax separate from income tax since 1965, can also be thought of as a tax on personal income, but it supplies very little revenue compared with income tax or National Insurance (see Table 1).

### *Income tax rate structure*

The most dramatic change to income tax has been the reform of the rate structure, as illustrated in Table 14. In 1978–79, there was a starting rate of 25%, a basic rate of 33% and higher rates ranging from 40% to 83%. In addition, an investment income surcharge of 15% was applied to those with very high investment income, resulting in a maximum income tax rate of 98%. In its first Budget, in 1979, the Conservative government reduced the basic rate of income tax to 30% and the top rate on earnings to 60%. In 1980, the starting rate was abolished; in 1984, the investment income surcharge was abolished; and through the mid-1980s, the basic rate of tax was reduced. In 1988, the top rate of tax was cut to 40% and the basic rate to 25%, producing a very simple regime with three effective rates – zero up to the tax allowance, 25% over a range that covered almost 95% of taxpayers and 40% for a small group of those with high incomes.

**Table 14: Income tax rates on earned income, 1978–79 to 2006–07**

Year	Starting rate	Basic rate	Higher rates
1978–79	25	33	40–83
1979–80	25	30	40–60
1980–81 to 1985–86	—	30	40–60
1986–87	—	29	40–60
1987–88	—	27	40–60
1988–89 to 1991–92	—	25	40
1992–93 to 1995–96	20	25	40
1996–97	20	24	40
1997–98 to 1998–99	20	23	40
1999–2000	10	23	40
2000–01 to 2006–07	10	22	40

Note: Prior to 1984–85, an investment income surcharge of 15% was applied to unearned income over £2,250 (1978–79), £5,000 (1979–80), £5,500 (1980–82), £6,250 (1982–83) and £7,100 (1983–84).

Sources: *Tolley's Income Tax*, various years.

This very simple rate structure was complicated by the reintroduction of a 20% starting rate of tax in 1992 (in a pre-election Budget), cut to 10% in 1999 (fulfilling a pre-election promise made by the Labour Party).

Table 15 gives the numbers of people affected by these various tax rates. In 2006–07, out of an adult population in the UK of 49.0 million, an estimated 29.5 million individuals will be liable for income tax. This is a reminder that attempts to use

income tax reductions to help the poorest in the country are likely to fail, since only three-fifths of the adult population have high enough incomes to pay income tax at all.<sup>17</sup> The total number of income taxpayers has increased slowly over the years, while the number of higher-rate taxpayers has grown much more quickly, from less than 3% of the taxpaying population in 1979–80 to more than 11% in 2006–07. Some of this growth reflects periods when the threshold above which higher-rate tax is due has not been raised in line with price inflation, some reflects the fact that incomes on average have grown more quickly than prices, and some the fact that the dispersion of incomes has grown, with especially rapid increases in the incomes of those already towards the top of the income distribution, pushing more of them into higher-rate income tax liability. Table 16 shows that, over the period as a whole, the basic-rate limit, beyond which higher-rate tax becomes due, has failed to keep pace with price inflation, whilst the personal allowance has risen in real terms, especially over the 1980s.

**Table 15: Numbers liable for income tax (thousands)**

<b>Year</b>	<b>Number of individuals paying tax</b>	<b>Number of starting-rate taxpayers<sup>a</sup></b>	<b>Number of basic-rate taxpayers</b>	<b>Number of higher-rate taxpayers</b>
1979–80	25,900	— <sup>b</sup>	25,226 <sup>b</sup>	674
1984–85	23,800	—	22,870	930
1989–90	25,600	—	24,040	1,560
1994–95	25,300	5,180	18,200	2,000
2000–01	29,300	3,830	22,600	2,880
2001–02	28,600	3,890	21,700	3,000
2002–03	28,900	3,830	22,000	3,040
2003–04	28,500	3,950	21,600	2,960
2004–05 <sup>c</sup>	28,900	4,070	21,800	3,100
2005–06 <sup>c</sup>	29,200	4,150	21,900	3,190
2006–07 <sup>c</sup>	29,500	4,210	22,000	3,290

<sup>a</sup>Includes those whose only income above the starting-rate limit is from either savings or dividends.

<sup>b</sup>Figure for 1979–80 covers both starting-rate and basic-rate taxpayers.

<sup>c</sup>Projected.

Sources: HM Revenue and Customs, [http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/income\\_tax/table2\\_1.pdf](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/income_tax/table2_1.pdf) and table 2.1 in *Inland Revenue Statistics 1994*.

<sup>17</sup>We might be more interested in the proportion of adults that live in a family containing a taxpayer. Authors' calculations using the IFS tax and benefit model, TAXBEN, run on data from the Family Resources Survey, suggest that this figure stood at 77% for Britain in 2004–05 (the latest year for which data are available): most non-taxpaying adults do not have taxpayers in the family.

**Table 16: Personal allowance and basic-rate limit in real terms (April 2006 prices)**

Year	Personal allowance (£ p.a.)	Basic-rate limit (£ p.a.)
1979–80	4,216	36,190
1984–85	4,445	34,138
1989–90	4,788	35,587
1994–95	4,694	32,296
2000–01	5,066	32,208
2001–02	5,148	33,374
2002–03	5,161	33,440
2003–04	5,005	33,075
2004–05	5,021	33,226
2005–06	5,020	33,229
2006–07	5,035	33,300

Note: 1990 marked the introduction of independent taxation. Prior to that date, the personal allowance was known as the single person's allowance. For a complete series of allowances in nominal terms, see [www.ifs.org.uk/ff/income.xls](http://www.ifs.org.uk/ff/income.xls).

Sources: HM Revenue and Customs, [www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/tax\\_structure/menu.htm](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/tax_structure/menu.htm); RPI used to uprate to April 2006 prices, *Monthly Digest of Statistics* ([www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase/TSDtimezone.asp](http://www.statistics.gov.uk/statbase/TSDtimezone.asp)).

The number of starting-rate taxpayers climbed in the years after 1992 as the width of the starting-rate band was increased, but fell sharply in 1999–2000, as the 10% rate applies over a much narrower range of income than the 20% rate that it replaced.

Although only 11% of income taxpayers face the higher rate, that group pays a very large share of the total amount of income tax that is paid. Table 17 shows that the top 10% of income taxpayers now pay over half of all the income tax paid, and the top 1% pay 22% of all that is paid. These shares have risen substantially since 1978–79, despite reductions in the higher rates.

**Table 17: Shares of total income tax liability (%)**

Year	Top 1% of income taxpayers	Top 10% of income taxpayers	Top 50% of income taxpayers
1978–79	11	35	82
1981–82	11	35	81
1986–87	14	39	84
1990–91	15	42	85
1993–94	16	44	87
1996–97	20	48	88
1998–99	21	49	88
2000–01	22	52	89
2001–02	22	52	89
2002–03	21	52	89
2003–04	21	51	89
2004–05 <sup>a</sup>	21	51	89
2005–06 <sup>a</sup>	21	51	89
2006–07 <sup>a</sup>	21	52	89

<sup>a</sup>Projected.

Sources: HM Revenue and Customs: [http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/income\\_tax/table2\\_4.pdf](http://www.hmrc.gov.uk/stats/income_tax/table2_4.pdf) and various *Inland Revenue Statistics*.

### ***The treatment of families***

Prior to 1990, married couples were treated as a single unit for income tax purposes. The 1970 Income and Corporation Taxes Act (in)famously announced that, for the purposes of income tax, ‘a woman’s income chargeable to tax shall ... be deemed to be her husband’s income and not her income’. Reflecting the ‘responsibilities’ taken on at marriage, the tax system also included a married man’s allowance (MMA). The system had developed over many decades and was widely felt to be unpalatable; a consensus emerged that a new system, neutral in its treatment of men and women, should be introduced. This was a widely held view by the late 1970s but, despite a series of Green Papers, proved difficult to implement. While equal treatment for men and women was easy to agree upon, it was not easy to agree whether equal treatment should be given to married and unmarried people.

In his 1986 Budget Speech, the then Chancellor, Nigel Lawson, published a Green Paper suggesting that the UK should move to a system of ‘transferable allowances’, where spouses, regardless of whether husband or wife, could transfer unused allowances between themselves. Two years later, in his 1988 Budget Speech, before the previous proposals had been implemented, he announced the introduction in 1990 of a completely different system. The new system was based on the principle of independent taxation of husbands and wives, but included a married couple’s allowance (MCA), which was available to either husband or wife. This established equal treatment of men and women, but not of married and unmarried people. In fact, married and unmarried people with children had been treated equally since 1973 through the additional personal allowance (APA), an allowance for unmarried people with children which was set equal to the MMA and then the MCA; but unequal treatment persisted for those without children.

Between 1993 and 2000, the MCA and APA were reduced in value, and they were eventually abolished in April 2000 (except the MCA for people aged 65 or over at that date). A year later, children's tax credit was introduced, reducing the tax liability of those with children by a flat-rate amount (tapered away for higher-rate taxpayers) but making no distinction between married and unmarried people. Meanwhile, in-work support for low-paid families with children was brought within the tax system when working families' tax credit (WFTC) replaced family credit from October 1999.<sup>18</sup> Children's tax credit and WFTC (along with parts of some state benefits) were replaced in April 2003 by child tax credit and working tax credit (see Section 3.1), neither of which depends on marriage. In short, over the past 15 years, the UK income tax has moved away from providing support for marriage and towards providing support for children.

### *National Insurance contributions*

The National Insurance system has its roots as far back as 1911, and until 1961 contributions continued as a (typically) weekly lump-sum payment by employers and employees to cover the cost of certain social security benefits – in particular, the flat-rate pension, unemployment benefits and sickness benefits. Since 1961, however, NI has steadily moved towards being simply another income tax. The link between the amount contributed and benefit entitlement, which was once close, has now almost entirely gone, and substantial progress has been made in aligning the NI rate structure and tax base with those of income tax. Most of this has occurred in the last 20 years.

Figure 3 shows the structure of the combined employee and employer NI system before and after the important 1985 reforms and as it stands in 2005–06. To enable comparison, thresholds from earlier systems have been uprated to April 2005 prices.

In 1984–85, no NI was due for those earning less than the lower earnings limit (LEL) of £75.37.<sup>19</sup> For those earning at least this amount, employees paid contributions of 9% and employers 10.45% of total employee earnings, including earnings below the LEL. This meant a jump in contributions from zero to £14.66 at the LEL, and it is not surprising that this discontinuity led to significant bunching of earnings just below the LEL. The 1985 reform reduced the jump in NICs at the LEL to £7.65 (5% each from employee and employer), introducing a number of graduated steps instead. The 5% 'entry rate' was later cut to 2% for employers, and the post-1997 Labour government has removed the entry rate altogether so that the earnings threshold in NI now operates in a similar way to the income tax personal allowance, essentially being discounted from taxable income. Furthermore, since April 2001, the earnings threshold for both employers and employees has been set at the same level as the income tax personal allowance, currently £97. This is somewhat higher than the LEL, currently £84, which is no longer used as the starting point for contributions.

The NI treatment of high earners has also come to resemble their treatment under income tax more, in that there is no longer a limit on payments. In 1984–85, no NI was payable on earnings above the upper earnings limit (UEL) of £554.18, giving a maximum weekly contribution of £107.79. The 1985 reform abolished the UEL for employers. The UEL is still in place for employees, but no longer acts as a cap on

---


<sup>18</sup>For more information on these two programmes, see A. Dilnot and J. McCrae, *Family Credit and the Working Families' Tax Credit*, IFS Briefing Note 3, 1999 ([www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn3.pdf](http://www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn3.pdf)).

<sup>19</sup>All figures are given in April 2005 prices.



contributions: the one percentage point rise in NI rates in April 2003 extended employee NICs to earnings above the UEL.

**Figure 3: The changing structure of National Insurance contributions**



Notes: Previous years' thresholds have been updated to April 2006 prices using the retail price index. Assumes employee contracted into State Earnings-Related Pension Scheme (SERPS) or State Second Pension (S2P). The 1984–85 schedule excludes the 1% National Insurance surcharge abolished in September 1984.

Sources: HM Treasury, *Financial Statement and Budget Report*, various years; Tolley's *National Insurance Contributions*, various years; National Statistics, [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk).

The abolition of the entry rate, the alignment of the earnings threshold with the income tax personal allowance, and the abolition of the cap on contributions have made NI look more like income tax. Important differences remain: in particular, the self-employed face a very different, and much less onerous, NI system (see Section 3.2). NI also has a different tax base: it is a tax on earnings only, whereas income tax is paid on a broader definition of income. However, the NI base has expanded to match the income tax base more closely; this can be seen, for example, in the extension of the NI system to cover benefits in kind. Economically, there is little rationale for having separate income tax and NI systems. Their separate existence is largely a matter of historical accident and makes the tax system unnecessarily opaque, complex and administratively expensive, while differences remaining between the two systems are distortionary and inequitable. But the political advantages of having a separate NI system make it likely that it will continue: both the government and the electorate appear to like this separate tax. That being the case, the substantial problems caused by the lack of integration of the two systems have been much reduced by their increased alignment.

### 4.3. Taxation of saving

The last 25 years have seen a significant reduction in the extent to which the tax system distorts the return on different savings vehicles. There are three reasons for this. First, one of the most difficult areas in the taxation of saving is the treatment of inflation. At the levels of inflation seen during the 1970s and 1980s, distortions created by variations in the treatment of inflation were large. At the inflation rates seen in the last decade, however, this is a far less severe problem, and if rates remain close to the 2% target, it will become even less important. Second, the dispersion of tax rates (especially income tax rates) has narrowed. If a particular form of saving attracted tax relief at, say, 83%, its underlying performance could be quite poor and yet it could still provide an attractive return. As the number of tax bands has fallen and the highest rates have come down, the distortion caused by the taxation of different forms of saving has also fallen. Third, there have been a series of reforms that have reduced the tax advantage of previously highly tax-privileged saving, and others that have removed tax disadvantages of other forms of saving, leading to a general levelling of the tax treatment of saving.

The two most significant changes in the taxation of saving were the abolition of life assurance premium relief in 1984, which had given income tax relief on saving in the form of life assurance, and the steady reduction and final abolition of mortgage interest tax relief (MITR). Until 1974, MITR was available on any size of loan, but in that year a ceiling of £25,000 was imposed. In 1983, this ceiling was increased to £30,000, which was not enough to account for general price inflation and much too little to account for house price inflation. From 1983, the ceiling remained constant, steadily reducing its effective level. From 1991, this erosion of the real value of MITR was accelerated by restricting the tax rate at which relief could be claimed, to the basic rate of tax in 1991 (25%), 20% in 1994, 15% in 1995 and 10% in 1998, with the eventual abolition of the relief in April 2000.

The main extension of relatively tax-favoured saving came in 1988 with the introduction of personal pensions, which allowed the same tax treatment for individual-based pensions as had been available for employer-based occupational pensions (tax relief on contributions, no tax on fund income, tax on withdrawals apart from a lump sum not exceeding 25% of the accumulated fund). The other main extensions were the Personal Equity Plan (PEP) and the Tax-Exempt Special Savings Account (TESSA), introduced in 1987 and 1991 respectively. The PEP was originally a vehicle for direct holding of equities, but it was reformed to allow holdings of pooled investments such as unit trusts. The TESSA was a vehicle for holding interest-bearing savings accounts. Both PEP and TESSA benefited from almost the reverse tax treatment to that of pensions: saving into a PEP or TESSA was not given any tax relief, there was no tax on income or gains within the fund and there was no tax on withdrawals. The PEP and TESSA have now been superseded by the Individual Savings Account (ISA), which is similar in most important respects.

Housing, pensions and ISAs cover the saving activity of the bulk of the population, and over the last two decades we have moved from an incoherent tax regime for saving to one that seems much more satisfactory. It has rarely been the case that a clear strategy has been evident, but the power of the practical arguments for similar tax treatment of all saving seems to have been great. Since April 2004 (when dividend tax credit stopped being payable on UK shares held in ISAs), we have had a situation where for housing, and for shares and cash held in ISAs, saving is out of taxed income

and there is no tax on returns and no tax on withdrawals, while for pensions, saving is out of untaxed income, fund income is untaxed but withdrawals are taxed. These two regimes produce the same effective tax rate of zero on the real return to saving. The one obvious exception is the existence of the tax-free lump sum in pensions, which makes the effective tax rate on the return to pensions saving negative. In addition, employers' pension contributions are particularly tax-favoured since they are not subject to either employer or employee National Insurance at the point of contribution or at the point of withdrawal.<sup>20</sup> There is still some way to go to reach a system that is neutral in its effects, but we are far closer to it now than we were 20 years ago.

For those (very few) who can and wish to save more than £7,000 per annum (the current ISA limit) in addition to any housing or pension saving, capital gains tax (CGT) is potentially relevant. In 2006–07, an estimated 260,000 people will pay CGT. Prior to 1982, CGT was charged at a flat rate of 30% on capital gains taking no account of inflation. Indexation for inflation was introduced in 1982 and amended in 1985, and then in 1988 the flat rate of tax of 30% was replaced by the individual's marginal income tax rate. The 1998 Budget reformed the CGT system, removing indexation and introducing a taper system, with the declared objective of encouraging longer-term holding of assets.

#### **4.4. Personal indirect taxes**

##### *Value added tax*

As noted earlier, the most dramatic shift in revenue-raising over the last 25 years has been the growth in VAT, which has doubled its share of total tax revenue. The bulk of this change occurred in 1979 when the incoming Conservative government raised the standard rate of VAT from 8% to 15%, to pay for reductions in the basic rate and higher rates of income tax. The rate was increased from 15% to 17.5% in 1991, to pay for a reduction in the community charge (poll tax). Since then, there have been a number of small extensions to the base of VAT, and the introduction of a reduced rate of VAT on domestic fuel and a few other goods.

Two general issues arise in the context of VAT: incentives and redistribution. It is frequently suggested that a revenue-neutral shift from direct to indirect taxation, such as that introduced in 1979, will reduce tax-induced disincentives to work. But if the attractiveness of working relative to not working, or working an extra hour as opposed to not doing so, is determined by the amount of goods and services that can be bought with the wage earned, a uniform consumption tax and a uniform earnings tax will clearly have very similar effects. Cutting income tax will not increase the attractiveness of work if the price of goods and services rises by an equivalent amount because of the increase in consumption tax. It may be, of course, that the shift will reduce the burden of taxation for one group and raise it for another, and that this redistribution will affect incentives. But this has little to do with the choice between direct and indirect taxes.

The second general issue concerning VAT relates to redistribution. As described in Section 3.3, many goods in the UK are zero-rated for VAT, with food, books and

---

<sup>20</sup> Other taxes which are not levied directly on savings income may also affect the return on different forms of saving, depending on the effective incidence of the tax: for example, corporation tax on savings invested in companies, or stamp duty on purchases of property and securities.

children's clothing being examples. This zero-rating is often defended on distributional grounds, because those with low incomes allocate a large proportion of their expenditure to these items. Although this argument is superficially persuasive, it needs to be balanced by the recognition that, although the better-off spend a smaller proportion of their incomes on these goods, they spend larger amounts of money and are therefore the main cash beneficiaries of zero rates of VAT. Reversing the argument, if we sought the best-targeted way of allocating resources to the needy, identifying goods that absorbed a large share of their spending and then cutting the indirect tax rates for these goods is unlikely to be the most effective form of targeting. Other considerations, such as particular concerns over, say, children's clothes, may be relevant, but it is important to realise that the distributional argument for zero rates of VAT is not obviously a powerful one.

### *Excisable goods*

Table 18 shows the total rate of indirect tax (VAT and excise duty) on the principal goods subject to excise duties. Between 1979 and 2000, taxes on cigarettes rose steadily, while those on petrol and diesel increased much more sharply. Both these commodity groups were covered by government commitments to substantial annual real increases in excise duty in the 1990s. Since 2000, however, taxes on cigarettes have increased only in line with inflation, while fuel taxes have fallen in real terms.

The pattern for alcoholic drink is more diverse. There has been a tendency for the rate of tax on spirits to fall, and the tax rate on spirits is now very much lower than it was in 1979. The tax rate on wine has shown relatively little trend, while that on beer has tended to fall since 1983. As shown in Table 19, implied duty rates per litre of pure alcohol are now much closer together than they were in 1979, though substantial variation does persist. This may seem puzzling since a natural starting point for a tax regime for alcoholic drink would be to impose the same level of tax per unit of alcohol, regardless of the form in which it is consumed. Variation in tax rates might be justified if one form of alcohol were more likely to lead to anti-social behaviour, for example, but such arguments are rarely made. The truth appears to be that the current system is more a product of history than of a coherent rationale, and there is obvious merit in reviewing it.

The existence of relatively high tax rates in the UK on some easily portable commodities could lead to loss of revenue through cross-border shopping. While it is possible that the UK tax rates are so high that reductions in those rates would encourage enough additional consumption to produce a net increase in revenue, the available evidence suggests that this is unlikely.<sup>21</sup> Only in the case of spirits is it likely that the current tax rate is high enough for a reduction to have little or no revenue cost, which might help explain why duty on spirits has been frozen in nominal terms (cut in real terms) every year since 1997.

---

<sup>21</sup>See I. Crawford, Z. Smith and S. Tanner, 'Alcohol taxes, tax revenues and the Single European Market', *Fiscal Studies*, 1999, vol. 20, pp. 305–20, and C. Walker and C-D. Huang, *Alcohol Taxation and Revenue Maximisation: The Case of Spirits Duty*, HM Customs and Excise Forecasting Team Technical Note *Series A* no. 10, 2003 ([http://customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/downloadFile?contentID=HMCE\\_PROD\\_008438](http://customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/downloadFile?contentID=HMCE_PROD_008438)).

**Table 18: Total tax as a percentage of retail price, 1979 to 2005**

Year	Cigarettes	Beer	Wine	Spirits	Leaded petrol	Unleaded petrol <sup>a</sup>	Diesel <sup>a</sup>
1979	70	34	47	77	49	—	49
1980	71	34	49	79	48	—	47
1981	74	38	51	78	54	—	51
1982	75	38	52	75	58	—	50
1983	74	38	53	74	56	—	50
1984	75	36	46	73	55	—	51
1985	75	36	49	73	53	—	48
1986	75	35	48	72	60	—	57
1987	74	34	47	71	64	—	63
1988	75	34	48	69	67	63	63
1989	74	33	47	66	63	58	61
1990	74	32	47	66	64	60	62
1991	76	33	48	65	68	64	65
1992	76	33	48	66	70	66	66
1993	76	33	49	64	71	67	66
1994	76	31	50	65	75	71	68
1995	78	31	51	67	76	73	73
1996	78	31	51	65	77	76	74
1997	79	30	49	62	79	75	74
1998	79	30	51	63	80	79	79
1999	79	30	51	61	86	85	85
2000	80	30	52	62	— <sup>b</sup>	76	75
2001	80	29	51	61	—	75	74
2002	83 <sup>c</sup>	30	50	61	—	75	74
2003	83	29	51	60	—	73	72
2004	83	29	52	61	—	75	74
2005	82	29	53	62	—	70	68
2006	81	28	53	63	—	66	64

<sup>a</sup>Ultra-low sulphur from 2000 onwards.

<sup>b</sup>Retail sales of leaded petrol stopped from 1 January 2000.

<sup>c</sup>This rise does not represent a real rise in duty rates. The discontinuity arises because the ONS measure of average cigarette prices changed in 2002 to include more, cheaper, brands.

Notes: Percentages relate to April/May for all years up to and including 1993, to January from 1994 to 2000 and to April from 2001. 'Cigarettes' refers to a packet of 20 king-size cigarettes, 'beer' to a pint of bitter (3.9% abv) in licensed premises, 'wine' to a 75cl bottle of table wine (not exceeding 15% abv) in a retail outlet, 'spirits' to a 70cl bottle of whisky (40% abv) in a retail outlet, and 'petrol' and 'diesel' refer to a litre of fuel.

Sources: HM Customs and Excise, website

([customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/channelsPortalWebApp.portal?\\_nfpb=true&\\_pageLabel=pageExcise\\_InfoGuides](http://customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/channelsPortalWebApp.portal?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=pageExcise_InfoGuides)) and various *Annual Report and Accounts*

([http://customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/channelsPortalWebApp.portal?\\_nfpb=true&\\_pageLabel=pageVAT\\_ShowContent&id=HMCE\\_PROD1\\_025157&propertyType=document](http://customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/channelsPortalWebApp.portal?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=pageVAT_ShowContent&id=HMCE_PROD1_025157&propertyType=document)); UK Trade Info website ([www.uktradeinfo.co.uk](http://www.uktradeinfo.co.uk)); National Statistics ([www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk)); authors' calculations.

**Table 19: Implied duty rates per litre of pure alcohol (April 2006 prices)**

Form of alcohol	1979	1989	2006
Beer	£11.29	£14.01	£13.26
Wine <sup>a</sup>	£20.02	£14.05	£14.35
Spirits	£34.81	£25.92	£19.56

<sup>a</sup>Wine of strength 12% abv.

Sources: HM Revenue and Customs, website

([http://customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/channelsPortalWebApp.portal?\\_nfpb=true&\\_pageLabel=pageExcise\\_InfoGuides&propertyType=document&id=HMCE\\_PROD1\\_025381](http://customs.hmrc.gov.uk/channelsPortalWebApp/channelsPortalWebApp.portal?_nfpb=true&_pageLabel=pageExcise_InfoGuides&propertyType=document&id=HMCE_PROD1_025381)) and various HM Revenue and Customs *Annual Reports*; National Statistics, [www.statistics.gov.uk](http://www.statistics.gov.uk); authors' calculations.

#### 4.5. Taxes on companies

Corporation tax – the principal UK tax on companies – has been through two major reforms in the last 25 years, one in 1984 and the second since Labour came to power in 1997. In 1984, the main corporation tax rate was cut from 52% to 35% (reduced to 33% by 1991–92), and a very generous system of deductions for capital investment (100% first-year allowances for investment in plant and machinery) was replaced by a less generous one (25% annual writing-down allowances). The 1984 reform was intended to be broadly revenue-neutral, but may possibly have raised extra revenue by increasing the number of taxpaying companies more than expected.

The incoming Labour government of 1997 changed the way that dividend income was taxed, no longer allowing certain tax-exempt shareholders, such as pension funds and other companies, to reclaim the value of their dividend tax credit. This was followed in 1999 with a reform of the system for corporation tax payments (see Section 3.6).

Since coming to power, the Labour government has also cut the main corporation tax rate from 33% to 30% and the small companies' rate from 24% to 19%. In April 2000, a 10% lower rate was introduced for companies with less than £10,000 of taxable profits, and this lower rate was cut to zero in April 2002. This last tax cut came as a surprise, with costs potentially running into billions of pounds if self-employed individuals registered as companies to reduce their tax liabilities.<sup>22</sup> Having apparently failed to anticipate this effect, the government swiftly reversed the reform. In April 2004, the zero rate was abolished for distributed profits, removing much of the tax advantage but at a cost of greater complexity; and so in December 2005, the zero rate was abolished for retained profits as well. This takes us back to precisely where we were before April 2000, with the standard small companies' rate applying to all firms with profits up to £300,000, regardless of whether the profits are paid out as dividends or retained by the firm. In the mean time, there has been unnecessary upheaval in the tax system, and thousands of individuals have incurred effort and

<sup>22</sup> More information about these changes can be found in L. Blow, M. Hawkins, A. Klemm, J. McCrae and H. Simpson, *Budget 2002: Business Taxation Measures*, IFS Briefing Note 24, 2002 ([www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn24.pdf](http://www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn24.pdf)). For a discussion of possible future reforms, see S. Bond and A. Klemm, *Corporation Tax Reform: A Response to the Government's August 2003 Consultation Document*, IFS Briefing Note 40, 2003 ([www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn40.pdf](http://www.ifs.org.uk/bns/bn40.pdf)).

expense to set up legally incorporated businesses that they would not otherwise have done. This episode provides a clear lesson in how not to make tax policy.

The other substantial company tax in the UK system is business rates. Prior to the local government tax reforms introduced in 1990, business rates were under the control of local authorities. Since 1990, they have been set at the national level: business rates are no longer a local tax in any meaningful sense, and it is now more obvious that they are a slightly surprising tax. Business rates are effectively an intermediate tax that bears heavily on productive activities that are property-intensive. As such, they seem ripe for the reformer's attention, or at least they would be if they attracted more public interest.

#### **4.6. Local taxation**

During the period considered here, local taxation has moved from the rates system, based largely on property values, to the community charge (poll tax), based on individuals, to the council tax, once again based largely upon property values, but with an individual element. These changes have been inspired by attempts to control local expenditure, which was far outstripping local revenue. The result is that local services are largely financed by central government, with the only local tax left – the council tax – providing only around a quarter of total local spending. At the margin, spending an extra pound locally requires the raising of an extra pound locally, giving local authorities appropriate incentives overall. But this extra money must come entirely from council tax, which bears particularly heavily on those groups (such as pensioners) with high property values relative to their incomes and hence limits local authorities' willingness to increase expenditure. Furthermore, while universal capping of local authority spending has ended, strengthened selective capping powers have been retained, and were used in 2004–05 and 2005–06 for the first time since 1998–99. No local authorities have been capped in 2006–07, although two authorities have been told that they will be allowed a lower maximum increase for 2007–08 because of the size of their increase in 2006–07. The threat and practice of capping are another limitation on local authorities' financial autonomy.

The experience with the poll tax itself provides an interesting lesson in policy-making and implementation. It was introduced in April 1990 in England and Wales after a one-year trial in Scotland, but was so unpopular that the government quickly announced that it would be replaced. The tax was based on the fact that an individual lived in a particular local authority, rather than on the value of the property occupied or the individual's ability to pay (subject to some exemptions and reliefs). In the 1991 Budget, the government increased VAT from 15% to 17.5% to pay for a large reduction in the burden of the poll tax, which resulted in a corresponding rise in the level of central government grant to local authorities. The poll tax was abolished in 1993 to be replaced by the council tax, which is based mainly upon the value of the property occupied, with some exemptions and reliefs (outlined in more detail in Section 3.8).

### **5. Conclusions**

Despite clear attempts to reform various aspects of the UK tax system over the last 25 years, with varying degrees of success, there remain many areas still in need of attention. This Briefing Note has set out the features of the current UK tax system,

described the major changes in those features over time and highlighted some of the areas potentially in need of a reformer's beady eye.