

23 SEP 54

DM/54/53

INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

Asian Department

Tax Burden and Expansion of Revenue in the Far East Countries^{1/}

Prepared by Ching Chun Liang

September 14, 1954

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
I. Introduction	1
II. Tax Burden, Income Structure and Tax Structure of the Far East Countries	2
1. Per Capita Tax Burden	2
2. Income by Industrial Origin - Predominance of Agricultural Income	4
3. Income Distribution by Size and its Relation to the Level of* Taxation	5
4. Tax Structure and the Level of Taxation	7
III. Recent Changes in the Tax Burden	10
1. Has Taxation kept up with the Increase in National Income	10
2. Has Taxation kept up with the Increase in Prices	13
IV. Summary and Conclusions	15

Tables in Text

A. Per Capita Income and Tax Burden (Central Government Tax) of Ten Far East Countries, United Kingdom and U.S.A., 1949	3
B. Total Tax Burden (Including Central and Local Government Taxes) of Six Far East Countries and the United States	3
C. Agricultural Income as Per Cent of Total Net Domestic Product of Six Far East Countries, United Kingdom and U.S.A.	4
D. Income Distributions by Size of Ceylon, Japan and the United States	6
E. Basic Exemption under the Individual Income Taxes of the Far East Countries, the United Kingdom and the United States	8
F. Ratios of Central Government Tax to National Income of Ten Far East Countries, United Kingdom and U.S.A.	12
G. Central Government Tax in Constant Purchasing Power of Eleven Far East Countries, United Kingdom and U.S.A.	14

^{1/} This paper was prepared at the request of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East for the use of the Second Meeting of its Working Party of Experts on Financial Aspects of Economic Development Programme of the Far East to be held October 25-30, 1954 in Bangkok, Thailand. It expresses the views of the writer and does not necessarily reflect those of the International Monetary Fund.

<u>Tables in Appendix</u>	<u>Page</u>
I. Ratio of Central Government Tax to National Income and Per Capita Tax Burden of Burma, Ceylon, China (Taiwan), India, Japan, Korea (South), Malaya, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and the United States, 1949	17
II. Total National Tax Burden (Including Central and Local Government Taxes) of China (Taiwan), India, Korea (South), Japan, Pakistan, Philippines and the United States	20
III. Share of Agriculture in the Total Net Domestic Product of China (Taiwan), India, Japan, Korea (South), Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States	21
IV. Ratio of Central Government Tax to National Income of Burma, Ceylon, China (Taiwan), India, Japan, Korea (South), Malaya, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and the United States	22
V. Central Government Tax in Constant Purchasing Power of Burma, Ceylon, China (Taiwan), India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea (South), Malaya, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States	25

Tax Burden and Expansion of Revenue in the Far East Countries

I. Introduction

In the discussion of the financial aspects of economic development of the underdeveloped countries, some common agreement has been reached with regard to certain general principles. Domestic savings must be mobilized. Since the capacity for private voluntary savings is limited and investment by inflationary measures would result in improper allocation of resources and thus defeat the development plan, the most desirable way of financing economic developments is by the expansion of taxation to such an extent that current receipts should exceed current expenditures other than government capital investment. It has been ascertained that the tax structure of the underdeveloped countries has been dominated by indirect taxes, such as import and export duties and excise and sales taxes. Export duties have been subject to great fluctuation in response to the changes of demand in the world market for the export commodities. This changing demand also affects the import duties on account of the fact that the underdeveloped countries, with insufficient exchange reserves and uncertain inflow of foreign capital, usually limit their imports to export earnings. Furthermore, inasmuch as the indirect taxes also fall heavily on import goods, their yield is also subject to fluctuation. Several underdeveloped countries rely on government enterprises as a source of revenue. In a sense this revenue also partakes of the nature of indirect taxes. When the commodities are sold by the government enterprises below cost, the difference is a form of negative taxation and should come under the expenditure side of the budget. With regard to direct taxation, if its percentage share in the total tax revenue is low, this is due to various institutional reasons, such as illiteracy, lack of bookkeeping system, deficiency in the tax collection machinery and the absence of a habit of self-assessment. What kind of tax should be expanded depends on the special economic and social environment of the country concerned. A comprehensive review of the individual existing taxes of the Far East has been the subject of a document prepared last year by the United Nations Secretariat.^{1/}

The possibility for the expansion of revenues is conditioned by many other factors besides institutions. The total national income, and its origin and distribution are some of the basic determinants. The present paper is a review of the tax burden of the Far East countries and its relation to the income and tax structure. This will be followed by a brief presentation of the recent changes in the tax burden in terms of national income and price level.

^{1/} Taxation and Economic Development in Asian Countries, Economic Bulletin for Asia and the Far East, Vol. IV, No. 3, Nov. 1953, United Nations.

II. Tax Burden, Income Structure and Tax Structure of the Far East Countries

In order to expand taxation in the Far East countries it is necessary to inquire about the present tax burden. There is no precise direct measure of the tax burden, especially when international comparison is to be made. However, some methods of approximation by indirect indicators are available. Three different sets of data are presented in this paper to show whether a possibility exists for the expansion of tax revenue, namely: (1) different tax burdens of the Far East countries in the same year; (2) the change in the tax burden over a period to show whether the tax collection has kept up with the change in the national income; (3) the change of tax revenue in constant purchasing power to show whether tax revenue has kept up with the price increase.

There are many difficulties in reducing the tax data of various countries to a comparative basis. Adjustments have been made as far as possible but reservations should be made in their generalization. Among the Far East countries there is taxation in kind such as land tax in China (Taiwan) and Korea. There are also exchange profits not included in the government budget (such as the exchange profits of Thailand). Adjustments for the underestimate of Korean land tax on account of the use of the official price have been made and exchange profits have been included in the Thailand tax. Many governments of the Far East countries engage in trading. The trade profits have been treated as indirect taxes.

1. Per Capita Tax Burden

The data on national income and central government tax of the Far East countries are more complete for the year 1949 than for any other year. The data for this year were taken to present a summary picture of the tax burden of the Far East region as a whole. The average tax collections of ten Far East countries in that year was 7.7 per cent of their national income. For the United States the corresponding figure was 18.4 per cent and for the U.K. it was 33.8 per cent. Among individual Far East countries only three had a tax burden of more than 10 per cent (Japan, Ceylon and Burma).^{1/} It is very difficult to compare the tax burden of these countries which have quite different per capita income. The low level of the per capita income of the Far East region (average U.S.\$78) has something to do with the low level of tax collections (see Table A below). Nevertheless, it cannot be denied that there

^{1/} The low level of taxes as shown by the figures included here is partly explained by the fact that they refer to central government taxes only. The central government tax of countries with federated type of government, such as India and U.S.A., is expected to be relatively lower than that with a centralized type of government.

Table A: Per Capita Income and Tax Burden (Central Government Tax) of Ten Far East Countries, United Kingdom and U.S.A., 1949

<u>Country</u>	<u>Per Capita Income (US\$)</u>	<u>Tax as Per Cent of National Income</u>
Burma	43.35	14.8
Ceylon	109.14	18.4
China (Taiwan)	38.50	6.3
India	70.92	3.5
Japan	99.15	22.6
Korea (South)	88.48	1.0
Malaya	161.85	8.4
Pakistan	67.34	4.3
Philippines	144.25	5.8
Thailand	<u>104.44</u>	<u>8.6</u>
Ten Far East Countries	78.47	7.7
United Kingdom	786.38	33.8
United States	1,449.70	18.4

For details, notes and sources, see Table I in the Appendix.

Table B: Total Tax Burden (Including Central and Local Government Taxes) of Six Far East Countries and the United States

<u>Country</u>	<u>Year</u>	<u>Total Tax as Per Cent of National Income</u>
China (Taiwan)	1952	14.0
India	1950	6.6
Korea (South)	1953	19.6
Japan	1953	20.5
Philippines	1950	8.1
Pakistan	1949	5.7
United States	1951	25.6

For details, notes and sources, see Table II in the Appendix.

is room for expanding the present tax burden without any serious effect on the national economy.

The above presentation refers to the tax collection of the central government alone, on account of the scarcity of data about local taxation. Tax revenue of the local governments of the Far East countries is readily available for only five countries referring to different years. Even when the combined tax revenues of the central and local governments of six Far East countries are taken into consideration, their total tax burden does not appear to be very much higher. The ratios of the combined taxes to national income ranged from 5.7 per cent for Pakistan to 20.5 per cent for Japan compared with a similar ratio of 25.6 per cent for the United States (see Table B).

2. Income by Industrial Origin - Predominance of Agricultural Income

There are many reasons why tax collections in the Far East region have been low. One of them is the special income structure of the Far East countries, namely, the predominance of agricultural income in the total national product and the large share of the low income groups in the national income.

It has been very well known that the agricultural sector occupies the most important position in the occupational distribution of the population in the Far East countries. In order to study the influence of this phenomenon on the taxation level of the country, some income data are needed. Very recently there have been made available national income figures according to industrial origin. These figures showed that the agricultural share in the total net domestic product of the Far East countries, aside from the low figure for Japan (22 per cent), lies within the range of about 40 per cent to 60 per cent. This is in great contrast to the corresponding figures for the United Kingdom (5.6 per cent) and the United States (6.6 per cent), (see Table C below).

TABLE C

Agricultural Income as Percent of Total Net Domestic Product of Six Far East Countries, United Kingdom and U.S.A.

<u>Country</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Thailand	57.0
Korea (South)	50.3
India	47.5
Philippines	42.8
China (Taiwan)	41.1
Japan	21.8
U.S.A.	6.6
U.K.	5.6

For details, notes and sources, see Table III in the appendix.

As is well known, it is much more difficult to tax the agricultural income than the non-agricultural income. Besides this, the recent trend of thought has been emphasizing relief of the farmer's financial burden in the wake of the agrarian reform movement. On the one hand, the landless class is given many benefits and on the other hand the land-owning class has been enjoying a decreasing real burden of taxation in view of the increase in prices. The difficulties for taxation to reach the agricultural group mean the freeing of some 40 to 60 per cent of the vast population from sharing the increasing expenditures of the government.

3. Income Distribution by Size - Large Share of the Low Income Groups in the National Income

The availability of data on income distribution by size for a few Far East countries throws some additional light on the relationship between the income structure and the low level of taxation. Since it is most difficult to tax the income earners within the low income groups, especially by direct taxation, the higher their share in the total national income, the lower will be the tax to be derived from this income sector. The income of both the first and second deciles of income earners of Ceylon and Japan are larger than the equivalent share for the United States. The first 20 per cent of the population of Ceylon and Japan share 5.1 per cent and 7.2 per cent respectively of the total national income while the equivalent share for the United States is only 4 per cent. (See Table D below.)

Table D: Income Distributions by Size of Ceylon, Japan and the United States

Percentage of Receivers		Percentage of Income					
		Ceylon (Dec. 1950) ^{1/}		Japan (1949) ^{2/}		U.S.A. (1950)	
Simple	Cumulative	Simple	Cumulative	Simple	Cumulative	Simple	Cumulative
10	10	1.5	1.5	2.9	2.9	1	1
10	20	3.6	5.1	4.3	7.2	3	4
10	30	4.7	9.8	5.6	12.8	5	9
10	40	5.4	15.2	6.4	19.2	6	15
10	50	6.2	21.4	7.4	26.6	8	23
10	60	7.6	29.0	8.4	35.0	9	32
10	70	9.4	38.4	10.1	45.1	11	43
10	80	12.4	50.8	12.0	57.1	13	56
10	90	15.9	66.7	15.3	72.4	15	71
10	100	33.3	100.0	27.6	100.0	29	100

^{1/} Distribution of monthly personal income. Based on income distribution data in "An Estimate of Inequality of Income," Central Bank of Ceylon Bulletin, Ceylon, March 1952. It is not clear from the basic data whether the personal income is given before or after taxation.

^{2/} Distribution of taxable income of entrepreneurs. Based on data in Statistical Yearbook of Japan, 1950, Table 199-B, p. 374. The basic data for this table appear to refer to taxable income of entrepreneurs only. At least it is evident that the table, with a coverage of 7,609,920 persons, applies only to certain categories of income earners. Figures based on the confirmed self-assessed amount of income. Each of the ten groups of income receivers includes 760,992 persons.

Source: Data for Ceylon and Japan are supplied by the Statistical Office of the United Nations, data for United States from Federal Reserve Bulletin, August 1951, p. 929, all quoted in Analysis of National Income in Selected Asian Countries, Economic Bulletin for Asia and the Far East, January-June, 1952, p. 7, United Nations.

With regard to the distribution of wealth, data are not available. Most probably the share of small property owners in the total national wealth of the Far East countries is smaller than in the case of the more economically developed countries.

4. Tax Structure and the Level of Taxation

Adequacy of tax revenue depends on a well balanced tax structure by which various tax sources can be tapped in a way most consistent with equity, certainty, convenience and economy. A brief review of the important taxes existing in the Far East is presented below to show how far they are related to the level of taxation.

(1) Income Taxes. As was mentioned above, very few Far East countries have had agricultural income tax. The income taxes which are supposed to fall on the non-agricultural incomes also suffer from high exemption limits and evasion. The basic exemption under the individual income taxes of the Far East countries is relatively high. There is, of course, no absolute precise criterion to measure the appropriateness of the basic exemption. It depends on the cost of living, per capita income, definition of taxable income, etc. Nevertheless, when the basic exemption is several times higher than the per capita income, it cannot but be considered unreasonably high. This is the actual case in the Far East. The basic exemption of seven Far East countries for which information is available ranges between two to twelve times their respective per capita income. In the case of the United Kingdom and the United States, the basic exemption is less than half of their respective per capita income. (See Table E below.)

Table E: Basic Exemption under the Individual Income Taxes of the Far East Countries, the United Kingdom and the United States

Country	Year ^{2/}	Basic Exemption ^{1/}		Per Capita Income (1949) ^{2/}	
		In Domestic Currency	In U.S. (at official rate)	In Domestic Currency	In U.S.\$
Ceylon	1951	Rs. 4,800	1,008	401	109
India	1953	Rs. 4,200	882	260	71
Japan	1954	¥ 70,000	194	33,463	99
Korea	1951	Won 12,000	5 ^{3/}	59,721	88
Malaya	1950	M\$ 3,000	980	495	162
Philippines	1953	P 1,500	750	291	144
Thailand	1953	Baht 3,000	239	1,109	104
United Kingdom	1951	£ 110	308	217	787
United States	1948	\$ 600	600	1,450	1,450

- ^{1/} Except for India, the exemption of all the countries included here refers to personal exemption for the taxpayer.
- ^{2/} The basic assumption refers to different years while per capita income refers to the same year (1949). The dollar exchange rates used to convert the two figures for the same country are, in some cases, not the same because their official exchange rates had been changed. Figures for Per Capita Income (1949) are taken from Table I in the Appendix.
- ^{3/} This is not a very significant figure. The Income Tax Law of Korea which provided for the rather low figure of won 12,000 for basic exemption (Art. XVI) was promulgated on January 1, 1951 just before the period of serious inflation set in. The low figure in terms of U.S. dollar was also due to the rapid devaluation of the won.

Besides the basic exemption there are also the exemptions for dependents under the income tax laws of many Far East countries. In view of the fact that the term "dependent" has a much broader meaning in the Far East family system, earners of even a very high income are often totally exempt from paying any income tax. The difficulty of assessing the net income under the Far East conditions and the predominance of non-cash income are also contributing factors toward the low income tax yields. In the case of India, "the total number of persons paying taxes on income is about 600,000 or only 1 to 2 per cent of the total households in India."^{1/} The extent to which low income earners were free from paying income tax was also evident in an interesting comparison made for the Philippines. At the time of the visit of the United States Economic Survey Mission, the Central Bank of the Philippines made an estimate that in the income class below 2,000 pesos there would be included 87.2 per cent of the total national income. In a preliminary analysis of the income tax returns for 1949 only 10.5 per cent of the taxable income in the tax returns fell into this income class. The only income tax in the Far East countries which reached the mass is the Japanese system, especially before 1950. The basic exemption in 1949 was ¥15,000 (the equivalent of U.S.\$41.67) which was considered by the Shoup Mission as too low, since "even a young shopgirl in a retail store in a small city gets ¥3,000 a month or more."^{2/}

There has also been a tendency during the postwar period for some Far East countries to raise the basic exemption figure successively. Ceylon raised this figure from 2,400 rupees to 4,800 rupees in 1951. Thailand revised the basic exemption from the pre-war figure of 600 baht to 1,200 baht during the period 1946 to 1950, 2,000 baht in 1951-52 and again to 3,000 since 1953.

(2) Property Tax. There are very few property taxes in the Far East. In fact, properties other than real estate are very unimportant. Land tax is practically the only property tax existing. In view of the fact that the landless class occupies such an important position in the whole population, the mass is outside of the reach of this tax. It has been estimated that the landless agricultural laborers numbered 45 million in undivided India.^{3/} Exemption from tax for small land owners is also not uncommon. For example, Thailand exempted from land taxes owners of 2½ acres of land last year.^{4/}

^{1/} Investment in India - Conditions and Outlook for United States Investors, p. 47, U.S. Department of Commerce, 1953.

^{2/} Report on Japanese Taxation by the Shoup Mission, Volume I, p. 44, September 1949, SCAP.

^{3/} O.H.K. Spake: India and Pakistan - A General and Regional Geography, p. 243, Rangoon, 1954.

^{4/} Far East Trader, New York, July 15, 1953.

(3) Excise and Sales Taxes. It has often been thought that indirect taxes fall mostly on the poor people. If this is true elsewhere, it is less so in the Far East. There are taxes in the Far East which fall on daily necessities such as taxes on cotton cloth and matches in India. The heaviest burden of indirect taxes, however, is on liquor and tobacco, mostly of the imported brands. It is not true that the poor classes are the habitual consumers of these luxurious kinds of commodities. In the country-side a great majority of the population still rely on home fermented wines and self-produced tobacco.

(4) Export Duties. The export duties imposed on commodities universally produced, such as rice in Burma and Thailand, may be considered as a mass tax insofar as they could not be shifted to domestic purchasers or foreign importers. Such duties, however, can exist only at the time when foreign demand is favorable. In this case since the exporters' profit margin is high, the export duties are likely to be shifted to the export merchants. It is doubtful, therefore, whether these duties actually are incumbent on the mass of the population.

(5) Import Duties. Import duties are one of the important sources of revenue for several Far East countries. The yield from this tax, however, is indirectly related to the export demand. Since the exchange reserves of some Far East countries are relatively low, and the inflow of foreign capital is uncertain, a decline in their export value often leads to restriction of imports.

(6) License Tax. The total yield from the license tax in the Far East countries is very small. Trade and manufacturing are still dominated by single proprietorship and the scale of operation is very small. It is very rare that the license tax extends coverage to them.

III. Recent Changes in the Tax Burden

In order to implement a development program it is not sufficient for the underdeveloped countries merely to maintain a fixed ratio of taxation to national income or to keep up with the same level of tax in constant purchasing power. A larger share of the national income has to be devoted to capital formation during the period in which the development plan is being implemented. However, before a comprehensive tax reform is effected, the Far East countries may have been doing as much as possible if the tax level has kept pace with the increase of national income and prices.

1. Has Taxation Kept up with Increases in National Income?

There has been a general tendency for the national income of the Far East countries to increase from year to year in the postwar period. The same trend was also observed in the tax collection of the national governments. The question arises whether it has been possible for the

Far East countries to increase their revenues at least in the same ratio as the national income increase. With the increase of per capita income a country should be able to raise the tax revenue more than the proportional increase of the national income. This point is of particular importance at the time when some Far East countries were enjoying a boom, mostly through the favorable export situation. During such a period a surplus budget should be achieved so that cash reserve may be increased. In comparing the tax revenue with national income from year to year, the national income figures have been arranged in such a way as to lead the tax collection by three or six months on the assumption that the current year's revenue comes from the income of a period sometime back. This way of pairing the national income and taxation figures was made possible by the fact that national income refers to calendar years while taxation refers to fiscal years. (See Table IV in the Appendix.)

The data available for ten Far East countries also show that China (Taiwan) and Korea succeeded in increasing from year to year the ratio of taxation to national income. Japan and the Philippines had increasing ratios except for one year during the period under study. These ratios for the other Far East countries fluctuated. On the whole it can be said that the Far East countries have been able to keep up the tax collection at least in the same proportion as the increase in national income. (See Table F below.)

Table F: Ratios of Central Government Tax to National Income of Ten Far East Countries, United Kingdom and U.S.A.

<u>Year</u>	<u>Burma</u>	<u>Ceylon</u>	<u>China (Taiwan)</u>	<u>India</u>	<u>Japan</u>	<u>Korea (South)</u>
1947	17.2	--	--	--	--	--
1948	11.8	18.7	--	3.7	19.8	--
1949	14.8	18.4	6.4	3.5	21.4	1.0
1950	17.4	19.0	7.2	3.8	14.4	--
1951	16.7	17.0	9.3	--	15.3	--
1952	19.4	16.4	11.7	--	15.5	6.8
1953	--	16.4	--	--	--	14.1

<u>Year</u>	<u>Malaya</u>	<u>Pakistan</u>	<u>Philippines</u>	<u>Thailand</u>	<u>U.K.</u>	<u>U.S.A.</u>
1947	--	--	5.4	--	--	--
1948	6.5	--	6.3	--	35.9	18.2
1949	8.4	4.3	5.8	8.6	33.8	18.4
1950	8.1	--	7.2	8.1	32.4	21.5
1951	--	--	9.6	--	33.0	23.8
1952	--	--	8.9	--	31.4	24.2
1953	--	--	8.3	--	28.7	24.2

For details, notes and sources, see Table IV in the Appendix.

2. Has Taxation Kept up with Increases in Price?

There has been price inflation in most of the Far East countries during the postwar period. A sound fiscal policy requires that their tax collection should at least keep up with the price increase. It is therefore significant to determine in what way tax collection has changed in terms of constant purchasing power. In measuring this phenomenon, there are difficulties in relating the cost of living index^{1/} to the tax series since the former refers to the calendar year while the latter to the fiscal year. The tax collection has therefore been paired with the index of the cost of living in such a way that the former leads the latter by three or six months on the assumption that some government expenditures lag behind the tax collection (see Table V in the Appendix). The results of the above statistical presentation for eleven Far East countries indicate that China (Taiwan) and Korea have been able to increase their tax collection greatly in real terms. Except for one or two years, eight of the other Far East countries have also been able to do so. The tax collection of Indonesia, however, has decreased during the period from 1951 to 1953 measured in constant purchasing power.

Of the Far East countries under study with respect to the expansion of tax relative to both national income and price increase, Korea was considered as standing out quite distinctly. According to a publication by the U.N. Korean Reconstruction Agency, "the performance of the revenue system of the Republic of Korea since 1950 has been above what could normally have been expected. Between the fiscal years 1949-50 and 1952-53 total national tax revenues increased by more than twice the rise in retail prices and by two and three quarter times the increase in wholesale prices...In order to achieve this large increase in tax revenue it was necessary for the government to do more than simply raise tax rates and lower the exemptions. Important structural changes were introduced in the tax system, such as the adoption of the temporary land income tax with its provision for tax collection in kind. The individual income tax was placed more completely on a pay-as-you-go-basis. Its assessment periods were shortened so that the Treasury would receive payment with the least possible delay. New collection methods were devised in order to administer the increased taxes under the extremely difficult circumstances that prevailed."^{2/}

The case of the Philippines is another illustration of the possibility of increasing taxes. In 1949 the ratio of central government tax to national income was only 5.8 per cent. Since the tax reform in 1951 this ratio has gradually increased. At one time (1951) it advanced to 9.6 per cent. In real terms the tax revenue of the Philippines more than doubled from 1948 to 1953. It also appears that similar progress was achieved in China (Taiwan). (See Table G below.)

^{1/} The cost of living index may not be the ideal index to deflate the tax series. It is used here merely because it is the only price index available for a large number of the Far East countries.

^{2/} An Economic Program for Korean Reconstruction, p. 162, United Nations Korean Reconstruction Agency, March 1954.

Some changes have taken place in the tax collections in the Far East in recent years. On the whole, the tax collections of the Far East countries have been able to keep up with the increases both in national income and in prices. A few of these countries succeeded in enlarging their tax revenues gradually both in comparison with national income and in real terms.

Table I: Ratio of Central Government Tax to National Income and Per Capita Tax Burden of Burma, Ceylon, China (Taiwan), India, Japan, Korea (South), Malaya, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States, 1949

Country	Population (million)	Rate of Exchange Domestic Currency per US\$	National Income			Tax			Per Capita Tax in Domestic Currency	Tax as % of National Income
			In US\$ (million)	Per Capita Income in US\$	Per Capita Income in Domestic Currency	In US\$ (million)	Per Capita Tax in US\$	In Domestic Currency (million)		
Burma	18.3	3.672 ^{1/2}	793.3	43.35	159	Kyat	431.1 ^{16/}	6.42	23.59	14.8
Ceylon	7.3	3.672 ^{1/2}	796.6	109.14	401	Rupee	538.4 ^{16/}	20.00	73.75	18.4
China (Taiwan)	7.1	5.00	273.4	38.50	193	N.T. ^{1/2}	86.7 ^{17/}	2.44	12.18	6.3
India	346.0	3.672 ^{1/2}	24,537.0	70.92	260	Rupee	3,114.9 ^{18/}	2.45	9.00	3.5
Japan	81.8 ^{2/}	337.500	8,110.5	99.15	33,463	Yen	620,000 ^{19/}	22.45	7,579.45	22.6
Korea (South)	20.0 ^{2/}	675 ^{1/2}	1,769.5	88.48	59,721	Won	11,428 ^{20/}	0.85	571.40	1.0
Malaya	6.1	3.061	987.3	161.85	495	Dollar	253.2 ^{21/}	13.56	41.51	8.4
Pakistan	75.0 ^{3/}	3.309	5,050.2	67.34	223	Rupee	712.9 ^{22/}	2.87	9.51	4.3
Philippines	19.5	2.015	2,812.9	144.25	291	Peso	328.5 ^{23/}	8.35	16.84	5.8
Thailand	18.1	10.614	1,890.3	101.44	1,109	Baht	1,719.3 ^{24/}	8.95	94.98	8.6
Total	599.2		47,021.0	78.47			3,606.0	6.02		7.7
U. K.	50.4	0.2754 ^{6/}	39,633.3	786.38	217	£	3,686.9 ^{25/}	265.62	73.15	33.8
U. S.	149.2	--	216,300.0	1,449.7	1,450	US\$	39,881.0 ^{26/}	267.30	267.30	18.4

Table I: Ratio of Central Government Tax to National Income and Per Capita Tax Burden of Burma, Ceylon, China (Taiwan), India, Japan, Korea (South), Malaya, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States, 1949 - Continued

General Note: The figures for national income mostly refer to calendar years while those for tax refer to fiscal years. The two sets of figures were paired as far as possible in such a way that the natural income series led the tax series by three or six months.

All tax figures refer to closed accounts except those which bear the following symbols: E = voted estimate; P = preliminary results.

Estimate for 1949 South Korea population, based on figures for 1952 and 1932.

1/ 1950.

2/ Monthly average of 3,309 (Jan. to Sept.) and 4,762 (Oct. to Dec.).

3/ Average of 450 (Jan. to June) and 900 (July to Dec.).

4/ Monthly average of 0.248139 (Jan. to Sept.) and 0.357143 (Oct. to Dec.).

5/ Year ending September 30.

6/ Gross national product at factor cost, unadjusted.

7/ Derived from national income of yuan 774.9 million in 1937 price by multiplying this figure by the index of cost of living of public servants for 1949 (176.4 with 1937 as base).

8/ Year beginning April 1.

9/ Gross national product of Korea (South) April 1949 to March 1950, originally expressed in U.S. dollars, and converted to won at the average exchange rate of 675 won per U.S. dollar.

10/ Including both Federation of Malaya and Singapore, unofficial estimate.

11/ Gross national product at factor cost; year beginning April 1.

12/ Excluding net factor income payments from abroad.

13/ Gross national product at factor cost.

14/ Year beginning October 1, closed accounts.

15/ Calendar year; total actual tax receipt including: (1) Central Government collections of customs duty and salt tax, NT\$26.8 million and

(2) National and Provincial Taxes collected by the Provincial Government, NT\$59.9 million.

16/ Year beginning April 1; preliminary results.

17/ Year beginning April 1; closed accounts.

18/ Year beginning April 1; budget estimate.

19/ Singapore not included; calendar year; closed accounts.

20/ Year beginning April 1; preliminary results.

21/ Year beginning July 1; voted estimate.

22/ Including profits of Rice Bureau (not including exchange profits, data for which are not available); calendar year; closed accounts.

23/ Year beginning April 1; closed accounts.

24/ Year beginning July 1; including individual income tax, gift and estate taxes, corporation income and excess profit taxes, employment taxes, customs duty and excise taxes; closed accounts.

Source:

Population

China: The Structure of the Taiwan Economy, 1953, Bureau of Accounting and Statistics, Provincial Government of Taiwan.

Other Countries: Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, August 1954, United Nations.

Table I: Ratio of Central Government Tax to National Income and Per Capita Tax Burden of Burma, Ceylon, China (Taiwan), India, Japan, Korea (South), Malaya, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States, 1949 -- Continued

Exchange Rate:

China: Same source as Population.

Korea: Monthly Statistical Review, April 1954, Bank of Korea.

Other countries: International Financial Statistics, October 1949, International Monetary Fund.

National Income:

China: Same as above.

Korea: An Economic Program for Korean Reconstruction, p. 452, March 1954, U.N. Korean Reconstruction Agency.

Other countries: Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, August 1954, United Nations.

Taxation:

China: Same as above.

Korea: Economic Review, 1949, P. I-129, Bank of Korea.

Thailand: Comptroller General's Department, Ministry of Finance, Thailand.

Other countries: Statistical Yearbook, 1953, United Nations.

Table II: Total National Tax Burden (Including Central and Local Government Taxes) of China (Taiwan), India, Korea (South), Japan, Pakistan, Philippines and United States

Country	Year	Currency Unit in Million	National Income	National Tax	As Percent of National Income
China (Taiwan)	1952	NT\$	13,706.1	1,924.2 ^{1/}	14.0
India	1950	Rs.	95,300	6,288.0 ^{2/}	6.6
Korea (South)	1953	Hwan	229,726	45,000 ^{3/}	19.6
Japan	1953	Yen	5,950,000	1,217,697 ^{1/}	20.5
Philippines	1950	Peso	6,169	500.1 ^{1/}	8.1
Pakistan	1949	Rs.	16,711	946.5 ^{2/}	5.7
United States ^{2/}	1949	--	--	--	26.0
	1950	--	--	--	23.6
	1951	--	--	--	25.6

^{1/} Including Central, Provincial (State) and local governments.

^{2/} Including central and state governments.

^{3/} Including central and local governments and adjustment for underestimation of land tax in kind.

Other explanations see footnotes in Table I.

Source: Total Taxes -

India and Pakistan: Economic Survey of Asia and the Far East, 1951, ECAFE, p.374.

Japan: Quarterly Bulletin of Financial Statistics, 1 Quarter Fiscal Year 1954, p. 25, Ministry of Finance, Japan.

Philippines: Annual Report, 1951, Central Bank of the Philippines.

United States: Tax Systems, 1952, p. 301, Chicago.

Other data: See Table I.

Table III: Share of Agriculture in the Total Net Domestic Product of China (Taiwan), India, Japan, Korea (South), Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States

Country	China (Taiwan)	India	Japan	Korea (South)	Philippines	Thailand	U.K.	U.S.
Year	1952	1948 ^{4/}	1951 ^{5/}	1952-53	1952	1950	1952	1952
Unit	Million "1937 Taipi Yuan"	Rs. Bil- lion	¥ Billion	U.S.\$ Million	Peso Million	Baht Billion	£ Million	\$ Billion
Total Net Domestic Product ^{1/}	806.83 ^{1/}	87.3	4,851	1,383.97 ^{1/}	7,034.8 ^{1/}	25.69 ^{1/}	13,575.10 ^{10/}	291.011
Agri- culture ^{2/}	331.3	41.55 ^{1/}	1,056	696.0	3,013	14.6	763	19.31 ^{12/}
As Percent of Total	41.1	47.5	21.8	50.3	42.8	57.0	5.6	6.6

- 1/ Net domestic product differs from national income by excluding income received from and income paid to the rest of the world.
- 2/ Including fishing, forestry and hunting.
- 3/ Domestic net national output at factor cost.
- 4/ April 1, 1948 to March 31, 1949.
- 5/ Includes processing, marketing and ancillary activities performed by the farmers themselves.
- 6/ April 1, 1951 to March 31, 1952.
- 7/ Gross national product.
- 8/ National income at factor cost.
- 9/ Gross domestic product at market price.
- 10/ Gross domestic product at factor cost, before stock valuation adjustment.
- 11/ Profits of government enterprises are not included.
- 12/ Includes imputed rents of owner-occupied farm houses.

Source: (1) China (Taiwan): The Structure of the Taiwan Economy, 1953, Bureau of Accounting and Statistics, Taiwan Provincial Government.

(2) Korea (South): An Economic Program for Korean Construction, March 1954, p. 452, U.N. Korean Reconstruction Agency, p. 453.

(3) Other Countries: Statistics of National Income and Expenditure, United Nations, Statistical Papers, Series No. 5, February 1954.

Table IV: Ratio of Central Government Tax^{1/} to National Income of Burma, Ceylon, China (Taiwan), India, Japan, Korea (South), Malaya, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and U.S.A.
(In millions of Domestic Currency Units)

BURMA				CEYLON				CHINA (TAIWAN)			
Year	National Income ^{2/}	Tax ^{3/}	As % of National Income	Year	National Income ^{4/}	Tax ^{3/}	As % of National Income	Year	National Income ^{5/}	Tax	As % of National Income
1947	Ryat 2,629	152.2	17.2	1947	Rs 2,310	--	--	1947	--	--	--
1948	3,121	367.6	11.8	1948	2,682	501.7	18.7	1948	--	--	--
1949	2,913	131.1	14.8	1949	2,925	538.4	18.4	1949	1,366.9	86.7	6.4
1950	2,745	175.6	17.4	1950	3,885	736.5	19.0	1950	6,763.5	485.8	7.2
1951	3,192	534.6 D	16.7	1951	4,527	770.2 E	17.0	1951	9,451.4	876.2	9.3
1952	3,556	688.3 R	19.4	1952	4,441	727.7 D	16.4	1952	13,706.1	1,598.5	11.7
1953	--	764.3 R	--	1953	4,419	723.7 E	16.4	1953	--	--	--
INDIA				JAPAN				KOREA (SOUTH)			
Year	National Income ^{6/}	Tax ^{6/}	As % of National Income	Year	National Income ^{6/}	Tax	As % of National Income	Year	National Income ^{8/}	Tax	As % of National Income
1947	--	--	--	1947	¥ 1,041,200	--	--	1947	--	--	--
1948	86,500	3,203.0 P	3.7	1948	2,123,600	421,000	19.8	1948	--	--	--
1949	90,100	3,114.9 P	3.5	1949	2,684,400	620,000	21.4	1949	1,194,413 ^{7/}	11,428 E	1.0
1950	95,300	3,589.6 P	3.8	1950	3,683,700	530,000	14.4	1950	--	600	--
1951	--	4,606.7 P	--	1951	4,535,300	694,000	15.3	1951	--	5,000	--
1952	--	3,724.7 R	--	1952	5,282,400	817,000	15.5	1952	184,067	12,500 ^F	6.8
1953	--	3,699.3 D	--	1953	--	857,000 R	--	1953	229,726	32,300 ^G	14.1

Table III: Share of Agriculture in the Total Net Domestic Product of China (Taiwan), India, Japan, Korea (South), Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States

Country	China (Taiwan)	India	Japan	Korea (South)	Philippines	Thailand	U.K.	U.S.
Year	1952	1948 ^{4/}	1951 ^{6/}	1952-53	1952	1950	1952	1952
Unit	Million "1937 Taipi Yuan"	Rs. Bil- lion	¥ Billion	U.S. Million	Peso Million	Baht Billion	£ Million	\$ Billion
Total Net Domestic Product ^{1/}	806.8 ^{3/}	87.3	4,851	1,383.9 ^{7/}	7,034 ^{8/}	25.6 ^{9/}	13,575 ^{10/}	291.0 ¹¹
Agri- culture ^{2/}	331.3	41.5 ^{5/}	1,056	696.0	3,013	14.6	763	19.3 ¹²
As Percent of Total	41.1	47.5	21.8	50.3	42.8	57.0	5.6	6.6

- ^{1/} Net domestic product differs from national income by excluding income received from and income paid to the rest of the world.
- ^{2/} Including fishing, forestry and hunting.
- ^{3/} Domestic net national output at factor cost.
- ^{4/} April 1, 1948 to March 31, 1949.
- ^{5/} Includes processing, marketing and ancillary activities performed by the farmers themselves.
- ^{6/} April 1, 1951 to March 31, 1952.
- ^{7/} Gross national product.
- ^{8/} National income at factor cost.
- ^{9/} Gross domestic product at market price.
- ^{10/} Gross domestic product at factor cost, before stock valuation adjustment.
- ^{11/} Profits of government enterprises are not included.
- ^{12/} Includes imputed rents of owner-occupied farm houses.

Source: (1) China (Taiwan): The Structure of the Taiwan Economy, 1953, Bureau of Accounting and Statistics, Taiwan Provincial Government.

(2) Korea (South): An Economic Program for Korean Construction, March 1954, p. 452, U.N. Korean Reconstruction Agency, p. 453.

(3) Other Countries: Statistics of National Income and Expenditure, United Nations, Statistical Papers, Series No. 5, February 1954.

Table IV: Ratio of Central Government Tax^{1/} to National Income of Burma, Ceylon, China (Taiwan), India, Japan, Korea (South), Malaya, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and U.S.A.
(In millions of Domestic Currency Units)

BURMA			CEYLON			CHINA (TAIWAN)					
Year	National Income ^{2/}	Tax ^{3/}	As % of National Income	Year	National Income ^{4/}	Tax ^{3/}	As % of National Income	Year	National Income ^{5/}	Tax	As % of National Income
1947	Ryat 2,629	452.2	17.2	1947	Rs 2,310	--	--	1947	--	--	--
1948	3,121	367.6	11.8	1948	2,682	501.7	18.7	1948	--	--	--
1949	2,913	431.1	14.8	1949	2,925	538.4	18.4	1949	MT\$ 1,366.9	86.7	6.4
1950	2,745	475.6	17.4	1950	3,885	736.5	19.0	1950	6,763.5	485.8	7.2
1951	3,192	534.6 D	16.7	1951	4,527	770.2 E	17.0	1951	9,451.4	876.2	9.3
1952	3,556	688.3 R	19.4	1952	4,441	727.7 D	16.4	1952	13,706.1	1,598.5	11.7
1953	--	764.3 R	--	1953	4,419	723.7 E	16.4	1953	--	--	--
INDIA			JAPAN			KOREA (SOUTH)					
Year	National Income ^{6/}	Tax ^{6/}	As % of National Income	Year	National Income ^{6/}	Tax	As % of National Income	Year	National Income ^{7/}	Tax ^{8/}	As % of National Income
1947	--	--	--	1947	¥ 1,041,200	--	--	1947	--	--	--
1948	86,500	3,203.6 P	3.7	1948	2,123,600	421,000	19.8	1948	--	--	--
1949	90,100	3,114.9 P	3.5	1949	2,684,400	620,000	21.4	1949	Won 1,194,413 ^{7/}	11,428 E	1.0
1950	95,300	3,589.6 P	3.8	1950	3,683,700	530,000	14.4	1950	--	600	--
1951	--	4,606.7 P	--	1951	4,535,300	694,000	15.3	1951	Hwan --	5,000	--
1952	--	3,724.7 R	--	1952	5,282,400	817,000	15.5	1952	184,067	12,500 ^{8/}	6.8
1953	--	3,699.3 D	--	1953	--	857,000 R	--	1953	229,726	32,300 ^{8/}	14.1

Table IV: Ratio of Central Government Tax^{10/} to National Income of Burma, Ceylon, China (Taiwan), India, Japan, Korea (South), Malaya, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and U.S.A. - Continued
(In Millions of Domestic Currency Units)

MALAYA				PAKISTAN				PHILIPPINES			
Year	National Income ^{10/}	Tax ^{11/}	As % of National Income	Year	National Income	Tax ^{6/}	As % of National Income	Year	National Income	Tax ^{11/}	As % of National Income
1947	M\$ 3,196	--	--	1947	Rs --	--	--	1947	Peso 5,579	301.9	5.4
1948	3,221	209.5 E	6.5	1948	--	535.8 P	--	1948	5,713	361.8	6.3
1949	3,022	253.212/E	8.4	1949	16,711 ^{7/}	712.9 P	4.3	1949	5,668	328.5	5.8
1950	4,849	394.8 E	8.1	1950	--	1,103.0 P	--	1950	6,169	443.4	7.2
1951	--	706.6 E	--	1951	--	1,266.9 P	--	1951	6,816	655.4	9.6
1952	--	676.1 E	--	1952	--	1,022.8 R	--	1952	6,952	620.7 E	8.9
1953	--	557.3 D	--	1953	--	729.1 R	--	1953	7,375	615.7 D	8.3
THAILAND				UNITED KINGDOM				U. S. A.			
Year	National Income ^{14/}	Tax ^{15/}	As % of National Income	Year	National Income ^{16/}	Tax ^{17/}	As % of National Income	Year	National Income	Tax ^{18/}	As % of National Income
1947	Bant 14,407	--	--	1947	--	--	--	1947	--	--	--
1948	16,678	--	--	1948	10,218	3,667.6	35.9	1948	\$ 223,500	40,710	18.2
1949	20,064	1,719.3	8.6	1949	10,915	3,686.9	33.8	1949	216,300	39,881	18.4
1950	23,377	1,897.7	8.1	1950	11,516	3,729.9	32.4	1950	240,600	51,740	21.5
1951	--	2,473.915/	--	1951	12,668	4,181.3	33.0	1951	278,400	66,196	23.8
1952	--	3,446.615/	--	1952	13,648	4,281.9	31.4	1952	291,600	70,554	24.2
1953	--	3,553.115/	--	1953	14,719	4,230.0 E	28.7	1953	307,700	73,475 E	24.2

Table IV: Changes in the Ratio of Central Government Tax to National Income of Burma, Ceylon, China (Taiwan), India, Japan, Korea (South), Malaya, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and U.S.A. — Continued

- General Notes: The figures for national income mostly refer to calendar years while those for tax refer to fiscal years. The two sets of figures were paired as far as possible in such a way that the national income series led the tax series by three or six months.
- 1/ All tax figures refer to closed accounts, except those which bear the following symbols: D = Draft estimate; E = Voted estimate; P = preliminary results; R = Revised estimate.
 - 2/ Year ending September 30.
 - 3/ Tax of both Burma and Ceylon refers to year beginning October 1. Tax of Burma includes Rehabilitation of Contribution profits from the State Agricultural Marketing Board (exports of rice, etc.) and from the State Timber Board.
 - 4/ Gross national product at factor cost, unadjusted.
 - 5/ Net national income at factor cost. The original figures were expressed in "1937 Taipi Yuan." To get the current value in New Taiwan Dollar, the figures were multiplied by the index of cost of living of public servants (with 1937 as base).
 - 6/ Year beginning April 1.
 - 7/ Gross national product, year beginning April 1; 1949 national income figure was originally expressed in U.S. dollars and was converted to % on at the average rate of 675 won per U.S. dollar.
 - 8/ Including monopoly revenue (tobacco, salt and ginseng); year beginning April 1.
 - 9/ Including adjustment for underestimation (7.5 billion Hwan) of land tax in kind due to use of official price.
 - 10/ Federation of Malaya and Singapore. Unofficial estimates.
 - 11/ Calendar year.
 - 12/ Federation government only.
 - 13/ Year beginning July 1.
 - 14/ Excluding net factor income payments from abroad.
 - 15/ All years including profits of Rice Bureau; the three years 1951 to 1953, including exchange profits (annual increase in the Stabilization Account deposits of baht 227 million, 580 million and 478 million respectively), see International Financial Statistics, IMF, September 1954.
 - 16/ Gross national product at factor cost.
 - 17/ Year beginning April 1.
 - 18/ Year beginning July 1; including individual income tax, gift and estate taxes, corporation income and excess profit taxes, employment taxes, customs duty and excise taxes.
- Source:

National Income:

- China: The Structure of the Taiwan Economy, 1953, Bureau of Accounting and Statistics, Provincial Government of Taiwan.
- Korea: 1949: An Economic Program for Reconstruction, p. 452, March 1954, U.N. Korean Reconstruction Agency.
- 1952-53: Estimates of the Korean National Income, 1952-53 and 1953-54 (In Korean), Planning Commission and Bank of Korea.
- Other Countries: Monthly Bulletin of Statistics, August 1954, United Nations.

Taxation:

- China: Same as above.
- Korea: 1949: Economic Review 1949, p. 1-129, Bank of Korea.
- 1952-53: An Economic Program for Korea Reconstruction, March 1954, U.N. Korean Reconstruction Agency, p. 145 and 165.
- Thailand: Comptroller General's Department, Ministry of Finance, Thailand.
- Other countries: Statistics Yearbook, 1953, United Nations.

Table V. Central Government Tax^{1/} in Constant Purchasing Power of Burma, Ceylon, China (Taiwan), India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea (South), Malaya, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States
(In Millions of Domestic Currency Units)

BURMA			CEYLON			CHINA (TAIWAN)					
Year	Tax ^{2/}	Cost of Living Index (1948 = 100)	Tax in 1948 Price	Year	Tax ^{3/}	Cost of Living Index (1948 = 100)	Tax in 1948 Price	Year	Tax ^{4/}	Cost of Living Index (1949 = 100)	Tax in 1949 Price ^{6/}
1948	Kyat 452.2	100	452.2	1948	Rs. ---	---	---	1948	NT\$ ---	---	---
1949	367.6	135	272.6	1949	501.7	99	506.7	1949	86.7	100	86.7
1950	431.1	114	378.1	1950	538.4	105	512.7	1950	485.8	250	194.4
1951	475.6	112	424.6	1951	736.5	109	675.6	1951	876.2	324	270.3
1952	534.6 D	107	498.7	1952	770.2 E	108	713.5	1952	1,598.5	418	382.2
1953	688.3 R	104	661.8	1953	727.7 E	110	657.1	1953	---	---	---

INDIA			INDONESIA			JAPAN			KOREA (SOUTH)		
Year	Tax ^{7/}	Cost of Living Index (1948=100)	Tax in 1948 Price	Year	Tax ^{8/}	Cost of Living Index (1948=100)	Tax in 1948 Price	Year	Tax ^{10/}	Cost of Living Index (1948=100)	Tax in 1948 Price
1948	---	---	---	1948	---	---	---	1948	---	---	---
1949	Rs 3,203.0 P	103	3,109.6	1949	---	---	318,900	1949	---	---	---
1950	3,114.9 P	103	3,024.1	1950	---	---	504,800	1950	---	---	---
1951	3,589.6 P	107	3,345.4	1951	Rp 9,968	189	370,600	1951	Hwan 600	1,397	42.9
1952	4,606.7 P	105	4,387.3	1952	9,037	199	465,400	1952	5,000	3,446	145.1
1953	3,724.7 R	108	3,448.7	1953	7,205	211	510,600	1953	12,500 P ^{11/}	---	---

Table V: Central Government Tax^{1/} in Constant Purchasing Power of Burma, Ceylon, China (Taiwan), India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea (South), Malaya, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States - Continued

(In Millions of Domestic Currency Units)

MALAYA

Year	Tax ^{13/}	Cost of Living Index (1948 = 100)	Tax in 1948 Price
1948	₹ 209.5	100	209.5
1949	253.2 E	94	269.4
1950	394.8 E	101	390.9
1951	706.6 E	133	531.3
1952	676.1 E	138	489.9
1953	557.3 D	--	--

PAKISTAN

Year	Tax ^{7/}	Cost of Living Index (1948 = 100)	Tax in 1948 Price
1948	--	--	--
1949	Rs 535.8 P	98	549.7
1950	712.9 P	95	750.4
1951	1,103.6 P	99	1,111.0
1952	1,266.9 P	101	1,254.3
1953	1,022.8 R	112	913.2

PHILIPPINES

Year	Tax ^{16/}	Cost of Living Index (1948 = 100)	Tax in 1948 Price
1948	Peso 301.9	100	301.9
1949	361.8	94	384.8
1950	328.5	98	335.2
1951	443.4	99	447.8
1952	655.4	95	689.8
1953	620.7 E	89	697.4

THAILAND

Year	Tax ^{17/}	Cost of Living Index (1948 = 100)	Tax in 1948 Price
1948	--	--	--
1949	Baht 1,719.3	96	1,790.8
1950	1,897.7	99	1,906.7
1951	2,473.9	110	2,219.0
1952	3,446.6	123	2,802.1
1953	3,533.4	135	2,617.3

UNITED KINGDOM

Year	Tax	Cost of Living Index (1948 = 100)	Tax in 1948 Price
1948	--	--	--
1949	£ 3,667.6	103	3,560.8
1950	3,686.9	106	3,478.2
1951	3,729.9	116	3,215.4
1952	4,184.3	126	3,320.9
1953	4,281.9	130	3,293.8

U. S. A.

Year	Tax	Cost of Living Index (1948 = 100)	Tax in 1948 Price
1948	--	--	--
1949	\$ 40,701	99	41,121
1950	39,881	100	39,881
1951	51,740	108	47,907
1952	66,196	110	60,178
1953	70,554	111	63,562

Table V: Central Government Tax-in Constant Purchasing Power of Burma, Ceylon, China (Taiwan), India, Indonesia, Japan, Korea (South), Malaya, Pakistan, Philippines, Thailand, United Kingdom and United States -- Continued

General note: The indexes for cost of living refer to calendar years while the figures for tax refer to fiscal years. The two sets of figures were paired as far as possible in such a way that the tax series led the cost of living series by three or six months.

1/ All tax figures refer to closed accounts, except those which bear the following symbols: D = Draft estimate; E = Voted estimate; P = preliminary results.

2/ Year ending September 30, including Rehabilitation of Contribution profits from the State Agricultural Marketing Board (exports of rice, etc.) and from the State Timber Board.

3/ Year ending September 30.

4/ Central and Provincial government.

5/ Cost of living of Public Servants.

6/ Data not available to convert to 1948 base.

7/ Year ending March 31.

8/ Calendar year, including exchange profits (exchange certificate, etc.).

9/ Retail Prices (Food in Djakarta).

10/ Including monopoly revenue (tobacco, salt and ginseng); year ending March 31.

11/ Including adjustment for underestimation (7.5 billion Hwan) of land tax in kind due to use of official price.

12/ Index of consumer prices of Pusan.

13/ Calendar year.

14/ Federation government only.

15/ Index of consumer prices of Chinese calendar in Malaya.

16/ Year ending June 30.

17/ Calendar year; including profits of Rice Bureau.

18/ Including Exchange Profits (increase in stabilization account deposits), see International Financial Statistics, September 1954, IMF.

19/ Year ending June 30; including individual income tax, gift and estate taxes, corporation income and excess profit taxes, employment taxes, customs duty and excise taxes.

Source:

Taxation:

China: The Structure of the Taiwan Economy, 1953, Bureau of Accounting and Statistics, Taiwan Provincial Government.

Indonesia: Report for the Fiscal Year 1952-53, p. 95, The Java Bank.

Korea: An Economic Program for Korea Reconstruction, March 1954, p. 145 and p. 165, U.N. Korean Reconstruction Agency

Thailand: Comptroller General's Department, Ministry of Finance, Thai Government.

Other Countries: Statistical Yearbook, 1953, United Nations.

Cost of Living Index:

China: Taiwan Monthly of Commodity-Price Statistics, June 1954, Bureau of Accounting and Statistics, Taiwan Provincial Government.

Korea and Malaya: Yearbook of Labour Statistics 1953, International Labour Office, p. 240.

Other countries: International Financial Statistics, September 1954, IMF.