FORD ASKS SLASH IN TAX, MATCHED BY SPENDING CUT

Would Pare Outlays \$28-Billion As 'First Step' to Balance the Federal Budget in 3 Years

OCT 7 1975

NYTimes . By Philip Shabecoff Special to The New York Tin

WASHINGTON, Oct. 6-President Ford proposed tonight to the Council of Economic Ac put \$11-billion in additional tax visers, conceded that the im reductions into effect next year pact would have an essential and to make permanent, with significant changes, the \$17- economy in terms of speeding

for the tax package was condi-will do the following for inditional upon a Congressional vidual taxpayers: commitment to reduce total Federal spending by \$28-billion emption from \$750 to \$1,000. in the next fiscal year.

Text of President's address appears on Page 24.

which would benefit both individuals and businesses, would constitute "the biggest single tax cut in our history."

However, the \$28-billion figthe permanent tax rates established in 1972, but not from the temporary rates signed into porary law. law last March. Unless Congress acts, the temporary tax rates will expire on Dec. 31.

that he would not hesitate to veto any tax cut enacted by Congress if Congress did not also take steps to set a ceiling on its spending. He asked Congress to pledge the whole Federal expenditures to \$395-billion in the next fiscal year, ending Oct. 1, 1977.

Thrust of Proposal

Saying it was his aim to reverse a "horrendous spending growth," Mr. Ford warned, "If we don't slow it down, Federal spending next year could easily jump to more than \$420-billion."

'I want these actions to be a first step-and they are a crucial first step—toward balancing the Federal budget within three years," the President

Earlier, at a briefing for reporters, several of Mr. Ford's economic advisers conceded that the chief thrust of the President's combined tax and spending cut proposal was to halt the rapid growth of the Federal budget.

Alan Greenspan, chairman e

billion of antirecession tax cuts up the recovery.

As explained by the Presi
However, he said his support dent, the proposed tax packag

. GRaise the personal tax er

¶Make the standard deduc In a televised speech, the tion for single taxpayers a flat President said his proposal, \$1,800 and for married couples \$2,500.

> ¶Lower basic personal is come rates by varying amount For business, the Presider

proposed a 2 per cent reduc tion in corporate tax rates from the present 48 per cen maximum to 46 per cent and ure represents a reduction from permanent continuation of in contained in the current tem

"If companies and plants ar to regain their footing and the ress acts, the temporary tax hire more employes in the future, they must have greate incentives for investment," the

Continued on Page 24, Column

Continued From Page I, Col. 8

\$50,000 a year, the highest income the tables go to, would receive a \$390 reduction from current taxes, equivalent to a \$510 reduction from the 1974 rate.

The President gave as an example garning \$14,000 a year."
Such a family, he said, "would get a permanent tax cut of \$412 — a 27 per cent reduction."

However, the President's example represents a reduction from the tax rates prevailing in 1974. The actual reduction from current taxes, judging from tables issued by the White House, would only be about half that amount for the typical family described by the President.

The new maximum standard deductions for individuals replace a \$300 "low income allowance" designed to help the working poor. No such provision appears in the President's new proposal which, on its face, does not contain any special provisions for lower income families.

Mr. Greenspan sald that the maximum savings under the new proposal would go to families earning about \$25,000 a year.

The tables issued by the White House show that a family described in the President's new proposal would go to families earning about \$25,000 a year.

The tables issued by the White House show that a family described in the process of recovering from the worst downturn since the Great Depression of the interemental provision of the interemental provision of the interemental provisions for lower income families.

Mr. Greenspan sald that the maximum savings under the new proposal would go to families earning about \$25,000 a year.

The tables issued by the the white House show that a family of four earning \$1000 a year.

The tables issued by the the working poor. No such provision from the tax cuts were considerable. For one thing, the economy, while in the process of recovering from the worst downturn since the Great Depression of the interemental provision of the interemental provision

maximum savings under the new proposal would go to families earning about \$25,000 a year.

The tables issued by the White House show that a family of four earning \$5,000 a year would get no reduction at all from current tax rates under the President's proposal although it would have a reduction of \$98 compared to the 1972-1974 tax rates.

A family of four earning mineteen-thirties, is still not regarded as in robust health.

In its midyear report, published last week, the Democratic majority on the oJint Economic Committee of Congress raised questions about the stability of the recovery and said that a continuation of the current tax cut as well as an additional tax reduction was necessary to sustain growth and reduce unemployment.

Moreover, Mr. Ford will soon

be facing a fight to retain his Presidency—assuming he needs the support of Republis nominated by the Republican can conservatives to win the party. A tax increase is not normally considered good politics in an election year, but the party stressing fiscal stringency that is what a failure to extend in appearances before Republisher current tax cut would can audiences. To support as

in the tax law that would make it more attractive to invest capital in business.

To give a tax "break" to business while taking one away from individuals would be a difficult if not impossible task in the view of many familiar with the way Congress functions.

When he signed the original tax bill last March, the President said that he was doing so reluctantly because he had no choice but to "take or leave it" in a time of economic difficulty for the nation.

One provision of that bill, a tax rebate of up to \$200 to individual tax repares.

pressures on the President to oppose a continuation of the tax cut, which was adopted this year to stimulate spending and investment and thereby help push the economy out of the deep recession into which it had sunk.

One source of suck pressure.

amount to extend mappearances before kepublican audiences. To support a new tax cut that could add to the Federal budget deficit might erode some of the self-ministration is seeking changes in the tax law that would make

ons.

The view of many familiar one provision of that bill, a tax rebate of up to \$200 to individual taxpayers was not an issue in the current

In answering reporter's questions in Omaha last week, the President indicated that he which it had sunk.

One source of such pressures was from Presidential advisers who are concerned about the continued inflation besetting the economy and their concern that an additional tax stimulus would spur that trend.

Administration officials have said repeatedly that they were said repeatedly that they were

Administration officials have said repeatedly that they were troubled by the current high budget deficit and prospects of continuing high deficits. which, they said, could create severe fiscal problems throughout the economy.

There also were political continuing the line" on additional spending. The President met with his economic advisers today and over much of the weekend as the prepared for his decision. Ron Nessen, the White House press secretary, said today that Mr. Ford had also spoken with siderations that could cause "a few key members of Continuing high deficits."