SOME INEQUALITIES IN LAND TAXATION.

THE RESULTS OF AN INVESTIGATION BY THE MINNESOTA BUREAU OF LABOR.

THE Minnesota Bureau of Labor has just completed a study of land taxation in that state. The statistical force of the bureau has been engaged upon this investigation the greater portion of the time for the past three years. The data employed are the sales of realty by warranty deeds and by mortgage foreclosures. A comparison is made between the amounts stated in these instruments of sales as the consideration for transfer and the equalized assessed value of the lands sold. The report includes the tabulation of 26,881 sales of realty by warranty deed in the eighty-one counties of the state in 1895, and 8,216 in fifteen counties in 1896. The amount of these sales, as stated in the deeds, was, for 1895, \$50,380,017, and for 1896, \$16,791,715. There were also tabulated in the same investigation 5,518 sales of realty by mortgage foreclosures in the eighty-one counties of the state in 1895, and 2,534 foreclosures in three counties in 1896. The amount of these sheriff certificates, in 1895, was \$10,951,080, and for 1896, \$7,731,476. The investigation thus tabulated 43,049 distinct sales of realty of a recorded consideration of transfer of \$85,854,288.

The instruments tabulated constituted, however, only about two-thirds of those of record which were examined with a view of tabulation. The other third were rejected because, for one reason or other, they showed on their face that the stated consideration was probably not the true value of the land sold. The investigation, therefore, involved a consideration of over 60,000 recorded sales of realty.

The bureau investigated the subject of the reliability of such data as a measure of the relative taxation of different classes of property and of the different sections of the state. It points out in its forthcoming report the limitations that surround the use of

such data, and calls attention to a large number of interesting phases of the tax question, as well as to the purely statistical elements presented in the tables. A discussion of all, or even a few, of these subjects is impossible in an article such as the present. Attention is called to only two of the leading facts brought out by this investigation. They are the greater relative taxation of the acre or farm property owned by the poor, and the reason for the same. The report includes the tabulation of many thousands of sales of city or town lots. Those sales are tabulated by themselves, as are the sales of acre or farm property. No detailed reference will here be given to the relative taxation of city lots. Only the sales of acres by warranty deed and by mortgage foreclosures will here be passed in review. At the close of the article are to be found brief summary tables of all the facts to which reference is here made. The percentages of those tables are the only portions thereof which are given in tabular form in connection with the reading matter here presented.

Minnesota has three quite important cities within its borders. They are Minneapolis, St. Paul, and Duluth. The counties containing them are Hennepin, Ramsey, and St. Louis. In the report these counties are referred to as the city counties. The balance of the state, including seventy-eight counties, is spoken of as the rural counties. As the character of the real property sold in the last few years and the condition of sale under which land is transferred are, and have been, quite different in the city and rural sections, the data of land values and of actual and relative assessment for the two sections have been tabulated apart. There are here given only the data for acre property in the rural counties. Those data amply suffice to set forth the character of the assessment of farm property in the state, and the circumstances under which a faulty system of assessment has grown up in most of the western states, and the causes and cure for the same. Attention is now called to those data. The following is a condensed exhibit from the accompanying tables of the relative assessment of the acre or farm property in the seventy-eight rural counties of Minnesota, sold by warranty deed and mortgage foreclosures. The exhibit presents separately the percentages for improved and

unimproved acres. These percentages express the parts which the assessed value of the lands sold bears to the recorded selling value of the same. Some of the lands classed as unimproved on the book of the assessors and so tabulated here had houses and other buildings upon them, but these were so poor that they were not taken into account by the assessors in their appraisal.

Classification by amounts of sales	Improved acres		Unimproved acres	
	Warranty deeds	Mortgage foreclosures	Warranty deeds	Mortgage foreclosures
\$ 500 and less	65.91	228.34	57.60	148.95
501 to \$ 1,000	58.51	93.18	51.53	84.02
1,001 to 2,000	47.19	72.90	44.51	65.31
2,001 to 3,000	40.60	66.12	39.14	50.74
3,001 to 5,000	36.39	61.39	35.88	54.52
5,001 to 10,000	34.40	47.95	36.58	45.82
Over 10,000	29.66	64.91	37.82	64.04
Total,	39.40	84.29	42.37	74.65
Below average amt.	47.87	127.87	51.00	103.82
Above average amt.	35.64	65.81	38.55	59.05

The improved acres sold by warranty deeds in those seventy-eight counties, and here tabulated, numbered 655,974. The consideration for the sales stated in the deeds was \$13,640,879. The average sale was approximately \$2,500. There were 3,138 sales for amounts below the average and 2,020 for amounts above it. The sales by mortgage foreclosures of the same class of property conveyed title to 142,969 acres. The amount of sheriff certificates was \$1,007,620. The average foreclosure was approximately \$1,000. There were 572 foreclosures for amounts below this sum and 337 for amounts above it. Both series of percentages exhibit a regular gradation from the sales with the smallest amounts up to those for the largest. There is but one exception, and that is found in the group for foreclosures in amounts over \$10,000. This contained only two sales, which were plainly of land that differed from the body of acres sold by foreclosures. They should, therefore, be disregarded in any consideration of relative taxation of the more, and of the less, valuable tracts of land. Disregarding them, it can be said that the percentages for sales of improved acres by warranty deeds and those for mort-

gage foreclosures agree in this respect. They show a much higher relative assessment for the lands sold for small amounts than for those disposed of for larger ones. The different classes, or groups, from the least valuable to the most valuable, form a more or less regular series. The tracts of land sold by warranty deeds for amounts less than \$500 were assessed for 65.91 per cent. of the selling value, while those for amounts over \$10,000 were assessed relatively only 45 per cent. as much, or for 29.66 per cent. The average assessment of all lands sold by warranty deeds was 39.40 per cent. of the selling price. The tracts selling for less than \$500 were, therefore, forced to pay relatively 1.67 for every 75 cents paid by the owners of the land sold in amounts over \$10,000, and where each should pay one dollar. The lands selling for less than the average amount of all sales were assessed at 47.87 per cent. of the selling price, while those selling for amounts above the average were assessed only 35.64 per cent. The former were assessed relatively 34 per cent. more than the latter. Here is a greater relative over-assessment of the poorer and a more unjust under-assessment of the richer owners of realty than has been disclosed by any similar tax study in the United States. Before explaining the origin of the vicious system of assessment which works this practical injustice, the reader's attention is first directed to the figures showing the relative assessment of unimproved lands, or lands having upon them no valuable buildings to attract the notice of the assessors.

Of sales by warranty deeds of unimproved acres in the rural counties there were tabulated in the report 8,200, conveying 796,591 acres, for a stated consideration of \$11,377,525. The average consideration was approximately \$1,500. There were 5,693 sales for sums below this average and 2,507 for amounts above it. Of corresponding sales by mortgage foreclosures there were 644, conveying 90,984 acres, with amounts of sheriff's certificates making a total of \$651,857. The average for each sale was about \$1,000. There were 452 sales for amounts below this average and 182 for amounts above it.

The percentages for assessment for the sales by warranty deeds of unimproved acres make a series, the highest being for

the group for the smallest amounts and the lowest for the group with the amounts between \$3,000 and \$5,000. After this group is reached, the percentage materially rises to the group for the largest sales, those for amounts over \$10,000. The figures for mortgage foreclosures show the same regularity for the groups from \$500 to \$3,000, but a slight irregularity in the series for amounts above \$3,000. But there were only ten sales in the larger two of these groups, and the variation noticed between the two series of percentages is, under these circumstances, nothing strange. The lands conveyed by warranty deeds for amounts below the average were assessed 51 per cent. of the selling value, while those for amounts above that average were assessed 38.55 per cent. The less valuable tracts were assessed relatively 32 per cent. more than the more valuable. This quite closely agrees with the corresponding variation noted for the improved acres of 34 per cent.

Noting the series of percentages presented in the foregoing table, the economic student will want to know how far this apparent variation in relative assessment is expressive of an actual discrimination by the Minnesota assessors, and how much of it is due to sacrifice sales and sales with unreal considerations stated in the deeds of transfer. The officers of the Minnesota bureau gave much consideration to this subject. Its agents expended much time and labor in a special investigation into the same. The results of that investigation are given at length in the published report both for city lots and rural acres or farm property. For farm property the conclusion reached was that the percentages fairly represented the relative assessment of the different classes of property. Attention is here called to one fact of the many presented in proof of that belief.

It is well known that the maximum credit usually allowed on farm lands in Minnesota is from 60 to 66 per cent. of the selling value of the land mortgaged. Land thus mortgaged for the maximum of credit that may be secured upon the same should, when sold by foreclosure, show an amount of sheriff certificate approximately equal to from 60 to 66 per cent. of the true selling value of the land when disposed of by private sale. The

percentages of assessment of such land should bear to that of similar lands sold by warranty deed a ratio of 100 to from 60 to 66. This would be the case, providing the lands sold by warranty deeds do not have fictitious considerations stated in the same. The following exhibit presents for the seventy-eight rural counties the percentages of all acres sold by warranty deeds, and also of those sold by foreclosures, and the percentage which the former constitute of the latter. The groups over \$5,000 are here consolidated into one, since there were only five sales by foreclosures over \$10,000.

Classification by amounts of sales	Percentages of assessed value to stated selling price		Percentages which the former are of the latter
	Deeds	Foreclosures	
\$ 500 and less	59.04	190.78	30.95
501 to \$1,000	53.65	89.39	60.02
1,001 to 2,000	45.68	70.00	65.26
2,001 to 3,000	39.92	62.08	64.30
3,001 to 5,000	36.22	58.59	61.82
Over 5,000	34.36	53.51	64.62
Total,	40.75	80.50	50.62

The percentages of the last column are obtained by dividing those of the first by those of the second. On the assumption that the lands sold by foreclosures are, by groups of sale, assessed relatively the same as the lands sold by warranty deeds, the percentages in the last column show the relative credit secured by the loans which led to the foreclosures here tabulated. The percentages in the last column, with the exception of that for sales in amounts less than \$500, are such as would occur on the conditions of assessment above stated, where there was no material number of deeds tabulated with sacrifice sales, or with fictitious stated considerations, or other factors creating large apparent variations in relative assessment. For all excepting the first group the table leaves but little room for doubt that most, if not all, of the variation shown in the percentages of assessment records discriminations by the assessors against the poor man, or at least against the owner of cheap, or little improved, land.

The figures for the first group measure quite accurately the loss by mortgage foreclosures of the poor men who secure credit in small amounts and are unable to meet their obligations. Where the average man, with a fair amount of resources, obtains a credit on real estate security of from 60 to 66 per cent. of its selling value, the poorer man obtains such credit only on the average of 33.95 per cent. By inability to meet his obligation he loses the balance of his possessions, or substantially 70 per cent. of his prior savings. This sacrifice throws the loss of the poor man by inequitable assessment into the shadow and proves conclusively how much worse as a taskmaster are debts assumed under conditions that prevent their payment than is the vicious assessment of Minnesota acre realty.

The various tables of the report throw much light upon the character and origin of the discrimination of assessors, above noted, by which the poor man, or the owner of cheap land, is made to pay relatively a higher taxation than the richer land-owner, or the valuable lands. One series of tables which throws much light upon the question contains the data for forty-one rural counties, in all of which improved acres were assessed relatively considerably less than were the unimproved. The following table presents for those counties the average selling and assessed value of the acres conveyed by warranty deeds, and the percentage which the latter value was of the former.

Classification by amounts of sale	Improved acres			Unimproved acres		
	Average per acre		Percentage assessed to selling value	Average per acre		Percentage assessed to selling value
	Selling value	Assessed value		Selling value	Assessed value	
\$ 500 and less	\$ 6.85	\$ 4.53	66.22	\$ 6.75	\$4.01	59.34
501 to \$ 1,000	9.26	5.27	56.90	9.98	5.20	52.09
1,001 to 2,000	14.61	6.54	44.77	13.34	6.00	44.94
2,001 to 3,000	19.85	7.66	38.60	16.53	6.76	40.87
3,001 to 5,000	24.14	8.14	33.71	17.57	6.55	37.26
5,001 to 10,000	26.85	8.53	31.76	15.35	6.13	39.93
Over 10,000	48.76	10.95	22.45	10.37	4.59	44.25
Total,	19.88	7.34	36.95	12.64	5.61	44.40

A glance at the foregoing exhibit discloses this fact: the average selling price per acre of improved lands in this group of counties increased from the first subgroup up to that for amounts over \$10,000. The average assessed value also increased, but not to the same extent. As a result, the percentages of assessment for improved acres decreased without a break from the sales for the smallest amounts to those for the largest.

The unimproved acres in this group of counties had a low average selling price for the tracts sold in amounts less than \$500. That average increased until sales are reached with amounts for from \$2,000 to \$3,000. Afterward that average decreases. The percentages of relative assessment move in lines the very converse of the averages for the selling price of the land. The sales of improved and unimproved acre property agree in these particulars: they record the highest percentage of assessment for the lands worth the least per acre; that percentage decreases until the highest average selling price per acre is reached; the percentages of relative assessment make a series more or less regular and proportional to the changes in the average values per acre. The discrimination here shown is one primarily between the owners of land with a high value per acre and that with a low value, and not between the rich and the poor; but this discrimination works to the detriment of the poor and to the advantage of the rich as classes.

The beginnings of this system of unjust assessment are found in the condition of affairs that once existed in all parts of the state, and of the Northwest, but which has now been superseded in most of the older counties. In the first settlement of any agricultural county of the western prairie states the land taken up was all of nearly, if not quite, the same value per acre. It had about the same natural resources and no artificial ones. It was all without improvements, or additions made by man. Under these circumstances an honest and equitable assessment would be one that appraised all acre property at substantially the same rate per acre. This was the first assessment in all the counties of Minnesota and of the western states. But with the fuller settlement and more complete development of any section

there has come a great variety in the buildings erected and in the changes and improvements in or upon the several tracts of land in any township or county. For a time no attention is paid by the assessors to these improvements. The original flat or level assessment—so much per acre—would, with few exceptions, prevail. Such a condition leads, first, to assessing the vacant or unimproved acres at a higher relative amount than the improved. It gives to the most improved land the greatest degree of tax exemption. Later, when the assessors begin to take notice of buildings and improvements, they lay less stress upon them than upon the land. As a result, a portion of the earlier injustice caused by the bad assessment still remains in most counties of Minnesota. The report of the Minnesota bureau calls special attention to the statistics of a few counties which exhibit the worst phases of this faulty method of assessment. In Cottonwood county the average selling price per acre varied from \$10.25 to \$35.80, while the average assessment for unimproved acres varied between \$6.41 and \$6.90, and that for improved from \$6.99 to \$7.48.

As a result of this faulty system of taxation, in the group of seventy-eight rural counties for which the figures were presented in the first exhibit, the poor owner of a small tract of improved land is assessed \$1.62; the rich owner of a large tract of vacant land, 90 cents; and the rich owner of improved land only 70 cents, where all should pay one dollar. The system works to the benefit of all classes excepting the poor man. The rich resident farmer is satisfied because he receives the most benefit. He is specially satisfied because he is taxed relatively less than the owner of non-resident vacant acres. But the system of assessing vacant lands more than improved actually exempts the rich owner of such land from a part of his true burden of taxation and secures his exemption at the expense of the very poorest resident owner.

Incidental to the foregoing analysis of the facts disclosed by this investigation of land taxation in Minnesota, attention is here called to the 1898 report of the Kansas Bureau of Labor. This work, just out of press, contains the summary of an investigation

similar to the one made in Minnesota. The same general principles of investigation were followed, although the Kansas report, in its tabulation, presents its figures in a way which shows even better than that of the Minnesota the principle which lies at the basis of this unjust assessment of acre property. A number of the newer counties, notably Ford, furnish illustration of almost perfectly level assessment. Improved and unimproved acres, though selling for widely differing prices, were assessed at practically the same amount per acre. The discrimination thus affected in Ford county, Kansas, between the poor owner of cheap land and the rich owner of highly improved land is greater than was found in any Minnesota county. Wyandotte county in Kansas, like the older counties in Minnesota, furnishes an illustration of a practically just assessment of land, since there are in it no wide disparity in the relative taxes paid by the cheaper and the dearer lands.

The level assessment of acre property, which has its fullest application in such counties as those of Cottonwood and Otter Tail in Minnesota, is a practical exemplification of the results that would everywhere follow the general introduction of that first step toward single tax which has been advocated by some of Henry George's disciples. It raises the present tax upon real property by an assessment primarily upon land in the state of nature, and takes but a small and incidental notice of the improvements made thereupon by man. Its practical results, as has been pointed out above, is to lay additional and seemingly unjust burdens upon the poor landowner to the benefit of the richer. This is all wrong, unless there is, incidental to this seeming injustice, some benefit gained for the poor which more than balances this loss by over-assessment.

In this connection it may be said that no one has stated the principles in accordance with which all systems of raising public revenue must finally be judged better than Mr. Henry George. He tells us very forcibly and correctly that systems of taxation should be fostered which lay the lightest relative burden upon the man struggling on a basis of slender resources to win an industrial and economic independence. Applying this principle

to the situation which exists today among Minnesota farm owners, this question arises: Is this level assessment which disregards, in part or wholly, the values of buildings and improvements the best and most equitable method of levying taxes on realty owned and controlled under existing circumstances? In answering this question no one should fail to distinguish the import of the condition above set forth. The complete theories of Mr. George call for a social order quite at variance with the one which now exists. Under it land would be held and transferred under conditions very different from anything of which we have practical experience today. The question is not, then: Would a level assessment under the conditions described by Mr. George be the best one? It is: Is the level assessment—an assessment that regards land values and disregards the values of improvements—the best under existing conditions? If it is, it must lay the fewest obstacles in the way of the poor man striving to gain the ownership of a farm or home, or to create such a farm out of the wilderness. But to levy on a farm of 160 acres, with few improvements and worth in the markets of the day only \$750, as heavy taxes as on a farm of the same size and selling for \$3,000, as is done in numberless cases in Minnesota, is to lay, under existing social and economic conditions, unjust as well as heavy burdens upon the poor owner of poor land. It places the heaviest load of taxes upon the man starting out in the struggle for industrial progress, and relieves the man who by his accumulation has won a certain degree of financial independence. It makes it more difficult for the poor man in debt for his farm to pay for the same. The facts collected by the Minnesota Bureau of Labor, while they do not in the least throw light upon the relative benefits for the toiler, under the existing social system, and under such a system as Mr. George has pictured, do demonstrate this truth: they prove that with land ownership, under the existing social order, an assessment which considers land values, and not the value of improvements, is the worst possible method of raising public revenues. It doubles the share of tax to be paid by the poor man starting in life, and brings to him no corresponding or compensating benefit. The

AN EXHIBIT OF THE RELATIVE TAXATION OF ACRE PROPERTY IN MINNESOTA IN 1895.

Classification by amounts of sales	Number of instruments	Number of lots	Number of acres	Consideration	Assessed value	Percentage assessed value of stated value
------------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------	-----------------	---------------	----------------	---

A. Rural Counties, Sales of Improved Acres by Warranty Deeds.

\$ 500 and less.....	434	26	20,195	\$ 156,737	\$ 103,309	65.91
501 to \$1,000....	789	22	63,332	627,862	367,350	58.51
1,001 to 2,000....	1,424	51	152,826	2,260,639	1,066,834	47.19
2,001 to 3,000....	962	22	119,999	2,489,849	1,010,809	40.60
3,001 to 5,000....	1,041	5	164,944	4,106,851	1,494,396	36.39
5,001 to 10,000....	457	15	107,326	3,065,451	1,054,478	34.40
Over 10,000....	51	19	27,352	933,490	276,919	29.66
Total.....	5,158	160	655,974	\$13,640,879	\$5,374,095	39.40
2,500 and less.....	3,138	108	293,851	\$4,193,327	\$2,007,378	47.87
Over 2,500.....	2,020	52	362,123	9,447,552	3,366,717	35.64

B. Rural Counties, Sales of Unimproved Acres by Warranty Deeds.

\$ 500 and less.....	2,836	54	98,093	\$ 744,998	\$ 429,092	57.60
501 to \$1,000....	1,842	17	137,665	1,441,384	742,726	51.53
1,001 to 2,000....	1,927	7	206,203	2,945,936	1,311,305	44.51
2,001 to 3,000....	860	18	119,408	2,176,166	851,819	39.14
3,001 to 5,000....	545	365	103,956	2,090,449	749,995	35.88
5,001 to 10,000....	145	33	53,948	1,003,294	366,989	36.58
Over 10,000....	45	24	77,318	975,298	368,827	37.82
Total.....	8,200	518	796,591	\$11,377,525	\$4,820,753	42.37
1,500 and less.....	5,693	78	334,927	\$3,489,703	\$1,779,842	51.00
Over 1,500.....	2,507	440	461,664	7,887,822	3,040,911	38.55

C. Rural Counties, Sales of Improved Acres by Sheriff's Certificates.

\$ 500 and less.....	272	1	35,325	\$ 77,007	\$175,837	228.34
501 to \$1,000....	300	3	40,345	223,027	207,821	93.18
1,001 to 2,000....	229	...	35,549	311,863	227,359	72.90
2,001 to 3,000....	60	...	13,615	145,552	96,245	66.12
3,001 to 5,000....	32	3	9,228	120,662	74,073	61.39
5,001 to 10,000....	14	59	5,547	94,838	45,472	47.95
Over 10,000....	2	...	3,360	34,671	22,506	64.91
Total.....	909	66	142,969	\$1,007,620	\$849,313	84.29
1,000 and less.....	572	4	75,670	\$300,034	\$383,658	127.87
Over 1,000....	337	62	67,299	707,586	465,655	65.81

AN EXHIBIT OF THE RELATIVE TAXATION OF ACRE PROPERTY IN MINNESOTA IN 1895—*continued.*

Classification by amounts of sales	Number of instruments	Number of lots	Number of acres	Consideration	Assessed value	Percentage assessed value of stated value
------------------------------------	-----------------------	----------------	-----------------	---------------	----------------	---

D. Rural Counties, Sales of Unimproved Acres by Sheriff's Certificates.

\$ 500 and less.	235	...	21,360	\$ 69,256	\$103,157	148.95
501 to \$1,000.	217	8	27,004	157,905	132,679	84.02
1,001 to 2,000.	138	145	23,844	193,334	126,276	65.31
2,001 to 3,000.	22	...	4,631	51,902	26,337	50.74
3,001 to 5,000.	22	...	6,744	83,142	45,328	54.52
5,001 to 10,000.	7	...	3,880	48,446	22,196	45.82
Over 10,000.	3	149	3,521	47,872	30,657	64.04
Total.	644	302	90,984	\$651,857	\$486,630	74.65
1,000 and less.	452	8	48,364	\$227,161	\$235,836	103.82
Over 1,000.	192	294	42,620	424,696	250,794	59.05

E. Forty-one Special Counties, Sales of Improved Acres by Warranty Deeds.

\$ 500 and less.	264	11	13,640	\$ 93,385	\$ 61,844	66.22
501 to \$1,000.	387	...	33,301	308,517	175,532	56.90
1,001 to 2,000.	689	9	74,459	1,087,680	487,005	44.77
2,001 to 3,000.	482	19	62,258	1,235,659	476,923	38.60
3,001 to 5,000.	464	...	75,992	1,834,394	618,329	33.71
5,001 to 10,000.	161	...	39,855	1,069,970	339,787	31.76
Over 10,000.	27	14	11,200	546,089	122,604	22.45
Total.	2,474	53	310,705	\$6,175,694	\$2,282,024	36.95
2,500 and less.	1,599	28	152,675	\$2,089,829	\$855,467	40.93
Over 2,500.	875	25	158,030	4,085,865	1,426,557	34.91

F. Forty-one Special Counties, Sales of Unimproved Acres by Warranty Deeds

\$ 500 and less.	1,449	8	57,586	\$ 388,968	\$230,833	59.34
501 to \$1,000.	1,040	9	81,285	810,858	422,394	52.09
1,001 to 2,000.	1,030	7	117,372	1 566,131	703,806	44.94
2,001 to 3,000.	423	16	64,724	1 070,173	437,369	40.87
3,001 to 5,000.	254	5	55,139	968,524	360,914	37.26
5,001 to 10,000.	67	21	30,506	468,365	187,033	39.93
Over 10,000.	26	8	59,763	619,702	274,201	44.25
Total.	4,289	74	466,375	\$5,892,721	\$2,616,550	44.40
1,500 and less.	3,036	24	195,154	\$1,899,888	\$983,970	51.79
Over 1,500.	1,253	50	271,221	3,992,833	1,632,580	40.89

selling value of realty is the only true and honest measure of its proper share of public taxation. To assess any class of realty more than another, on any speculative theory, is to wrong someone. To assess vacant or unimproved farm property more, relatively, than the improved is to lay specially onerous burdens on the poor, to cripple the man with limited resources, and to destroy some of the motives on the part of the poor for saving, and some of the opportunities for this saving which exists when all classes of property bear each its proportional share of public expenditure.

It is possible that in a later number of this JOURNAL attention will be called to some of the other inequalities of taxation discovered in Minnesota by the investigation of its labor bureau, and also to the lessons to be deduced therefrom.

L. G. POWERS,

Commissioner of Labor.

ST. PAUL, MINN.