Price 5 cents each or \$3 per hundred, without covers. With covers, \$5 per hundred. Address, 68 Essex-St., Boston.

BANQUET

OF THE

MASSACHUSETTS SINGLE TAX LEAGUE,

HOTEL VENDOME, MONDAY EVENING, APRIL 13, 1903,

TC

SOME OF THE LANDLORDS OF BOSTON.

ADDRESS OF

C. B. FILLEBROWN, PRESIDENT OF THE LEAGUE,

UPON THE SUBJECT OF

GROUND RENT.

- I. WHAT IS THE NATURE OF GROUND RENT?
 - II. WHAT IS THE OPERATION OF GROUND RENT?
 - III. WHAT IS THE OFFICE OF GROUND RENT?
 - IV. WHAT CAUSES GROUND RENT?
 - V. WHAT MAINTAINS GROUND RENT?
 - VI. HOW MUCH IS THERE OF IT IN BOSTON? (Tabulations.)

ALSO

VII. THE TAXATION OF REAL ESTATE ONLY.

VIII. THE TAX WHICH TIME IMPOSES.

IX. CORRESPONDING EXEMPTIONS.

X. THE EXEMPTION OF ASSESSED VALUES.

XI. THE SINGLE TAX AS AN INCOME TAX.

WITH

NEWSPAPER EDITORIALS.

BOSTON:

PUBLISHED BY MASSACHUSETTS SINGLE TAX LEAGUE.

1903.

INTRODUCTION.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

The Massachusetts Single Tax League has long looked forward to a time when it might have something especial to say to the landlords of Boston, and worthy, perhaps, of their attention. For this reason it takes pride in extending a cordial welcome to those guests who, by their acceptance of our invitation, have lent countenance to the study of a great problem.

The present occasion is one of importance to the League as the seventeenth and closing number in a progressive series of dinners and after dinner discussions outlined seven years ago, occasions which have been made memorable by the distinguished guests who, from the standpoint of benevolent observation, have from first to last honored these events by their presence.

Upon the recent occasion of a dinner given by the League to professional economists, eight able papers were presented which discussed the question of GROUND RENT — what is its nature, operation, and office, what causes it, what maintains it, how much is there of it? These papers, together with editorial comments upon them, have since been printed in full and sent to the two hundred and ninety-five professors of political economy in all United States colleges and universities, to two hundred presidents of colleges which do not have such a department, and to four thousand other friendly and intelligent people. This able and impartial treatment by eminent professors, which, it should be said, has put upon the League a perpetual bonded indebtedness, was given largely from the theoretical standpoint of the schools of political science.

In the hope of a further elucidation of the theory of rent thus already set forth, it has been thought opportune to put in evidence, from an every-day business point of view, some agencies and conditions existing to-day in our own city and State, as indeed all over the world, as facts upon which we base our appeal to the judgment of an intelligent public.

Let it be kindly noted that the treatment of facts and figures which here follows has in view two specific main objects, viz.:

- 1. What is the source or cause of ground rent?
- 2. What is the volume of ground rent?

What is said about the taking in taxation of enough of the ground rent to meet all public needs is single tax, the remainder is intended to be sound political economy according to the schools.

By your kind indulgence we submit a number of facts, questions, and reflections, grouped under each of the six somewhat arbitrary sub-divisions of the subject as originally presented.

GROUND RENT.

I. What is the Nature of Ground Rent?

As defined by Mr. Shearman, GROUND RENT is, in its nature, "a tribute which natural laws levy upon every occupant of land as the market price of all the social as well as natural advantages appertaining to that land, including necessarily his just share of the cost of government." It is found operative in every civilized country, automatically collecting "from every citizen an amount almost exactly proportionate to the fair and full market value of the benefits which he derives from the government under which he lives and the society which surrounds him." It is a tribute, "a tax, just, equal, full, fair, paid for full value received." "It is not merely a tax which justice allows; it is one which justice demands. It is not merely one which ought to be collected; it is one which infallibly will be and is collected. It is not merely one which the State ought to see collected; it is one which, in the long run, the State cannot prevent from being collected." . . . "Seldom has there been a more beautiful illustration of the wise yet relentless working of natural law than in the proved impossibility of justly collecting any tax other than upon ground rent. It shows that Nature makes it impossible to execute justly a statute which is in its nature unjust." This definition of Mr. Shearman is offered as one difficult to be improved or condensed.

Such, it may be added, is the nature of rent—ground rent—that all the public and private improvements of a community to-day are reflected in the land values of that community. Not only this, but the value of all those ideal public improvements conceived of as being possible under Utopian conditions would be similarly absorbed, as it were, in the ground, would be reflected in its site value. For illustration: Suppose you stand before a big mirror, you see your image perfectly reflected before you. If you are a man scantily, shabbily clad, so is the image in the glass. The addition of rich and costly attire is imaged in the glass. Load yourself with jewels and fill your hands with gold: in the mirror, true to nature, is the image and likeness of them all. Not more perfectly, nor more literally, is your image reflected in the mirror, than are public improvements reflected in the value of the land.

One peculiarity in the nature of ground rent to which we urge your attention is the subtle relation existing between this natural income and the artificial outgo of the public taxes — a relation not unlike that of cause and effect, by which the wise expenditure of the tax finds its resultant expression in ground rent.

Simple illustrations may help to open the mind to a judicial consideration of whatever may seem novel or strange in the re-statement of a familiar truth. For instance: The cook turns the crank of her coffee mill; the whole coffee that was in the hopper comes out ground coffee, but it is coffee just the same. The Minneapolis miller lets on the water that turns the crank of his flour mill; the wheat that goes into the hopper comes out flour, wheat in a more subtle form. The people turn the crank of a great tax mill; the taxes that go into the hopper come out ground rent, no tax quality lost, no rent ingredient added.

Or again: The myriad springs and rivulets of the great Mississippi are continually delivering themselves in one great river to the sea. Suppose that some day you should read in the weather bulletin that nature had decided to suspend the

regular return of these waters in clouds and rain and dew to their point of departure, how long would it be before the Mississippi Valley would be as parched and dry as the Desert of Sahara, or the North End of the city of Boston, or the East Side of

the city of New York?

Or more pertinent still, because more vital: The constant round of taxes and ground rent is the blood circulation of the body politic. When the heart throws out the life blood through the arteries, if that blood does not return through the veins, the patient dies—not of heart failure, but from loss of blood. When this public heart charges the arteries of the land with ground rent, if that ground rent does not return, the body politic is prostrated or enervated by loss of blood. The Boston body politic to-day is like a man with a ravenous appetite, cleaning his plate of all the seventeen or eighteen million a year that he can earn, and mortgaging the future for nearly as much more, always eating, yet always hungry, and simply because the best part of his forty million dollars' worth of arterial life blood instead of coming back to the public heart ebbs rapidly away through severed blood vessels in the private appropriation of ground rent.

These illustrations of the miscarriage of a beneficent provision seem to us to hint strongly at the true nature of ground rent, as waiting to be naturally developed

under a natural law, and as a natural SOCIAL PRODUCT.

II. What is the Operation of Ground Rent?

Your critical consideration is invited to Mr. Shearman's statement that the operation of ground rent is to exact from every user of land the natural tribute which he ought to pay in return for the perpetual public and social advantages secured to him by his location, a part of which natural tribute now goes to the State in the form of a tax, and the remainder to the landlord in the form of rent. Objection to monopolies and special privileges is that they participate in the private appropriation of an undue share of this natural tribute, and while recognizing that in the end all quasi-public, as well as all public service, should be at the least practicable cost to the people, it is held that meantime whatever monopoly is enjoyed should be obliged through taxation to repay to the public a full and fair equivalent for the privilege conceded to it.

The monopolies and special privileges which it is here thought should properly share with land values the burden of taxation, may be partially enumerated as follows, viz.: the private appropriation of natural resources such as gold, silver, copper, iron and coal mines, oil fields, and water powers; all franchises of steam and electric railways; all other public franchises, granted to one or several persons incorporated, and from which all other people are excluded, and which include all "rights, authority, or permission to construct, maintain, or operate in, under, above, upon, or through any streets, highways, or public places any mains, pipes, tanks, conduits, or wires, with their appurtenances for conducting water, steam, heat, light, power, gas, oil, or other substance, or electricity for telegraphic, telephonic, or

other purposes."

The reforms contemplated by the single tax would leave the State and the individual to deal together exactly as individuals deal with one another in ordinary business. Parties desiring special privileges would rent them from the State or the municipality, just as they now rent them from individuals and corporations, and on similar terms fixed from year to year. When paid for in this way, the special privilege feature would be eliminated. Then there really would be no special privileges, and there would be need of no other taxation. Hence, we say, the least the public can do is to tax and collect upon these special privileges, including ground rent, a sum sufficient to defray all public expenses.

The value of these special privileges is held to be ground rent, which in turn is held to be very largely, if not entirely, a SOCIAL PRODUCT.

III. What is the Office of Ground Rent?

The true office of ground rent is that of a Board of Equalization — equalization of taxation, of distribution, and of opportunity. The tendency of an increase in the tax upon ground rent is not only to equalize taxation and distribution, but to equalize the opportunity of access to what is erroneously called the land, which of itself, even in a city, would be of little or no use if it had a perpetual fifty-foot tight board fence around it. In this clear distinction between land and land value, which cannot be too critically noted, may there not be found an explosion of the notion that a man has a right to the private appropriation of ground rent, because his father bought and paid for the land fifty or one hundred years ago? The question is: When he bought the land fifty or one hundred years ago did he buy and pay for the land value of to-day? A company having five shares and five stockholders bought in 1686 a lot of land in Philadelphia for \$5. The same company, with its five shares and five stockholders, has just sold the value of the same land for \$1,000,000. Does it sound reasonable to say that for one pound sterling in 1686 these five men bought and paid for the \$1,000,000 land value of 1,000, with its ground rent of \$40,000 a year? Would not such a sale in 1686 of goods to be delivered two hundred and sixteen years later be dealing in futures with a vengeance? True it is that the land sold to-day is the same land bought in 1686. It is also true that its value to-day is not the value of land itself, but is the value of the rights and privileges pertaining thereto, and exterior to the land itself. The demand which enhances land value is not for land, but for the command of these same rights and privileges.

Land value, being a social creation, and its rent a social maintenance, equal access to the rights and privileges pertaining to the land can be promoted by the taxation of ground rent alone, and by this means alone. Ground rent, the natural tax feeder, extracts from the user of land the exact measure of his advantage over other men in his exclusive enjoyment of rights and privileges pertaining to his own location, and the whole tendency of the taxation of ground rent is to equalize participation in these common rights and privileges, by commuting into dollars and cents, which can be divided, those indivisible advantages of location, which can only be enjoyed individually. Whatever of rent goes into the public treasury tends to a fairer distribution of produce in wages earned. Whatever of taxation is transferred from other wealth to ground rent leaves so much more wealth to be distributed in wages.

Again, it is submitted that the true office of ground rent is to offer a communal shoulder suited to bear all the burden of common needs, leaving produce — current wealth — to be distributed, as fast as produced, in wages and interest, the total volume of which will always be increased by the amount of rent appropriated through the taxation of whatever of economic rent there is in special privilege.

Ground rent being a SOCIAL PRODUCT, is not its private appropriation a special privilege?

IV. What Causes Ground Rent?

The dimension, as well as the continuous character, of the contribution made by the people to the growth and volume of ground rent is seldom measured, — by many persons it is hardly suspected. Almost anything else, except land, which he owns a man may appropriate, destroy, tear down, burn down, remove, consume, change in form, wear out. To the land itself he cannot do any of these things. The value of its use is ground rent, an annual value, which is all that the owner of land can consume each year. The land value itself survives, and usually intact. People speak of owning land, because they or their fathers have bought and paid for it. A simple illustration may not unfairly indicate how a disproportionate

reliance may be placed upon this argument, considered in the light of all the causes contributing to the value of land. Suppose, for instance, that a vacant lot was bought fifty years ago for \$1,000 and to-day is worth \$10,000. When the purchaser paid his original \$1,000, the chances are that the people, in one capacity or another, paid for the same year \$50 to maintain that purchase value, and for forty-nine years thereafter the people have paid in annual arithmetical progression up to \$500 for the present year. The purchaser paid \$1,000 in one payment. The people have paid during the fifty years an average of \$250 a year to maintain this value. On the part of the people it has been not unlike a continuous purchase in the proportion of \$250 a year of the people's tax money to \$50 a year of the purchaser's interest money.

In addition to whatever income the purchaser has received, he possesses to-day \$10,000 worth of land, and the people possess nothing except an outgo of five per cent. in maintenance to an income of one and one-half per cent. in tax. Such an inheritance would usually be counted worse than nothing. Is it not reasonable that the community should derive profit from its part in this transaction, by appropriating to its own use the one-half of that ground rent which is manifestly created by the simple expenditure of its taxes? Why should not taxes, all of which are spent upon the land, be taken from the land?

In particularizing its sources, let it be said that ground rent must be the direct effect of at least three distinct causes: 1. Public expenditure; 2. Quasi-public expenditure; 3. Private expenditure.

First: Public Expenditure.

All wise public expenditures are the direct feeders of ground rent. The streets, lights, water, sewerage, fire and police systems of Boston, her schools, libraries, museums, parks, and playgrounds, one and all, contribute directly to the appreciation in the value of her land, a corresponding depreciation in which would instantly follow the abolition of any of these systems.

Second: Quasi-Public Expenditure.

It is scarcely less clear that steam and electric railways, gas and electric lights, telegraph and telephone companies, subways and ferries, are contributors to the value of land. This fact is not altered by the other fact that the people who pay for the use of those things get, in return, full value received. No one would deny that the Subway has added all the millions that it cost to the value of Boston land.

Third: Private Expenditure.

If the contribution from this source is not so self evident as are those from public and *quasi*-public expenditures, will it not appear upon a little closer analysis that churches, private schools, colleges, and universities *surely stand to ground rent* in the relation of cause and effect, that all private and public buildings, well appointed apartment houses, stores and office buildings unquestionably add to the value of the land?

This question of what are the causes of ground rent is the hinge upon which the single tax must turn. The endeavor has been to omit no contributor from the enumeration. Population is the cause often first named, but a passive population gives little value to land. The activities of such population are what create the value, and it is the listing of these which is here attempted, and the help of our guests is besought in making good any omissions.

Thus, while it is now generally conceded that, as a matter of *fact*, ground rent is what land is worth for use, as a matter of *economics* it is of far greater importance to understand clearly what is the source of ground rent, and especially to what extent it may be regarded as a group, propagate.

what extent it may be regarded as a SOCIAL PRODUCT.

V. What Maintains Ground Rent?

So far as the cost of streets, lights, water, sewerage, fire, police, schools, libraries, museums, parks, playgrounds, steam and electric railways, gas and electric lights, telegraph and telephone companies, subways, ferries, churches, private schools, colleges, universities, public buildings, well appointed houses, stores and office buildings is what constitutes the cost value of the land, just so far the maintenance of all this public or social service, if not in a literal sense, is in an all-sufficient common sense, the maintenance of ground rent.

A simple illustration may help to an appreciation of the absurd absence of a

true economy in Boston's family tax affairs to-day:

A landlord owns a factory which requires steam power, and which is useless and worthless without it. Another party owns a steam plant, and furnishes steam to factories at so much per horse power. The man who hires and uses the factory pays factory rent to his landlord, who furnishes the factory, and steam rent to the party that furnishes the steam, and would smile if you should talk to him about paying his steam rent to the landlord who does not furnish it.

In vivid contrast with this sensible performance, another landlord owns a store which requires public service and convenience, and which is useless without it. The municipality owns and runs a public service plant, and furnishes public service at a cost of so much per thousand dollars' worth. The man who hires and uses the store pays store rent to his landlord, who furnishes the store, but, by some perverse obliquity, he pays his public service rent to the same landlord. Our inquiry is, Should he not pay his public service rent to the public that furnishes it?

Inasmuch as all these contributions to its maintenance, so far as enumerated, are from the treasuries of the people, what can ground rent possibly be, if it is not

a social product?

VI. How much is there of Ground Rent in Boston?

A dense skepticism and, indeed, a denser ignorance seem to obtain even in regard to the simple fact that there is such a thing as ground rent, and yet much more in regard to what is the VOLUME of ground rent. It has been questioned whether the ground rent of Boston, under the single tax with the accompanying shrinkage in speculative values, would exceed to-day five per cent. on the assessed valuation of land or \$28,000,000. Indications are that the net rent of land itself might not, but our investigations are directed to ascertaining not the net but the gross ground rent, which is net rent plus the taxes.

One Hundred and Twenty Sales.

In a systematic attempt to dispel these clouds of ignorance and skepticism, now to be found in surprisingly high places, and to demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt about how much gross ground rent there is in the city of Boston, actual sales and actual rentals have been consulted and collected, and are herewith submitted. One hundred and twenty pieces of real estate in various sections of the city are shown to have been sold at prices averaging one-fifth higher than their assessed valuation, indicating that at least in these one hundred and twenty cases the valuations were less than five-sixths of the selling price. The following exhibit is offered of these specimen cases in detail.

Num Es	ber ate.						Assessed Valuation of Land.	Assessed Valuation of Building.	Total Assessed Valuation.	Price Indicated by Revenue Stamps on Deeds.	Percentage of Selling Price repre- sented by Valuation.
I,							. \$67,200	\$75,000	\$142,200	\$165,000	86
2	٠.						. 43,500	15,000	58,500	75,000	78
3							. 245,000	85,000	330,000	625,000	52
4							. 65,000	10,500	75,500	75,500	. 100
5							. 77,600	22,400	100,000	120,000	83
6							. 89,500	17,500	107,000	130,000	82
7							. 196,000	60,000	256,000	280,000	91
8							. 42,000	11,000	53,000	75,000	70
9							. 10,800	4,000	14,800	20,000	74
10							. 101,500	24,500	126,000	175,000	72
11						1	. 17,000	3,000	20,000	28,000	7 I
I 2	٠.						. 33,700	2,300	36,000	45,000	80
13		٠.			٠.		. 6,000	2,700	8,700	8,500	102
14							. 21,200	15,000	36,200	42,000	86
15							. 115,500	59,500	175,000	290,000	60
16	•						. 21,500	10,500	32,000	35,500	92
. I7							. 22,400	8,000	30,400	46,000	66
18		. •					. 135,700	75,000	210,700	210,000	100
19							492,000	232,400	724,400	925,000	75
20							. 10,800	5,100	15,900	30,000	53
2 I							49,500	9,000	58,500	46,500	125
22					٠.		. 90,000	17,000	107,000	136,000	78
23		•					. 14,300	2,700	17,000	21,000	80
24							. 48,000	7,000	55,000	85,000	64
25							68,800	10,000	78,800	94,000	83
26							164,600	120,400	285,000	425,000	67
27	•						. 1,800	2,100	3,900	3,500	111
28	. •						167,000	100,000	267,000	333,000	8o
29			•,					7,000	21,200	23,500	90
30					٠.		39,300	11,500	50,800	60,000	84
3 I							4,200	3,100	7,300	9,500	76
32			•				105,000	25,000	130,000	160,000	81
33		•					29,000	6,000	35,000	35,000	100
34	•	•	•	•	•		34,100	7,000	41,100	55,000	74
35	٠	٠	•				79,300	7,000	86,300	122,000	70
36	•	•.	•		•		10,000	3,000	13,000	12,500	104
37	•	•	•	•			79,300	20,000	99,300	135,000	73
38	•	•	•	•	•		54,000	8,000	62,000	69,500	89
39	•	•	٠	•	•		25,900	12,000	37,900	57,000	66
40	•	٠	•	•	•		131,000	28,000	159,000	200,000	79
4 I	•		•	٠	•		14,000	23,500	37,500	39,000	96
42	•	•	•	•	٠	•	7,700	14,900	22,600	29,000	77
43	٠	٠		•	•	•	8,600	8,400	17,000	16,500	103
44	٠	•	٠	٠	٠	•	2,000	7,500	9,500	10,000	95
45	•	•	•	٠	•	٠	27,500	26,500	54,000	65,000	83
46	•	٠	•	٠	•	, •	9,200	11,800	21,000	22,000	95
47	•	٠	٠	•	•	•	14,000	20,000	34,000	47,500	71
48	•	•	٠	•	•	•	11,000	9,000	20,000	21,000	95
49	•	•	•	•	٠	•	9,200	10,300	19,500	22,000	88
50	•	•	•	•	•	•	11,500	56,000	67,500	75,000	90
51	•	•	•	•	•	•	6,000	17,000	23,000	33,000	69
52	•	•	•*	•	٠		4,400	6,100	10,500	10,000	105
53	•	٠	•	٠	•	•	14,300	22,700	37,000	42,000	88

Numh Est		f					Assessed Valuation of Land.	Assessed Valuation of Building.	Total Assessed Valuation.	Price Indicated by Revenue Stamps on Deeds.	Percentage of Selling Price repre- sented by Valuation.
54							\$26,000	\$5,000	\$31,000	\$38,000	8 r
55							5,900	12,100	18,000	23,500	76
56							3,200	6,500	9,700	9,500	102
57							17,000	27,000	44,000	47,000	93
58	·		·	Ċ		·	16,200	10,800	27,000	25,000	108
59						·	13,300	14,000	27,300	27,000	101
60		·	Ĭ.		·	Ĭ.	3,600	5,200	8,800	9,000	97
61		·	Ĭ	·		•	9,200	11,800	21,000	22,000	95
62	Ċ	·	·	•	·	·	8,300	29,200	37,500	42,000	95 89
63	•	•		,	•	•	4,000	6,700	10,700	9,500	112
64	•	•	•	•	•	•	18,000	18,000	36,000	32,000	112
65	٠	•	•	•	•	•	7,600	20,900	28,500	35,000	81
66	•	•	•	•	•	•	13,300	20,700	34,000		
67	•	•	•	•	•	•	3,600	4,200	7,800	33,000	103 86
68	•	•	•	•	•	•	30,000	31,000	61,000	9,000 80,000	
69	•	•	•	•	•	•	65,000	20,000	85,000	91,000	76
70	٠	٠	•	•	٠	•	18,000	13,000	31,000	38,000	93 81
71	•	•	•	•	٠	•	7,800	17,000	24,800	28,000	88
72	•	•	•	•	•	•	4,800	16,000	20,800	25,000	83.
73	•	٠	•	•	•	•	18,000	11,500	29,500	27,000	
73 74	•	•	٠	•	•	•	6,300	10,700	17,000	15,500	109
75	•	٠	•	•	•	•	8,800	8,200	17,000	22,000	109
76	•	•	•	•	•	•	14,700	12,300	27,000	25,000	77 108
77	•	•	•	•	•	•	6,200	15,000	21,200	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
78	•	•	•	•	•	•	18,800	11,200	30,000	25,500	83
79	•	•	•	•	•	•	10,800	10,200	-	29,000	103
80	•	•	•	•	•	•	6,400	11,600	21,000 18,000	25,000	84
81	٠	•	•	•	•	•	3,700	6,800		18,000	100
82	•	•	•	•	•	•	3,700	•	10,500	10,500	100
83	•	•	•	•	•	•	4,500	4,500 1,200	8,100	10,000	81
84	•	•	•	•	•	•	1,300	•	5,700 3,800	6,500	87
85	•	•	•	•	•	•	4,800	2,500 8,200	_	4,000	95
86	٠	•	•	•	•	•	1,000		13,000	15,500	83
87	•	•	•	•	•	•	4,200	3,500	4,500	5,000	90
88	•	•	•	•	•	•	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	10,000 3,600	14,200	17,000	83
89	•	•	•	•	•	•	2,900 2,800	_	6,500	8,500	76
90	•	•	•	•	•	٠	1,600	5,000 2,600	7,800	7,800	100
91	•	•	•	•	•	•	1,000	64,000	4,200	4,500	93
92	•	•	•	•	•	•	1,600	3,600	76,500	70,000	109
92	•	•	•	•	•	•			5,200	5,800	89
93 94	•	•	•	•	•	•	4,000 3,500	6,500 4,800	10,500	12,000	87
95	•	٠	•	•	٠	•	8,400	25,000	8,300	7,000	118
96	•	•	•	•	•	•			33,400	25,000	133
97	•	•	. •	•	•	•	1,000 2,400	1,500	2,500	2,300	108
98	•	•	•	•	•	•	5,800	2,900	5,300	4,000	132
99	•	•	•	•	•	•	3,200	7,200 5,200	13,000	15,000	86
100	•	•	•	•	•	•	3,200	5,200 6,000	8,400 9,100	9,300	90
101	•	•	•	•	٠	•	6,000	5,200		8,000	113
101	• •	•	•	•	•	•	3,600	-	0,100	12,000	93
103	•	•	•	•	•	•	2,700	5,500 6,000		10,000	91
103	•	•	•	•	•	•	30,000	14,500	8,700	10,000	87 .
105	•	•	•	•	•	•	15,700	8,000	44,500	45,000	98
105	•	•	•	•	•	•	6,300	7,700	23,700 14,000	20,000	118
	٠	•	٠	•	•	•	0,300	1,100	14,000	12,000	110

Numb Esta		f					Assessed Valuation of Land.	Assessed Valuation of Building.	Total Assessed Valuation.	Price Indicated by Revenue Stamps on Deeds.	Percentage of Selling Price repre- sented by Valuation.
107							\$4,300	\$7,700	\$12,000	\$13,000	92
108							5,400	5,000	10,400	11,000	94
.109							3,000	4,000	7,000	8,000	87
110							25,200	2,500	27,700	29,000	95
III							3,900	9,000	12,900	15,000	86
112							6,200	9,800	16,000	16,000	100
113							8,000	16,000	24,000	27,000	88
114							5,600	9,500	15,100	12,000	125
115							4,000	5,000	9,000	10,000	90
116				• ,		•	4,800	6 ,0 00	10,800	10,000	108
117		•					1,600	5,400	7,000	5,500	127
118		•					2,000	1,6 0 0	3,600	3,675	97
119							9,00 0	13,000	22,000	27,000	. 81
120	•	•	•	•	•	•	8,000	6,000	14,000	14,000	100
To	otal	s.				\$	3,758,600	\$2,079,700	\$5,838,300	\$7,291,375	- <u>-</u>

Landlords and real estate men are the best judges of what allowances should be made on account of the fact that the prices given in these tables are those indicated by the revenue stamps on deeds, and that it is assumed in the following estimate that the buildings sold for one-third more than their assessed valuation:

Deducting from the total of prices indicated by the footing of the	
above table •	\$7,291,375
Four-thirds of assessed valuation of buildings	2,772,933
Would give perhaps a fair estimate of what the land sold for To this it is necessary to add the capitalized tax upon the land for	\$4,518,442
1900, \$3,758,600 × \$14.70 × 20 = · · · · ·	1,105,028
In order to get the gross capitalized ground rental value of the land Of which the assessed valuations were only two-thirds.	\$5,623,470

Seven Hundred and Fifty=One Rentals.

Seven hundred and fifty-one net rentals of estates, together with their assessed valuations, averaging \$47,680 each, have been obtained from reliable sources, and to a large extent in confidence, the record of which is also put in evidence. In each of these cases there is deducted from the net rental (column D) ten per cent. for the interest, depreciation, insurance, and repairs of the building (column C), leaving a balance of income (column F) to be credited to the land. The valuation of the land (column B) multiplied by Boston's tax rate (\$14.80) plus the net rent (column D) gives what the user pays for the use of the land (net rent plus taxes, column H). This gross ground rent which the user pays (column H) multiplied by twenty, i.e., capitalized at five per cent., gives the gross capitalized ground rental value of the land (column I).

It will be noticed that what the user pays for use of the land (column H) is $125\%_0$ per cent. of the assessed valuation of the land (column B). Comparison of column I with column B indicates that in these seven hundred and fifty-one instances the average assessed valuation corresponds very closely to the actual *net* value of the land, the total net income upon the land being $4\%_0$ per cent. of the assessed valuation, and averages four-fifths of the *gross* land value.

13,500										=
Total Assessed Ass		A.	в.	c.	D.	i .	F.	G.		I.
Total Assessed Xaluation of Net Net Insurance, Net Ins	j			,						
Total Assessed Valuation, Assessed Valuation, Assessed Valuation, Assessed Valuation, Candidate Assessed Valuation, Candidate Candidat			1					Per cent.	for the	Gross
Total Assessed Valuation State Valuation S						ings for		of Net	use of the	Value
\$914,000	S.	İ	A	Language A	Not		Not			
\$914,000	eg]	Total			Rental	repairs,	Income	Assessed	Ground	Rent
\$914,000	n n		of	of		and depre-		Valuation	Rent plus	
2 8,000 3,600 4,400 902 440 462 12.8 515 10,300 13,500 6,500 7,000 1,600 700 900 13.8 996 19,992 14,88 1,075 21,500 13,300 11,200 21,000 10,000 2,100 7,900 7,1 9,575 19,144 1,1504 32,268 77,300 7,400 6,000 802 600 202 2.7 3,000 1,400 1,500 1,100 1,200 1,000 3,000 6,400 4.3 3,307 66,144 1,604 32,268 7,7300 3,000 3,000 2,300 800 1.4 1,604 3,208 1,200 1	Z	Valuation.	Land.	bullding.	ing raxes.	Clation.	Land.	or Land.	the Tax.	at 5 per cent.
2 8,000 3,600 4,400 902 440 462 12.8 515 10,300 13,500 6,500 7,000 1,600 700 900 13.8 996 19,992 14,88 1,075 21,500 13,300 11,200 21,000 10,000 2,100 7,900 7,1 9,575 19,144 1,1504 32,268 77,300 7,400 6,000 802 600 202 2.7 3,000 1,400 1,500 1,100 1,200 1,000 3,000 6,400 4.3 3,307 66,144 1,604 32,268 7,7300 3,000 3,000 2,300 800 1.4 1,604 3,208 1,200 1		\$014.000	\$220,000	\$¢7¢.000	\$75.000	\$57.500	\$17.500	5.1	\$22,517	\$450,340
3	- 1		3,600							10,300
4 28,600 6,600 22,000 3,177 2,200 977 14.8 1,075 21,500 13,300 11,200 2,100 10,000 3,600 6,400 4.3 8,608 172,166 185,200 7,400 6,600 802 3600 6,400 4.3 8,608 172,166 6,222 37,300 54,300 23,000 3,100 2,300 800 1.4 1,604 32,268 6,800 47,800 23,000 3,100 2,300 800 1.4 1,604 32,268 12,2160 12,800 20,300 1,500 1,777 150 1,177 150 1,027 5 1,337 26,544 1,000 3,200 800 24,000 3,200 800 258 80 209 6.5 256 5,122 1,137 1,000 1,814 120 1,694 9.3 1,962 33,244 1,410,300 7,300 3,000 5,683 3,970 3,386 19,5 3,642 7,524 1,684 1,	3				1 5			13.8		19,920
133,000						2,200	977	14.8	1,075	21,500
6 185, 200 149, 200 36,000 10,000 3,600 6,400 4,31 8,608 172, 166 77, 300 54,300 23,000 3,100 2,300 800 1.4 1,604 32,086 6,680 4,78 800 19,000 4,500 1,900 2,600 5.4 3,307 66,144 1,604 3,208 80,209 1,500 1,177 150 1,027 5. 1,327 26,544 1,000 3,200 800 289 80 209 6.5 256 5,112 3,000 1,300 1,8100 1,200 1,814 120 1,694 9.3 1,962 39,244 14,100 1,700 7,300 3,000 7,356 3,970 3,386 19.5 3,642 72,844 1,168 1,200 1,1604 1,200 1,300 1,		133,000		21,000	10,000		7,900	7.1	9,557	191,140
9		185,200	149,200					4.3	8,608	172,160
9	7			1						6,220
10										
11										
12									1	
13										1
14 10,300 7,300 3,000 568 300 268 3.7 376 7,526 15 57,000 17,300 39,700 7,356 3,070 3,3842 52 584 1,681 16 14,700 7,600 18,400 5,683 1,840 3,843 5.4 4,888 97,762 17 89,000 70,600 18,400 5,683 1,840 3,843 5.4 4,888 97,760 19 72,900 45,900 27,000 8,921 2,700 6,221 13.5 6,900 138,000 20 21,000 86,500 12,400 2,339 1,240 1,099 12.7 1,226 24,520 21 80,500 69,500 11,000 2,339 1,100 4.3 1,473 29,460 22 32,2000 6,600 13,400 1,744 1,340 404 6.1 501 10,022 22 32,200 13,500 44,500 <td>- 1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>ſ</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	- 1			ſ						
15										
10					7.356	3.070			3.642	72:840
17					1,182	710				
18 210,000 179,800 30,200 11,392 3,020 8,372 4.6 11,033 220,666 19 72,900 45,900 27,000 8,921 2,700 6,221 13,50 6,900 138,000 21 80,500 69,500 11,000 6,000 1,100 4,900 7. 1,826 24,520 22 32,200 25,200 7,000 1,800 700 1,100 4.3 1,473 29,466 24 200,000 170,000 30,000 9,649 3,900 6,640 3.9 9,156 818,122 25 64,500 224,500 40,000 6,845 4,000 2,845 11.6 3,207 64,142 26 58,000 13,500 44,500 8,412 4,450 3,962 29.3 4,162 8,522 28 26,000 11,000 15,000 2,365 1,500 650 6.5 798 15,966 30 124,000								i	4,888	97,760
19										
21 80,500 69,500 11,000 6,000 1,100 4,900 7, 5,928 118,560 23 20,000 6,600 13,400 1,744 1,340 404 6.1 501 10,002 24 200,000 170,000 30,000 9,640 3,900 6,640 3.9 9,156 183,122 26 64,500 24,500 40,000 6,845 4,400 2,845 11.6 3,207 64,1462 83,244 20,000 15,000 5,000 704 500 204 1.3 426 8,522 29 27,000 15,000 17,000 2,350 1,500 865 7.8 1,028 20,500 29 27,000 10,000 17,000 2,350 1,500 650 6.5 798 15,966 30 124,000 113,000 11,000 342 140 202 12.6 65,72 131,444 31 3,000 11,000 1,400 342 140 202 12.6 65 225 4,500 33 82,500 49,000 33,500 62,500 7,816 6,250 1,566 9. 7,825 16,044 38,500 17,500 92,500 7,816 6,250 1,566 9. 7,825 16,044 38,500 17,500 92,500 11,300 1,826 1,130 6,66 9. 7,825 16,044 31 1,500 9,500 11,300 1,826 1,130 6,250 1,253 2.6 1,945 38,900 17,500 9,500 11,826 31 18,500 7,200 11,300 1,826 1,130 6,250 1,253 2.6 1,945 38,900 17,500 9,500 1,964 950 1,014 4.2 1,369 27,386 31 18,500 7,200 11,300 1,826 1,130 6,250 1,253 2.6 1,945 38,900 17,500 9,500 1,826 1,130 6,66 9.6 802 16,044 117,000 26,500 90,500 1,826 1,130 6,66 9.6 802 16,044 117,000 26,500 90,500 1,826 1,130 6,66 9.6 802 16,044 117,000 26,500 90,500 1,964 950 1,014 4.2 1,369 27,386 41 19,8500 123,000 32,000 3,200 3,200 3,200 3,200 3,200 4,242 5.5 5,374 107,486 127,700 118,700 30,000 11,013 3,000 4,200 11,013 3,000 4,200 11,013 3,000 4,200 11,013 3,000 4,200 11,013 3,000 4,200 11,013 3,000 4,200 11,013 3,000 4,200 11,013 3,000 4,200 11,013 3,000 4,200 11,013 3,000 4,200 11,013 3,000 4,200 11,013 3,000 4,200 11,013 3,000 4,200 11,013 3,000 4,200 12,000 4,000 1,200 2,200 4,200 2,200 4,200 2,200 5,200 4,200 2,200 5,200 4,200 3,300 3,300 2,700 5,200 11,014 4.2 1,369 3,240 4,200 11,013 3,000 11,013 3,000 11,013 3,000 11,013 3,000 11,013 3,000 11,013 3,000 11,013 3,000 11,013 3,000 11,010 11,00	19	72,900	45,900	27,000					6,900	
22	1				1.002					
23 20,000 6,600 13,400 1,744 1,340 404 6.1 501 16,02 24 200,000 170,000 30,000 9,640 3,900 6,640 3.9 9,156 183,122 25 64,500 24,500 44,500 8,412 4,450 3,962 29.3 4,162 83,244 26 58,000 13,500 5000 704 500 204 1.3 426 8,522 28 26,000 11,000 15,000 2,350 1,500 865 7.8 1,028 20,566 29 27,000 10,000 17,000 2,350 1,700 650 6.5 7.8 1,028 20,566 30 124,000 11,300 1,600 1,400 342 140 202 12.6 5,572 131,450 31 3,000 1,600 1,400 342 140 202 12.6 6,572 4,500 32 18,50										
24 200,000 170,000 30,000 9,640 3,600 6,640 3.9 9,156 183,122 25 64,500 24,500 40,000 6,845 4,000 2,845 11.6 3,207 64,144 26 58,000 13,500 5,000 704 500 204 1.3 426 8,524 27 20,000 15,000 5,000 704 500 204 1.3 426 8,524 28 26,000 11,000 15,000 2,350 1,700 650 6.5 798 15,960 30 124,000 113,000 11,000 6,000 1,100 4,900 4.3 6,572 131,444 31 3,000 1,600 1,400 342 1,100 4,900 4.3 6,572 4,500 31 3,000 1,500 1,400 33,500 6,299 3,350 2,929 8.9 3,654 73,08 32 114,000 <	í									
25 64,500 24,500 40,000 6,845 4,000 2,845 11.6 3,207 64,144 26 58,000 13,500 5,000 704 500 204 11.6 83,244 27 20,000 15,000 5,000 704 500 204 1.3 426 8,526 28 26,000 11,000 15,000 2,350 1,700 650 65 798 15,960 30 124,000 113,000 11,000 6,000 1,100 4,900 43 6,572 131,440 31 3,000 1,600 11,400 342 140 202 12.6 225 4,500 32 18,500 7,200 11,300 1,826 1,330 696 9.7 802 16,04 33 82,500 49,000 33,500 6,290 7,816 6,250 1,566 9. 1,825 3654 73,08 34 80,000 17,500 <td>- 1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	- 1									
26 58,000 13,500 44,500 8,412 4,450 3,962 29.3 4,162 83,246 27 20,000 15,000 5,000 704 500 204 1.3 426 8,524 28 26,000 11,000 15,000 2,365 1,500 865 7.8 1,028 20,566 29 27,000 10,000 17,000 2,350 1,700 650 6.5 798 15,966 30 124,000 113,300 11,000 6,000 1,100 4,900 4.3 6,572 131,444 31 3,000 1,600 33,500 7,200 11,300 1,826 1,330 696 9.7 802 16,044 33 82,500 49,000 33,500 6,279 3,350 2,929 8.9 3,654 73,086 35 114,000 46,860 67,200 7,973 6,720 1,253 2.6 1,945 38,900 37					1 21-1					
27				,				,		
28 26,000 11,000 15,000 2,365 1,500 865 7.8 1,028 20,566 29 27,000 10,000 17,000 2,350 1,700 650 6.5 798 15,966 30 124,000 113,000 11,000 342 140 202 12.6 225 4,500 31 3,000 1,600 11,400 342 140 202 12.6 225 4,500 32 18,500 7,200 11,300 1,826 1,130 696 9.7 802 16,044 34 80,000 17,500 62,500 7,816 6,250 1,566 9. 1,825 36,50 35 114,000 46,860 67,200 7,973 6,720 1,253 2.6 1,945 38,50 37 18,500 7,200 11,300 1,826 1,130 696 9.6 802 16,044 38 150,700 118,700 32,										
29 27,000 10,000 17,000 2,350 1,700 650 6.5 798 15,960 30 124,000 13,3000 1,600 1,400 342 140 202 12.6 225 4,500 32 18,500 7,200 11,300 1,826 1,130 696 9.7 802 16,040 33 82,500 49,000 33,500 6,279 3,350 2,929 8.9 3,654 73,086 34 80,000 17,500 62,500 7,816 6,250 1,566 9. 1,825 36,504 35 114,000 46,800 67,200 7,973 6,720 1,253 2.6 1,945 38,900 36 33,500 24,000 9,500 1,964 950 1,014 4.2 1,369 27,38 37 18,500 7,200 113,300 1,826 1,130 696 9.6 802 16,042 38 150,700										
30 124,000 113,000 11,000 6,000 1,100 4,900 4.3 6,572 131,440 31 3,000 1,600 1,400 342 140 202 12.6 225 4,500 32 18,500 7,200 111,300 1,826 1,130 696 9.7 802 16,044 33 82,500 49,000 33,500 6,279 3,350 2,929 8.9 3,654 73,086 34 80,000 17,500 62,500 7,816 6,250 1,566 9. 1,825 36,500 35 114,000 46,860 67,200 7,973 6,720 1,253 2.6 1,945 38,900 36 33,500 24,000 9,500 1,964 950 1,014 4.2 1,369 27,380 37 18,500 7,200 11,300 3,800 3,200 5,300 4.4 7,056 141,120 39 15,500 12,300 <td>29</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	2 9									
32 18,500 7,200 11,300 1,826 1,130 696 9,7 802 10,041 33 82,500 49,000 33,500 6,279 3,350 2,929 8.9 3,654 73,08 34 80,000 17,500 62,500 7,816 6,250 1,566 9. 1,825 36,50 35 114,000 46,860 67,200 7,973 6,720 1,253 2.6 1,945 38,500 36 33,500 24,000 9,500 1,964 950 1,014 4.2 1,369 27,386 37 18,500 7,200 11,300 1,826 1,130 696 9.6 802 16,040 38 150,700 118,700 32,000 8,500 3,200 3,800 3. 5,620 112,400 40 117,000 26,500 99,500 20,268 9,050 11,218 42.3 11,610 232,200 41 98,500 76	30	124,000								
33 82,500 49,000 33,500 6,279 3,350 2,929 8.9 3,654 73,086 34 80,000 17,500 62,500 7,816 6,250 1,566 9. 1,825 36,500 35 114,000 46,800 67,200 7,973 6,720 1,253 2.6 1,945 38,500 36 33,500 24,000 9,500 1,964 950 1,014 4.2 1,369 27,38 37 18,500 7,200 113,300 1,826 1,130 696 9.6 802 16,040 38 150,700 118,700 32,000 8,500 3,200 5,300 4.4 7,056 141,120 39 155,000 123,000 32,000 7,000 3,200 3,800 3. 5,620 16,040 40 117,000 26,500 90,500 22,200 6,442 2,200 4,242 5.5 5,374 107,480 41 <										4,500
34 80,000 17,500 62,500 7,816 6,250 1,566 9. 1,825 36,50 35 114,000 46,860 67,200 7,973 6,720 1,253 2.6 1,945 38,900 36 33,500 24,000 9.500 1,964 950 1,014 4.2 1,369 27,386 37 18,500 7,200 11,300 1,826 1,130 696 9.6 802 16,040 38 150,700 1123,000 32,000 8,500 3,200 5,300 4.4 7,056 141,120 39 155,000 123,000 32,000 7,000 3,200 3,800 3. 5,620 112,400 40 117,000 26,500 90,500 20,268 9,050 11,218 42.3 11,610 232,200 41 98,500 76,500 22,000 6,442 2,200 4,242 5.5 5,374 107,48 42 141,000					1,826	1,130	_		1 -	
35 I14,000 46,800 67,200 7,973 6,720 1,253 2.6 1,945 38,900 36 33,500 24,000 9,500 1,964 950 1,014 4.2 1,369 27,38 37 18,500 7,200 11,300 1,826 1,130 696 9.6 802 16,040 38 150,700 118,700 32,000 3,200 5,300 4.4 7,056 141,120 40 117,000 26,500 90,500 20,268 9,050 11,218 42.3 11,610 232,200 41 98,500 76,500 22,000 6,442 2,200 4,242 5.5 5,374 10,148 42 141,000 111,000 30,000 11,913 3,000 8,013 7.2 9,656 193,120 43 34,800 30,600 4,200 1,945 420 1,525 5. 1,978 39,566 45 57,300 45,300			49,000		6,279					
36 33,500 24,000 9,500 1,964 950 1,014 4.2 1,369 27,386 37 18,500 7,200 11,300 1,826 1,130 696 9.6 802 16,044 38 150,700 118,700 32,000 3,500 3,200 3,800 3. 5,620 141,120 40 117,000 26,500 90,500 20,268 9,050 11,218 42.3 11,610 23,2200 41 98,500 76,500 22,000 6,442 2,200 4,242 5.5 5.374 107,480 42 141,000 111,000 30,000 11,013 3,000 8,013 7.2 9,656 193,122 43 34,800 30,600 4,200 1,945 420 1,525 5. 1,978 39,566 44 56,800 51,800 5,000 3,000 500 2,500 4.8 3,266 65,322 45 57,300 <										
37 18,500 7,200 11,300 1,826 1,130 696 9.6 802 16,046 38 150,700 118,700 32,000 8,500 3,200 5,300 4.4 7,056 141,122 39 155,000 123,000 32,000 7,000 3,200 3,800 3. 5,620 112,400 40 117,000 26,500 90,500 20,268 9,050 11,218 42.3 11,610 232,200 41 98,500 76,500 22,000 6,442 2,200 4,242 5.5 5,374 107,480 42 141,000 111,000 30,000 11,013 3,000 8,013 7.2 9,656 193,122 43 34,800 30,600 4,200 1,945 420 1,525 5. 1,978 39,560 44 56,800 51,800 5,000 3,000 4,000 1,200 2,800 4.8 3,266 65,320 45								I		
38 150,700 118,700 32,000 8,500 3,200 5,300 4.4 7,056 141,124 39 155,000 123,000 32,000 7,000 3,200 3,800 3. 5,620 112,400 40 117,000 26,500 90,500 20,268 9,050 11,218 42.3 11,610 232,200 41 98,500 76,500 22,000 6,442 2,200 4,242 5.5 5,374 107,480 42 141,000 111,000 30,000 11,913 3,000 8,013 7.2 9,656 193,112 43 34,800 30,600 4,200 1,945 420 1,525 5. 1,978 39,560 44 56,800 51,800 5,000 3,000 500 2,500 4.8 3,266 65,320 45 57,300 45,300 12,000 4,000 1,200 2,800 6.2 3,470 69,400 47 6,500						, 1				
39 155,000 123,000 32,000 7,000 3,200 3,800 3. 5,620 112,400 40 117,000 26,500 90,500 20,268 9,050 11,218 42.3 11,610 232,200 41 98,500 76,500 22,000 6,442 2,200 4242 5.5 5,374 107,480 42 141,000 111,000 30,000 11,913 3,000 8,013 7.2 9,656 193,120 43 34,800 30,600 4,200 1,945 420 1,525 5. 1,978 39,556 44 56,800 51,800 5,000 3,000 500 2,500 4.8 3,266 65,320 45 57,300 45,300 12,000 4,000 1,200 2,800 6.2 3,470 69,400 47 6,500 4,300 2,200 792 220 572 13 3 635 12,708 48 6,000 3										1 .
40 117,000 26,500 90,500 20,268 9,050 11,218 42.3 11,610 232,200 41 98,500 76,500 22,000 6,442 2,200 4,242 5.5 5,374 107,48 42 141,000 111,000 30,000 11,013 3,000 8,013 7.2 9,656 193,122 43 34,800 30,600 4,200 1,945 420 1,525 5. 1,978 39,566 65,322 45 57,300 45,300 12,000 4,000 1,200 2,800 6.2 3,470 69,400 46 127,700 104,200 23,500 4,970 2,350 2,620 2.5 4,162 83,246 47 6,500 4,300 2,200 792 220 572 13 3 635 12,700 48 6,000 3,300 2,700 446 200 246 6.4 302 6,940 51 5,400 <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>,</td> <td></td> <td></td>								,		
41 98,500 76,500 22,000 6,442 2,200 4,242 5.5 5 5,374 107,486 42 141,000 111,000 30,000 11,013 3,000 8,013 7.2 9,656 193,122 43 34,800 30,600 4,200 1,945 420 1,525 5. 1,978 39,566 45,300 45,300 12,000 4,000 1,200 2,800 6.2 3,470 69,400 46 127,700 104,200 23,500 4,970 2,350 2,500 4.8 3,266 65,322 47 6,500 4,300 2,200 792 220 572 13 3 635 12,700 48 6,000 3,300 2,700 595 270 325 98 374 7,486 49 7,500 4,300 3,200 707 320 387 9. 450 9,000 50 5,800 3,800 2,000 446 200 246 6.4 302 6,040 51 5,400 2,800 2,600 555 260 295 10.5 336 6,720 52 12,500 6,500 6,000 775 600 175 2.7 271 5,420 53 5,900 3,700 2,200 50 50 1,800 519 180 339 9.2 393 7,860 55 13,200 10,200 3,000 1,489 300 1,189 11.7 1,340 26,800 56 50 0,000 10,100 9,900 2,404 990 1,414 14. 1,553 31,260 56 50 50 6,000 1,100 9,900 2,404 990 1,414 14.										
42										107.480
43 34,800 30,600 4,200 1,945 420 1,525 5. 1,978 39,560 44 56,800 51,800 5,000 3,000 500 2,500 4.8 3,266 65,326 45 57,300 45,300 12,000 4,000 1,200 2,800 6.2 3,470 69,400 46 127,700 104,200 23,500 4,970 2,350 2,620 2.5 4,162 83,246 47 6,500 4,300 2,200 792 220 572 13 3 635 12,700 48 6,000 3,300 2,700 595 270 325 9.8 374 7,480 49 7,500 4,300 3,200 707 320 387 9. 450 9,000 50 5,800 3,800 2,000 446 200 246 6.4 302 6,040 51 5,400 2,800 2,600 <td></td> <td>141,000</td> <td>111,000</td> <td></td> <td>11,013</td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>193,120</td>		141,000	111,000		11,013	1				193,120
44 56.800 51,800 5,000 3,000 500 2,500 4.8 3,266 65,32c 45 57,300 45,300 12,000 4,000 1,200 2,800 6.2 3,470 69,40c 46 127,700 104,200 23,500 4,970 2,350 2,620 2.5 4,162 83,24c 47 6,500 4,300 2,200 792 220 572 13 3 635 12,700 48 6,000 3,300 2,700 595 270 325 9.8 374 7,48c 49 7,500 4,300 3,200 707 320 387 9. 450 9,00c 50 5,800 3,800 2,000 446 200 246 6.4 302 6,04c 51 5,400 2,800 2,600 555 260 295 10.5 336 6,72c 52 12,500 6,500 6,600 775	43				1,945			5.		
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$								j 4.8		65,320
47 6,500 4,300 2,200 792 220 572 13 3 635 12,700 48 6,000 3,300 2,700 595 270 325 9 8 374 7,48c 49 7,500 4,300 3,200 707 320 387 9. 450 9,00c 50 5,800 3,800 2,000 446 200 246 6.4 302 6,04c 51 5,400 2,800 2,600 555 260 295 10.5 336 6,72c 52 12,500 6,500 6,000 775 600 175 2.7 271 5,42c 53 5,900 3,700 1,800 519 180 339 9.2 393 7,86c 54 5,500 3,700 1,800 519 180 339 9.2 393 7,86c 55 13,200 10,200 3,000 1,489 300 <								6.2		69,400
48 6,000 3,300 2,700 595 270 325 9.8 374 7,48c 49 7,500 4,300 3,200 707 320 387 9. 450 9,000 50 5,800 3,800 2,000 446 200 246 6.4 302 6,042 51 5,400 2,800 2,600 555 260 295 10.5 336 6,720 52 12,500 6,500 6,000 775 600 175 2.7 271 5,420 53 5,900 3,700 1,800 519 180 339 9.2 393 7,860 54 5,500 3,700 1,800 519 180 339 9.2 393 7,860 55 13,200 10,200 3,000 1,489 300 1,189 11.7 1,340 26,800 56 20,000 10,100 9,900 2,404 990								2.5		83,240
49 7,500 4,300 3,200 707 320 387 9. 450 9,000 50 5,800 3,800 2,000 446 200 246 6.4 302 6,04 51 5,400 2,800 2,600 555 260 295 10.5 336 6,72 52 12,500 6,500 6,000 775 600 175 2.7 271 5,42 53 5,900 3,700 2,200 537 220 317 8.6 371 7,42 54 5,500 3,700 1,800 519 180 339 9.2 393 7,86 55 13,200 10,200 3,000 1,489 300 1,189 11.7 1,340 26,800 56 20,000 10,100 9,900 2,404 990 1,414 14. 1,553 31,260	47									12,700
50 5,800 3,800 2,000 446 200 246 6.4 302 6,040 51 5,400 2,800 2,600 555 260 295 10.5 336 6,720 52 12,500 6,500 6,000 775 600 175 2.7 271 5,420 53 5,500 3,700 1,800 519 180 339 9.2 393 7,860 54 5,500 3,700 1,800 519 180 339 9.2 393 7,860 55 13,200 10,200 3,000 1,489 300 1,189 11.7 1,340 26,800 56 20,000 10,100 9,900 2,404 990 1,414 14. 1,563 31,260							325	9.0		7,480
51 5,400 2,800 2,600 555 260 295 10.5 336 6,720 52 12,500 6,500 6,000 775 600 175 2.7 271 5,420 53 5,900 3,700 2,200 537 220 317 8.6 371 7,420 54 5,500 3,700 1,800 519 180 339 9.2 393 7,860 55 13,200 10,200 3,000 1,489 300 1,189 11.7 1,340 26,800 56 20,000 10,100 9,900 2,404 990 1,414 14. 1,563 31,260										
52 12,500 6,500 6,000 775 600 175 2.7 271 5,420 53 5,900 3,700 2,200 537 220 317 8.6 371 7,420 54 5,500 3,700 1,800 519 180 339 9.2 393 7,800 55 13,200 10,200 3,000 1,489 300 1,189 11.7 1,340 26,800 56 20,000 10,100 9,900 2,404 990 1,414 14. 1,563 31,260									226	6 720
53 5,900 3,700 2,200 537 220 317 8.6 371 7,42c 54 5,500 3,700 1,800 519 180 339 9.2 393 7,86c 55 13,200 10,200 3,000 1,489 300 1,189 11.7 1,340 26,80c 56 20,000 10,100 9,900 2,404 990 1,414 14. 1,553 31,266					, 555					
54 5,500 3,700 1,800 519 180 339 9.2 393 7,860 55 13,200 10,200 3,000 1,489 300 1,189 11.7 1,340 26,800 56 20,000 10,100 9,900 2,404 990 1,414 14. 1,563 31,260	53		3,700	2,200	537					
55 13,200 10,200 3,000 1,489 300 1,189 11.7 1,340 26,800 56 20,000 10,100 9,900 2,404 990 1,414 14. 1,563 31,260	54	5,500	3,700		519	180				7,860
50 20,000 10,100 9,900 2,404 990 1,414 14. 1,563 31,260 57 15,500 8,600 6,900 1,115 690 425 4.9 552 11,040 58 9,900 5,900 4,000 754 400 354 6. 441 8,820	55								1,340	26,800
57	50									
20. 33400. 23900. 43000. 734. 400. 354. 0. 1 44II 8,820	57									11,040
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	20,	,9,900	5,900	4,000	754	400	354	. 0.	441	ა გაგვი

_		 							
	A.	В.	C.	D.	E. Less 10 per ct.	F.	G.	H. What the User pays	1.
					on Build-		Per cent.	for the	Gross
. !					ings for	ļ	of Net	use of the	Value
ers.		Assessed	Assessed	Net	interest, insurance,	Net	Income on	Land, i.e., the Net	of Land, the User's
i pe	Total	Valuation	Valuation	Rental	repairs,	Income	Assessed	Ground	Rent
Numbers.	Assessed Valuation.	of Land.	of Building.	after pay- ing Taxes.		from Land.	Valuation of Land.		
4	varuation.	Land.	Building.	ing rakes.	Clation.	Lanu.	or Lanu.	the Tax.	at 5 per cent.
59	\$27,000	\$13,800	\$13,200	\$2,600	\$1,320	\$1,280	9.2	\$1,484	\$29,680
60	103,300	80,300	23,000	8,471		6,171	7.6	7,359	147,180
61	5,800	2,800	3,000	635		335	12.	376	
62	67,000	27,000	40,000	5,608		1,608	_	2,007	40,140
63	31,500	30,000	1,500	574		424	1.4	868	
64	54,400	35,400	19,000	3,595		1,695	4.8	2,219	1.0_
65	6,700	4,200	2,500	400		150	3.6	212	4,240
66	32,500	13,800	18,700	2,099	1,870	229	1.6	433	8,660
67	128,000	112,000	16,000	9,505		7,905	7.	9,562	191,240
68	48,800	38,800	10,000			3,278	8.5	3,852	
69	20,900	15,400	5,500	804		254	1.6	482	
70	12,500	6,900	5,600			155	2.2	257	
71	9,800	7,000	2,800			415	5.9	518	
72	15,900	12,400	3,500				3.4	598	
73	13,000	7,000 113,800	6,000 10,200	1,008 6,000		308	4.4	411	
74 75	124,000	7,100	5,400	1	1 .	4,980	4.4	6,664	00.
76	100,000	46,000	54,000			235 1,434	3.3	2,115	
77	20,500	6,900	13,600	1,977		617	3. I 8.8	719	
78	317,000	269,600	47,400		4,740			14,250	285,000
	58,000	13,500	44,500			4,691	34.7	4,891	97,820
79 80	57,000	34,000	23,000				5.6	2,417	
81	61,500	55,500	6,000	2,300			3.	2,521	
82	200,000	170,000	30,000	9,940	3,000	6,940	4.I	9.456	189,120
83	220,000	199,500	20,500	8,744	2,050	6,694	3.4	9,646	
84	56,400	47,900	8,500				3.2	2,224	
85	2,000	1,300	700				1.08	159	
86 87	36,300	22,000	14,300					88	
88	77,500 28,000	70,500 12,900	7,000					3,343	
89	41,900	23,900	18,000				3.7 12.5	3,333	
90	22,200	8,200	14,000	2,311	1,400		11.1	1,032	
91	35,000	28,000	7,000				E .	1,809	
92	24,200	19,200	5,000		1 .			1,926	
93	17,500	14,000	3,500			823		1,030	
94	27,900	26,400	1,500					827	
95	13,500	10,500	3,000	640	300			495	
96	4,000	2,100	1,900					261	
97	4,500	2,500	2,000	1 000		, ,,,		190	
98	4,900	3,200	1,700					447	
99	9,300	6,300	3,000				, .	305	
100	6,000 6,300	3,700 4,000	2,300				1	155	
101	24,600	20,700	2,300					156	
103	9,100	7,100						250	
104	7,200	6,000	1,200		'I			212	
105	8,300	6,000				187	3.1	276	5,520
106	8,300	6,000	2,300			187	3.1	276	
107	7,900	5,600	2,300	363	230		2.3	216	4,320
108	6,900	4,300	2,600	378	230		3.4	211	
109		5,300	2,300	368	3 230	138	2.6	216	4,320
110	7,500	.4,700	2,800					158	3,160
III	7,000	4,700	2,300					155	
112						, ,		339	
113 114				350			1	155	
115		4,700	2,600	359			1	150	3,620
116								154	
	J,	3,300	-,500	-0,	, -00	-93	, 5.~	- 3-	3,000

	A.	в.	С.	D.	E.	F.	G.	н.	I.
					Less			What the	
					io per ct. on Build-		Per cent.	User pays for the	Gross
.					ings for	i	of Net	use of the	Value
Numbers.		Assessed	Assessed	Net	interest, insurance.	Net	Income	Land, i.e., the Net	of Land, the User's
유 	Total	Valuation	Valuation	Rental	repairs,	Income	Assessed	Ground	Rent
n Z	Assessed Valuation.	of Land.	of Building.	after pay- ing Taxes.	and depre- ciation.	from Land.	Valuation of Land.		
~				1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	CIRCLE	Danu.	————	the Tax.	at 5 per cent.
. 117	\$5,200	\$3,400	\$1,800	\$283	\$180	\$103	3∙	\$153	\$3,060
118	2,800	1,600	1,200		120	7 9.	4.9	102	
119	3,200	1,500	1,700	311	170	141	9.2	163	3,260
I 20	9,900	5,900	4,000			354	6.	441	8,820
121	64,000	29,000	35,000		3,500	4,463	15.4	4,892	
122	12,000 40,500	5,500	6,500		650	172	3. I	253	5,060
123	7,600	31,500 3,600	9,000 4,000		,	1,900	6.	2,366	
125	3,500	1,500	2,000			903 98	$6\frac{1}{2}$	956 I 20	
126	631,300	331,300	300,000			20,000	6.	24,903	
127	8,300	3,300	5,000		500	277	8.4	325	6,500
128	33,000	9,000	24,000	5,012		2,612	29.	2,745	
129	7,700	2,500	5,200			-34] 3	60
130	23,000	10,000	13,000			510	5.1	658	
131	25,800 11,800	16,600	9,200			580	3 1/2	825	
132	17,500	5,800 7,500	6,000		600	725	1216	810	
133 134	8,800	4,800	10,000	1 .		121 270	1.6	232	
135	6,600	2,600	4,000			102		341	
136	11,200	5,000	6,200			318	1 .	392	
137	8,300	2,400	5,900	597	590	7	3	42	
138	4,600	2,900	1,700		170	504	17.3	547	
139	6,700	3,000	3,700	789	370	419	14.	463	
140	11,500	3,900	7,600		1 0-			697	
141	11,500	3,900	7,600				1	697	0.,
142 143	11,500 1 6,000	3,900	7.600 8,000	, ,			1	69	
144	32,500	27,300	5,200			, ,		1,00	
145	8,300	3,300	5,000					315	
146	7,000	3,700	3,300					280	
147	12,200	7,800	4,400		440	274	31/2	389	
148	28,800	21,800	7,000					1,396	
149	6,900 11,500	5,100	1,800	1		1	1 ., 5	343	
150 151	11,000	8,500 5,000	3,000 6,000				4.3	495	
152	19,000	10,800	8,200			107		511	
153	11,100		7,200		· [, , , ,		898	1 11
154	8,200	5,200	3,000		,	179	1	256	5,120
155	8,200	5,200	3,000	599		299		376	7,520
156	10,200	5,200	⁷ 5 000			349		426	8.520
157	14,400	6,900	7,500	1,287	750			639	
158	21,000 5,600	16.000	5,000				1 -	1,375	27,500
159 160	25,500	2,800 11,200	2,800	, ,,				303	
161	16,500	9,500	14,300 7,000	1 0 9			9.7	1,258	
162	14,000	9,300		936		236 833	2½ 8.8	376	7,520
163			3,000	1,422			7.7	972	19,440
164	13,000						25.	1,335	
165	39,000							810	
166	39,500		18,500				2.7	87	17,500
167	29,500			2,643	790			2,172	
168	84,000				5,450	5,107	17.3	5,543	110,860
169 170	23,500			3,452	1,250			2,36	47,280
171	4,500 6,500		2,300					15!	
172	17,000	6,300	10,700					514	
173	6,300							62	
174	6,500		2,500					31	
				-				٠,	, ,

=									
	А.	В.	С.	D,	E. Less 10 per ct.	F.	G.	H. What the User pays	I.
		·			on Build-		Per cent.	for the	Gross
တို					ings for interest,		of Net Income	use of the Land, i.e.,	Value of Land,
Numbers.	m . 1	Assessed	Assessed	_Net	insurance,	Net	on	the Net	the User's
E .	Total Assessed	Valuation of	Valuation of	Rental after pay-	repairs, and depre-	Income from	Assessed Valuation	Ground	Rent
. ž	Valuation.	Land.	Building.	ing Taxes.	ciation.	Land.	of Land.	Rent plus the Tax.	Capitalized at 5 per cent.
1		1		<u> </u>				<u>' </u>	
175	\$5,500	\$4,000	\$1,500	\$519	\$150	\$369	9.2	\$428	\$8,560
176	6,400	4,000	2,400	. 505	240	265	6.6	324	6,480
177	21,700	14,700	7,000	3,179	700	2,479	16.8	2,696	53,920
179	34,000 42,900	25,300	8,700	1,997	870	1,127	4.4	1,501	30,020
180	39,800	27,900 37,300	15,000 2,500	12,115 1,661	1,500	10,615	38.	11,028	
181	80,000	25,000	55,000	6,816	250 5,500	1,411 1,316	3.8	1,963 1,686	39,260
182	32 000	21,000	11,000	1,926	1,100	826	5·3 3·9	1,030	33,720 22,740
183	31,300	22,300	9,000	2,537	900	1,637	7.3	1,967	39,340
184	30,100	21,600	8,500	1,955	850	1,105	5.ĭ	1,424	28,480
185	44,000	21,700	22,300	1,949	2,230	— 28 1	•	40	800
186	23,500	5,500	18,000	1,800	1,800			81	1,620
188	25,800 52,000	17,800	8,000	1,618	800	818	4.6	1,081	21,620
189	104,800	39,000 86,800	13,000	3,150	1,300	1,850	4.7	2,427	43,540
190	44,000	37,000	18,000 7,000	10,449 2,400	1,800 700	8,649	10.	9,934	198,680
191	45,200	37,200	8,000	2,300	800	1,700 1,500	4.6	2, 2 47 2,050	44,940
192	140,000	64,000	76,000	8,750	7,600	1,150	4. 1.8	2,050	41,000 41,940
193	91,000	77,700	13,300	6,403	1,330	5,073	6.5	6,223	124,460
194	99,000	84,400	14,600	5,135	1,460	3,675	4.3	4,924	98,480
195	23,800	15,800	8,000	748	800	- 52	. •	182	3,640
196	19,300	15,800	3,500	614	350	264	1.7	498	9,960
197	9,900	6,400	3,500	700	350	350	′ 5·5	445	8,900
199	9,900	6,400	3,500	600	350	250	4.	345	6,900
200	11,200	7,600 9,200	7,400	978	740	238	3.1	350	7,000
201	74,200	66,700	2,000 7,500	814	200	614	5.6	750	15,000
202	85,600	63,600	22,000	4,500 5,000	750 2,200	3,750 2,800	5.6	4,737	94,740
203	45,800	37,800	8,000	1,722	800	922	4·4 2·4	3,741 1,481	74,820 29,620
204	50,000	45,000	5,000	2,600	500	2,100	4.7	2,766	55.320
205	22,000	12,000	10,000	1,360	1,000	360	3.	537	10,740
206	102,300	58,300	44,000	7,536	4,400	3,136	5.4	3,999	79,980
207	8,000	5,000	3,000	602	300	302	6.	376	7,520
200	40,900	30,900	5,000	4,916	500	4,416	4.3	5,925	118,500
210	60,000	40,000	20,000	2,755 2,612	2,000	1,755	5.7	2,212	44,240
211	42,000	36,000	6,000	1,378	600	612 778	1.5 2.1	1,204 1,311	24,080 26,220
212	25,800	21,300	4,500	1,618	450	1,168	5.5	1,483	29,660
213	46,900	28,900	18,000	3,431	1,800	1,631	5.6	2,059	41,180
214	157,000	123,500	33,500	8,476	3,350	5,126	4.2	6,954	139,080
215	117,500	57,500	60,000	3,761	6,000	— 2239		1,388	27,760
216	49,000	33,900	15,100	3,000	1,510	1,490	4.4	1,992	39,840
217	22,000	17,000	5,000	1,500	500	1,000	6.	1,252	25,040
219	56,800	17,000 51,800	4,000	1,000	400	600	3.5	851	17,020
220	25,200	19,200	5,000 6,000	3,000	500 600	2,500	4.8	3,267	65,340
221	32,500	19,500	13,000	1,500	1,300	900 669	4.7	1,184	23,680
222	75,000	55,000	20,000	4,390	2,000	2,390	3·4 4·3	957 3,204	19,140 64 080
223	134,700	99,700	35,000	10,406	3,500	6,906	7.	8,381	167,620
224	36,300	23,300	13,000	2,163	300	1,863	8.	2,208	44,160
225	97,500	69,900	27,600	5,557	2,760	2,797	4.	3,831	76,620
226	20,000	11,000	9,000	1,904	900	1,004	9.1	1,166	23,320
227	238,000	229,500	8,500	10,000	850	9,150	4.	12,546	250,920
228	12,800 84,900	9,800	3,000	1,211	300	911	9.3	1,056	21,120
230	141,900	64,900 116,900	20,000	6,943	2,000	4,943	7.6	5,903	118,060
231	127,700	104,200	25,000 23,500	7,000 4,970	2,500	4,500	3.8	6,230	124,600
232	59,400	34,400	25,000	3,500	2,350 2,500	2,620 1,000	2.5 2.8	4,162 1,509	83,240 30,180
- 1,	0-11	0.07	=5,000	3,300	2,500	1,000	2.0	1,509	30,100

	A.	в.	c.	D.	E.	F.	G.	н.	I.
		:			Less			What the	
					10 per ct. on Build.		Per cent.	User pays for the	Gross
					ings for		of Net	use of the	Value
rs.			4	Net	interest,	Net	Income	Land, i.e.,	of Land, the User's
Numbers	Total	Assessed Valuation	Assessed Valuation	Rental	insurance, repairs,	Income	on Assessed	the Net Ground	Rent
nn	Assessed	of	of	after pay-	and depre	from	Valuation	Rent plus	Capitalized
Z	Valuation.	Land.	Building.	ing Taxes.	ciation.	Land.	of Land.	the Tax.	at 5 per cent.
233	\$54,900	\$40,900	\$14,000	\$4,750	\$1,400	\$3,350	8.2	\$3,955	\$79,100
234	54,600	50,400	4,200		420	772	1.5	1,518	30,360
235	98,500	76,500	22,000	6,442	2,200	4,242	5.5	5,374	
236	141,000	111,000	30,000			8,013	7.2	9,656	
237	163,200	130,200	33,000			3,700	2.8	5,627	
238	149,000	136,000	13,000		1,300	9,700	7.1	11,713	
239	305,000 269,000	146,500 189,000	158,500 80,000			8,150	5·5 6·3	10,318	
240 241	11,800	9,300	2,500		250	55	.6	14,797	
242	13,300	ļ 0,600	2,700					110	
243	25,700	25,200	500			1,350	5.4	1,723	
244	14,100	11,300	2,800		280	-9		158	
245	13,300	11,300	2,000	803	200	603	5.3	770	
2 46	15,600	12,600	3,000			— 5 I		135	
247	13,000	11,700	1,300			158	1.3	331	6,620
248	18,000	8,500	9,500			388		514	
249	9,300	6,300	3,000			102 102		195	
250 251	9,300 7,800	6,300 3,400	3,000 4,400			45	1.3	195	
252	9,300	6,300	3,000			102	1.6	195	
253	10,500	7,500	3,000		1 -	1,045	14.	1,156	
254	184,000	104,000	80,000					461	
255	140,000	134,000	6,000	7,000	600	6,400	4.8	8,383	167,660
256	3,500	1,300	2,200					101	2,020
257	124,500	91,500	33,000					8,054	
258	5,600	3,900	1,700				2.7	165	,
259	8,000	5,500	2,500				1	27	
260 261	9,000 7,800	3,500	5,500 2,800				4.5	209 63	
262	10,300	5,000 7,300	3,000		1			112	
263	10,300	7,300	3,000			28	.4	136	
264	10,300	7,300	/ 3,000			28		136	
265	10,300	7,300	3,000			52		160	
266	10,300		3,000					160	
267	10,300	7,300	3,000		300			160	
268	10,300	7,300	3,000					136	
269	249,000	179,000	70,000					10,640	
270	13,300	10,500	2,800	,				278	
271 272	7,000 5,200	4,500 3,200	2,500				1	250	
273	5,400	2,000	3,400	1				150	
274	6,600	1,600	5,000			2	1	26	
275	6,600	1,600	5,000		500	2	1	26	
276	5,400	1,600	3,800	520	380			164	
277	6,600		4,300	622				226	4,520
278	8,900				1 22	118		168	3,360
279	12,500							281	
280	16,500			956	1,030			1,	
281 282	10,300				500 820			326	6,520
282 283	13,000 - 5,200				i .	t .	1 -	59	
284	5,200				' I			250	
285	108,000							1,96	39,300
286	7,600							170	
287	7,500	5,000				119	2.4	19	3,860
288	7,400	4,900		370	250			192	
289			2,500	36	250		2.2	19	
290	7,300	4,800	2,500	338	250	$\delta^{\parallel}=8\tilde{\epsilon}$	b' 1.8	1 15%	3,140

_									
	A.	в.	С.	D.	E. Less	F.	G.	H. What the	1,
					no per ct.		Per cent.	User pays for the	Gross
					ings for		of Net	use of the	Value
ers		Assessed	Assessed	Net	interest, insurance,	Net	Income on	Land, i.e., the Net	of Land, the User's
e d	Total	Valuation	Valuation .	Rental	repairs,	Income	Assessed	Ground	Rent
Numbers.	Assessed Valuation.	of Land.	of Building.	ing Taxes.	and depre- ciation.	from Land.	Valuation of Land.	the Tax.	Capitalized at 5 per cent.
— 					!			<u>'</u>	1
291	\$6,300	\$4,100	\$2,200	· \$363	\$220	\$143	3.1	\$203	\$4,060
292	117,900	97,900	20,000		2,000	5,255	5.4	6,704	
293	54,800	39,300	15,500	1,589	1,550	39	, I	620	
294 295	352,000	288,000	64,000			11,600	4.	15,862	
296	159,000 4,700	147,200 1,700	11,800 3,000	10,300 452	1,180 300	9,120 152	6.2 9.	11,298	
297	8,400	6,400	2,000	1,200	200	1,000	15.6	1,095	
298	320,000		34,400		3,440	11,824	4.I	16.051	
299	7,800	2,300	5,500		550	19	.9	53	
300	27,300	15,800	11.500		1,150	630	4.	864	
301	36,500	24,400	12,100	,,,	1,210	350	1.4	711	14,220
302	45,500	40,000	5,500		550	577	1.4	1,169	
303 304	14,500	10,900	3,600		360	985	9.	1,146	1
304	14,900 400,000	8,400 299,000	6,500 101,000	979 19,080	650	329	4.	453	
306	94,000	78,800	15,200		10,100	8,980 1,589	3· 2.	13,405	
307	54,100	45,100	9,000	1,999	900	1,099	2.4	2,755 1,766	
308	9,500	9,000	´´500		50	649	7.2	782	
309	4,400	2,400	2,000		200	100	4.2	135	3, 1
310	51,000	43,000	8,000	2,321	800	1,521	3.5	2,157	
311	176,800	146,800	30,000	14,383	3,000	11,383	7.7	13,555	271,100
312	64,500	34,400	30,100	3,245	3,010	235	•7	744	14,880
313	23,500	11,400 120,300	12,100	1,652	1,210	442	3.8	610	
314	150,300 32,500	28,200	30,000 4,300	7,196 1,919	3,000	4,196	3.5	5,976	
316	30,200	15,200	15,000	3,153	430 1,500	1,489 1,653	5·3 10.8	1,906	
317	11,900	9,400	2,500	924	250	674	7.1	813	
318	39,100	31,100	8,000	3,021	800	2,221	7. I	2,681	
319	9,000	3,900	5,100	1,067	510	557	14.3	615	12,300
320	7,100	3,600	3,500	675	350	325	9.	378	
321	80,000	49,700	30,300	6,000	3,030	2,970	6.	3,705	74,100
322 323	44,500 68,000	15,800 60,000	28,700 8,000	5,141 2,160	2,870 800	2,271	14.4	2,505	50,100
324	74,200	66,700	7,500	2,100 2,902	750	1,360 2,152	2.3	2,248	
325	100,000	65,400	34,600	4,670	3,460	I,210	3.2 1.8	3,139 2,178	62,780
326	72,000	60,000	12,000	2,434	1,200	1,234	2.	2,170	43,500
327	98,000	82,400	15,600	4,916	1,560	3,356	4.	4,575	91,500
328	119,000	100,000	19,000	9,309	1,900	7,409	7·4 6.8	8,889	177,780
329	138,000	73,000	65,000	11,458	6,500	4,958		6,038	120,760
330	86,500	83,000	3,500	4,720	350	4.370	5.3	5,598	111,960
331	40,400 116,000	24,400 51,000	16,000	3,402 10,283	1,600	1,802	7.4	2,163	43,260
332 333	8,500	3,300	65,000 5,200	594	6,500 520	3,783	7·4 2·2	4,537	90,740
334	7,800	2,000	5,800	785	580	74 205	10.2	123 234	2,460 4,680
335	8,000	3,100	4,900	602	490	112	3.6	158	3,160
336	9,000	4,800	4,200	587	420	167	3.5	238	4,760
337	10,000	3,300	6,700	692	670	22	.7	71	1,420
337 338	12,000	6,900	5,100	822	510	312	4.5	.414	8,280
339	30,500	23,900	6,600	1,849	660	1,189	5.	1,543	30,860
340	6,800	5,400	1,400	379	140	239	4.4	319	6,380
341 342	10,000	7,500 12,800	2,500 2,000	332 381	250	82	I. I	193	3,860
343	12,300	5,700	6,600	1,300	200 660	181 640	I.4 11.	370	7,400
344	16,600	12,000	4,600	754	460	294	2.4	7 ² 4 47 I	14,480 9,420
345	18,100	10,100	8,000	1,600	800	800	8.	949	18,980
346	19,600	7,100	12,500	1,660	1,250	410	6.	515	10,300
347	20,000	15,500	4,500	1,504	450	1,054	6.8	. 1,283	25,660
3481	36,500	7,800	28,700	2,580	2,870	— 2 901		- 175	— 3,500

-									
	A.	в.	C. .	D,	E.	F.	G.	H.	1.
					Less			What the	
		İ			on Build-		Per cent.	User pays for the	Gross
. 1				İ	ings for		of Net	use of the	Value
Numbers		Assessed	Assessed	Net	interest, insurance,	Net	Income on	Land, i.e.,	of Land, the User's
e l	Total	Valuation	Valuation	Rental	repairs,	Income	Assessed	Ground	Rent
in Z	Assessed Valuation.	of Land.	of Building.	after pay- ing Taxes.	and depre-	from Land.	Valuation of Land.	Rent plus	Capitalized
	varuation.	Dand.		ing Taxes.	Clation.	Lanu.	or Land.	the Tax.	at 5 per cent.
349	\$33,500	\$9,900	\$23,600	\$3,590	\$2,360	\$1,230	12.4	\$1,376	\$27,520
350	34,000	18,000	16,000	2,797	1,600	1,197	6.6	1,463	29,260
351	34,500	25,700	8,800	1,689	880	809	3.1	1,189	23,780
352	37,000	31,000	6,000	2,202	600	1,602	5.1	2,061	41,220
353	42,500	16,500	26,000	5,321	2,600	2,721	16.2	2,965	59,300
354	50,000	13,000	37,000	3,580	3,700	— I20		72	1,440
355	45,500	11,600	33,900	5,127	3,390	1,737	15.	1,908	
356 357	57,000 54,400	34,000 35,400	23,000 19,000		2,300 1,900	1,656	4.9 8.4	2,159	
358	20,000	15,000	5,000	704	500	2,995 204	1.4	3,519	70,380 8,520
359	22,500	19,300	3,200	723	320	403	2.	688	13,760
360	15,600	12,600	3,000	369	300	69	.5	255	5,100
361	7,000	4,700	2,300	376	230	146	3.1	216	4.320
362	11,500	6,300	5,200	1,126	520	606	9.6	699	13,980
363	22,000	7,800	14,200	1,614	1,420	194	2.5	309	6,180
364	7,700	5,200	2,500	426	250	176	3.4	253	5,060
365 366	7,700 9,200	5,200 4,600	2,500 4,600	426 664	250 460	176		253	5,060
367	19,000	8,000	11,000	1,800	1,100	204 700	4·4 ◆ 8.7	272 818	5,440
368	42,200	35,700	6,500	2,447	650	1,797	5.	i	16,360 46,500
369	66,500	56,500	10,000	3,100	1,000	2,100	3·7	2,325 2,936	
370	37,700	23,700	14,000	3,042	1,400	1,642	6.9	1,992	39,840
371	140,000	134,000	6,000	8,500		7,900	5.9	9,883	197,660
372	95,000	77,000	18,000	4,850	1,800	3,050	3.9	4,189	
373	17,000	11,000	6,000	1,468		868	7.9	1,031	20,620
374	21,000	17,000	4,000	1,279	400	879	5.2	1,130	
375 376	196,000 29,400	86,200 14,100	109,800 15,300	9,000 1,800	10,980	— I,980	7.0	- 704	14,080
377	98,000	79,600	18,400	5,600	1,530 1,840	270 3,760	1.9 4.7	478	
378	64,500	44,400	20,100	2,845	2,010	835	1.2	4,938 1,492	98,760 29,840
379	25,000	19,000	6,000	1,790		1,190	6.2	1,471	29,420
380	52,500	42,500	10,000	4,500	1,000	3,500	8.2	4,129	82,580
381	125,900	65,900	60,000	9,600		3,600	5.4	4,575	91,500
382	71,600	41,600	30,000	5,540	3,000	2,540	6.1	3,155	63,100
383	425,000	317,000	108,000	16,000	10,800	5,200	1.6	9,891	197,820
384	73,000	65,000	8,000	3,900	800	3,100	4.7	4,062	81,240
385 386	49,000 13,000	38,500 11,700	10,500 1,300	4,000 288	1,050	2,950	7.6	3,520	70,400
387	52,000	27,400	24,600	3,030	130 2,460	158 570	1.3	331	6,620
388	260,000	156,000	104,000	15,000	10,400	4,600	2.9	975 6,909	19,500 138,180
389	9,000	5,000	4,000	467	400	67	1.3	141	2,820
390	8,600	6,100	2.500	293	250	43	.7	133	2,660
391	185,500	125,500	60,000	11,580	6,000	5,580	4.4	7,437	148,740
392	39,300	34,300	5,000	3,418	500	2,918	8.5	3,425	68,500
393	7,000	1,900	5,100	396	510	114		86	— I,720
394	9,000	3,000	6,000	623	600	23	.7	67	1,340
395 396	13,000 32,500	5,700 25,900	7,300 6,600	1,168 1,619		438	7.7	522	
397	169,400	150,000	19,400	6,750		959 4,810	3.7	1,342	
398	65,500	39,500	26,000	3,531	2,600	931	3.2 2.3	7,030	(' '
399	31,000	23,800	7,200	1,541	720	821	3.4	1,515	30,300 23,460
400	370,000	337,500	32,500	20,000	3,250	16,750	5.4	21,737	434,740
401	84,000	67,800	16,200	7,500	, I,620	5,880	8.7	6,883	137,660
402	243,000	224,000	19,000	9.454		7,554	3.3	10,869	217,380
403 404	103,600	83,600	20,000	3,300	2,000	1,300	1.5	2,537	50,740
405	77,000	191,500 60,000	26,500 17,000	13,000 7,000	2,650 1,700	10,350	5·4 8.8	13,184	263,680
406	180,000	133,000	47,000			5,300 7,300	5.5	6,188 9,268	123,760
,	, 	- 557 - 20.	77,-30	,	-4,700	1,300	2.2	9,200	185,360

				1	.1				
	A.	в.	c.	D.	Œ.	F.	G.	H.	1.
			 	1	Less to per ct.			What the	-
					on Build-		Per cent.	User pays for the	Gross
້					ings for interest,		of Net Income	use of the Land, i.e.,	Value of Land,
Numbers.	Total	Assessed	Assessed	Net	insurance,	Net	on	the Net	the User's
nun	Total Assessed	Valuation of	Valuation of	Rental after pay-	repairs, and depre-	Income from	Assessed Valuation	Ground Rent plus	Rent Capitalized
z	Valuation.	Land.	Building.	ing Taxés.	ciation.	Land.	of Land.	the Tax.	at 5 per cent.
407	\$19,000	\$15,000	\$4,000	\$619	\$400	\$219	1.4	\$441	\$8,820
408	227,000	197,000	30,000		3,000	7,000	3.5	9,915	198,300
409 410	32,000 105,400	12,400 90,400	• 19,600 15,000		1,960	66	.5	249	4,980
411	286,000	263,600	22,400		1,500 2,240	2,500 7,260	2.7 2.7	3,838	76,760 223,220
412	1,760,000	1,460,000	300,000		30,000	70,000	4.7	91,608	1,832,160
413	205,000	118,000	87,000		8,700	6,072	5.1	7,818	156,360
414	131,500	81,500	50,000		5,000	3,054	3.7	4,263	85,260
415	6,500 9,300	6,500 6,300	vacant 3,000		200	480 — 18	7.4	576	11,520
417	9,300	6,300	3,000		300 300	102	1.6	75 195	1,500 3,900
418	9,800	6,300	3,500		350	45	•7	138	2,760
419	13,500	5,800	7,700	1,000	770	230	4.	316	6,320
420 421	20,200 16,200	11,700 6,200	8,500 10,000		850	850	7.3	1,023	20,460
422	9,800	3,300	6,500		1,000 650	— 440 5	.2	348 54	— 6,960 1,080
423	27,000	22,500	14,500		1,450	150	.7	483	9,660
424	28,000	I I 200	16,800		1,680	94	•	72	1,440
425 426	28,000 23,500	17,100 10,000	10,900		1,090	496	2.9	749	14,980
427	20,000	11,000	13,500		1,350 1,900	302 4	3.	450 167	9,000
428	34,500	16,500	18,000			189	1.1	433	3,340 8,660
429	20,000	7,000	13,000	1,504	1,300	204	2.9	307	. 6,140
430	15,500	6,500 7,000	9,000		900	371	5.7	467	9,340
431 432	18,000	8,300	8,000 9,700		800 970	378 564	5.4 6.8	482 687	
433	43,000	17,000	26,000		2,600	236	0.0	16	13,740 320
434	9,000	3,900	5,100	867	510	357	9.2	415	8,300
435	7,200 18,400	3,300	3,900		390	223	6.7	372	7,440
436 437	9,100	14,900 7,100	3,500 2,000	808 665	350 200	458 465	3. I 6.5	678	13,560
438	10,500	4,700	5,800	1,245	580	665	14.1	57° 735	11,400 14,700
439	7,500	3,300	4,200	689	420	269	8.2	318	6,360
440	22,500	13,900	8,600		860	1,307	9.4	1,512	30,240
441 442	8,300 9,200	2,900 6,200	5,400 3,000	777	540	237	8.2	280	
443	46,900	26,900	20,000	464 1,106	300 2,000	— 894	2.6	256 496	
444	35,000	14,600	20,400		2,040	- 58		158	3,160
445	25,000	10,000	15,000		1,500	130	1.3	278	5,560
446	48,000	32,500	15,500		1,550	240	.7	721	14,420
447 448	26,000 34,000	12,300	13,700		1,370	445 997	3.6 5.2	1,278	12,540
449	22,000	11,700	10,300		1,030	997 844	7.2	1,017	25,560 20,340
450	47,000	22,500	24,500	1,804		646	,	- 313	- 6,260
451	22,000	11,200	10,800			94	.8	260	5,200
452 453	27,500 26,500	17,100 12,600	10,400	, , , ,		353	2. I	606	
454	31,000	14,000	17,000		I,390 I,700	318 459	2.5	504 252	10,080 5,040
455	25,000	10,000	15,000	1 '- '		330	3.3	478	9,560
456	13,300	6,300	7,000	703	700			96	1,920
457	23,500	10,000	13,500					50	
458	26,000	15,100	9,000 10,900		900	1,104 225	10.	1,267	25,340 8,960
460	22,200	12,100	10,100	1,371	1,010		3.	540	
461	19,000	10,300	8,700	1,219	870	349	3.4	501	10,020
462 463	40,000	19,300 8,000	20,700 16,000	1 /-	2,070 1,600		3.1	— 176 363	
	24,000								

===									
	A.	в,	C.	D ,	E. Less to per ct.	F.	G.	H. What the	1.
					on Build-		Per cent.	User pays for the	Gross
.:					ings for interest,	,	of Net Income	use of the Land, i.e.,	Value of Land,
Numbers.		Assessed	Assessed	Net	insurance,	Net	on	the Net	the User's
E d	Total	Valuation of	Valuation of	Rental	repairs, and depre	Income from	Assessed	Ground	Rent Capitalized
ž	Assessed Valuation.	Land.	Building.	ing Taxes.		Land.	of Land.	Rent plus the Tax.	at 5 per cent.
					·			!	
465	\$7,500	\$4,100	\$3,400	\$689	\$340	\$349	8.5	\$410	\$8,200
466	7,700	2.700	5,000	- 686		186	6.9	226	4,520
467	17,000	10,000	7,000	948		248	2.5	396	7,920
468	18.500	12,300	6,200	926	620	306	2.5	488	9,760
469	43,000	14,000	29,000		2,900	2,464		2,671	53,420
470	16,000	8,800	7,200	763	720	43	•5	173	
471	14,000	4,800	9,200		920	73	1.5	144	2,880
472	13,800	5,300	8,500		850	146		224	
473	15,500	8,000	7,500		750	421 266	5.3 9.8	539	10,780
474	7,000	2,700	4,300		430	200	6.9	306	
475 476	8,300 13,300	3,300 6,300	5,000 7,000		500 700	103	1.6	196	
477	12,700	9,100	3,600	1,012	360	652		787	
478	9,500	3,000	6,500		650	49	1.6	93	
479	9,400	4,400	5,000		500	261	6.	326	
480	8,300	3,300	5,000		500	117	3.5	166	
481	5,200	2,600	2,600			388	15.	426	8,520
482	30,600	12,500	18,100	1,147	1,810	663		- 478	
483	5,500	3,000	2,500	399	250	149	5.	193	3,860
484	6,200	1,300	4,900	508	490	18	1.5	37 58	740
485	5,400	1,200	4,200	460	420	40	3.3	58	1,160
486	4,800	2,000	2,800	409	280	129	6.4	159	3,180
487	124,000	106,000	18,000	9,165	1,800	7,365	6.9	8,934	
488	3,400	1,500	1,900	382	190	192	12.8	214	4,280
489	15,000	8,900	6,100	778	610	168	1.9	300	6,000
490	9,000	3,900	5,100 5,600	867	510 560	357	9.	415	8,300
491 492	9,500 9,500	3,900 2,900	5,600	759	560	199	5.	257	5,140 5,140
493	22,500	19,500	3,000	759 867	300	567	5. 3.	257 856	
494	7,000	2,000	5,000	546	500	46	2.3	76	
495	6,000	2,300	3,700	416	370	126	5.5	160	3,200
496	13,500	5,800	7,700	1,300	770	530	9.	616	
497	8,200	3,600	4,600	479	460	19.	• 5	. 72	1,440
498	11,200	7,000	4,200	674	420	254	3.6	358	7,160
499	11,800	6,800	5,000	725	500	225	3.3	326	6,520
500	12,400	6,700	5,700	656	570	86	1.3	185	. 3,700
501	13,100	7,600	5,500	910	550	360	4.7	472	9,440
502	12,000	5,800	6,200	722	620	102	1.7	188	3.760
503	22,000 19,600	5,400 13,600	16,600 6,000	1,440 1,330	1,660 600	— 220 720	r 4	140	- 2,800
504 505	13,400	8,600	4,800	1,802	480	730 1,329	5.4	931	18,620 28,980
506	9,500	3,900	5,600	759	56o	192	15.4 5.1	1,449 257	5,140
507	7,500	3,200	4,300	489	430	59	1.9	106	2,120
508	8,000	3,300	4,700	562	470	92	2.8	141	2,820
509	21,000	4,000	17,000	1,601	1,700	— 99		40	— 800
510	9,000	3,300	5,700	917	570	347	10.5	396	7,920
511	9,000	3,400	5,600	917	560	357	10.5	407	8,140
512	9,000	3,000	6,000	827	600	227	7.6	271	5,420
513	3,700	1,900	1,800	365	180	185	10.	213	4,260
514	8,700	2,700	6,000	591	600	 9		31	620
515	11,700	5,700	6,000	1,740		1,140	20.	I,224	24,480
516	9,00 0	4,800	4,200	643		223	4-7	294	5,880
517	8,200	4,000	4,200	1,079 886	420	659 486	16.5	718	14,360
518	11,500 6,000	7,500 1,800	4,000	47I	400 420		6.5	597	11,940
519 520	10,000	3,000	7,000	1,052	700	51 352	3. 11.7	77 396	1,540 7,920
521	19,500	10,500	9,000		900	411	4.	566	
522	9,000	5,300						445	
-				,		- ,	-		

	А.	в.	C.	D.	E. Less	F.	G.	H. What the	1.
	: .	:			on Build- ings for interest,		Per cent. of Net Income	User pays for the use of the Land, i.e.,	Gross Value of Land,
Numbers.	Total	Assessed Valuation	Assessed Valuation	Net Rental	insurance, repairs,	rance, Net		the Net	the User's Rent
Nu	Assessed Valuation.	of Land.	of Building.	after pay- ing Taxes.	and depre- ciation.	from Land.	of Land.	Rent plus the Tax.	Capitalized at 5 per cent.
523	\$6,300	\$4,300	\$2,000	\$1,407	\$200	\$1,207	29.	\$1,271	\$25,420
524	50,000	21,900 36,200	28,100		2,810	1,750	8.	2,074	
525 526	52,700 27,400	10,900	16,500 16,500		1,650 1,650	2,670 — 56	7.4	3,206	
527	68,500	41,400	27,100			4,276	10.3	4,889	
528	19,900	9,600	10,300		1,030	1,275	13.3	1,417	
529	3,100	1,600	1,500			260		284	
530	8,000	6,400	1,600			332		427	()
531	11,500	4,900	6,600 6,600		660 660	270		342	
532 533	• 11,500 15,400	4,900 10,900	4,500			370 593		754	1
534	194,500	168,500	26,000			2,721		5,215	
535	9,500	7,000	2,500		250	609		713	
536	9,000	5,500	3,500		350		.4	102	
537	. 9,500	5,400	4,100	859				529	
538	13,000	5,900 516,000	7,100 64,000			98		185	
539 540	580,000 454,000	437,300	16,700			35,600 16,330		43,237	
541	216,000	192,000	24,000					12,245	1.5
542	150,700	118,700	32,000					7,057	
543	106,500	81,500	25,000	8,299	2,500			7,00	
544	325,000	315,000	10,000		1 '-	9,		9,662	
545	425,000	317,000	108,000				1	25,892	
546 547	61,500 22,000	20,800 5,400	40,700 16,600					1,328	
548	13,600	8,200	5,400	, , , ,			1	400	1 -
549	11,000	4,600	6,400					210	4,300
550	9,900	3,900	6,000	1,200		600	15.4	. 658	13,160
551	44,300	16,300	28,000					1,68	33,700
552	12,400	10,600	1,800	_				877	
553 554	7,500 9,100	6,500 7,100	1,000 2,000					366	
555	12,600	9,600	3,000					770	
556	9,800	9,000	800					908	
557	46,600		18,000	3,510	1,800	1,710		2,13	
558	13,400	8,600	4,800					1,168	20.0
559 560	44,500 16,300	25,500 11,100	19,000 5,200					3,47	
561	21,300	18,300						453 73 ⁶	
562	14,800	12,800	2,000					310	
563	8,100	6,900		150		30		132	
564	208,000	188,000			1 .	1		10,782	
565	10,800	9,500	1,300				.	1,23	1
566 567	20,000 98,000	11,000 82,400	9,000				(4'	
568	302,500	246,400				1,560 2,640 3.2 3.8 5,610 14,390 5.8 18,6		18,03	
569							6.1	2,570	
570		14,600		1,080	700	380		596	
571	141,000					3,813	3.1	5,620	112,520
572	200,000							6,05	5 121,120
573								5,76	
574 575							1 1	1,44	
576	78,300							2,74	
577	249,800	234,800	15,000		1,500	9,500		12,97	
577 578	9,000						3 10.8	640	12,800
579 580	6,300		,	68	450			26.	
580	6,400	1,900	4,500	68	51 450) 23	5 12.4	26	3 ¹ 5,260

=									
	A.	в.	с.	D. .	E.	F.	G.	н.	I.
İ					Less to per ct.	Ì		What the User pays	
					on Build-		Per cent.	for the	Gross
					ings for interest,	of Net us		use of the	
Numbers.		Assessed	Assessed	Net	insurance,	Net Income L		Land, i.e., the Net	of Land, the User's
шp	Total	Valuation	Valuation	Rental	repairs,	Income	Assessed	Ground	Rent
2	Assessed Valuation.	of Land.	of Building.	after pay- ing Taxes.	and depre-	from Land.	Valuation of Land.	Rent plus the Tax.	
			24					the Taxi	at 5 per cent.
581	\$250,000	\$88,100	\$161,900	\$26,300	\$16,190	\$10,110	11.5	\$11,414	\$228,280
582	27,500	22,500	5,000	2,593	500	2,093	9.3	2,426	
583	103,300	80,300	23,000	10,000		7,700	9.6	8,888	177,760
584	63,000	50,800	12,200	0.1		2,268	4.5	3,020	
585	64,500	24,500	40,000	6,848	4,000	2,848	11.6	3,211	64,220
586 587	106,500	81,500 226,300	25,000			5,300	6.5	6,506	
588	255,000 570,000	396,000	28,700 174,000			8,256 4,164	3.6 1. 1	11,605	232,100
589	3,900	900	3,000			4,104	4.7	55	
590	3,900	900	3,000			42	4.7	55	
591	4,000	1,200	2,800			214	17.8	232	
592	2,900	, 9 0 0	2,000			108	12.	121	
593	2,900	900	2,000			108	12.	121	2,420
594	3,000	1,000	2,000	,		99	9.9	114	
595	1,900	400	` 1,500			43	10.7	49	
596	1,900	400	1,500			43	10.7	49	
597 598	1,900	400 10,900	1,500 44,100			134 172	33.5	140	1 2
599	12,100	2,100	10,000		4,410 1,000	621	29.6	333 652	
600	6,000	1,900	4,100		410	- 19	29.0	9	
601	7,800	1,800	6,000		600	269			
602	7,600	1,600	6,000	848	600	248	15.5	296	
603	21,700	3,700	18,000		1,800	- 441		386	
604	5,800	1,800	4,000			114	6.3	141	2,820
605	4,900	1,400	3,500			- 159		138	
606	4,900	1,400	3,500		350	— 63		42	
607 608	4,100 1,800	1,500	2,600		1	57		35	700
609	4,700	1,300 1,300	500 3,400			139 70		158	
610	7,000	2,500	4,500			264		227	4,540
611	4,700	1,300	3,400		, ,	10	/ -	20	
612	3,000	2.500	500			230	92	267	
613	3,300	1,300	2,000		200	51	3.9	70	5.0.
614	5,900	3,400	2,500	393	250	143	4.2	193	
615	14,600	9,100	5,5∞	924		374	4.1	509	10,180
616	13,200	5,200	8,000	621		— 1 79		102	, ,
617	14,800 11,800	6,800 5,800	8,000 6,000	1 5				110	
619	8.700	3,200	5,500	533 471		— 6 ₇ — 79		19	1
620	6,000	1,500	4,500		550 450	661	44.1	683	640 13,660
621	13,300	4,100	9,200			323	7.9	384	
622	11,000	2,500	8,500			— I 37	1.5	100	
623	11,200	2,700	8,500	566	850	— 28 ₄		244	
624	3,000	800	2,200		220	24		36	
625	3,000	800	2,200		220	— 2 <u>4</u>		12	240
626	3,500	1,700	1,800			56		81	1
627 628	1,900	900	1,000	212				125	2 500
629	88,000	10,200 2,600						2,749	
630	8,800	5,800	9,400 3,000					360	
631	12,800	6,000						356	
632	16,400	5,200	11,200			337	6.5	414	1 2/1-
633	111,000	13,500			9,750			7,126	
634	6,700	2,400		681	430			287	
635	5,700	1,700			400	176	10.4	201	
636	9,000	4,400						423	
637	8,200	4,000		, , ,				814	
6381	3,900	900	3.000	342	300	42	4.7	55	1,100

=									
	A.	в.	c.	D.	E.	F.	G.	н.	ı.
					Less to per ct.			What the User pays	
					on Build- ings for		Per cent. of Net	for the	Gross Value
s.					interest,	Income L		Land, i.e.,	of Land,
nbe	Total	Assessed Valuation	Assessed Valuation	Net Rental	insurance, repairs,	Net on Income Assessed		the Net Ground	the User's Rent
Numbers	Assessed Valuation.	of Land.	of Building.	after pay- ing Taxes.	and depre- ciation.	from Land.	Valuation of Land.	Rent plus the Tax.	Capitalized at 5 per cent,
-		43			Called			the Park	ac 3 per cent,
639	\$42,300	\$6,300	\$36,000	\$5,812	\$3,600	\$2,212	35.1	\$2,305	\$46,100
640	10,900	1,900	9,000	1,003	900	J .		131	2,620
641 642	3,900 5,000	2,400	1,500	182	150	32	1.3	67	1,340
643	2,900	3,200 2,400	1,800 500	370 139	180 50	190 89	5·9 3·7	237 125	4,740 2,500
644	5,200	700	4,500	571	450	121	17.3	131	2,620
645	2 700	500	2,200	476	220	256	51.2	263	5,260
646	36,100	16,100	20,000	2,310	2,000	310	1.9	548	
647 648	8,500 6,100	1,500	7,000 5,000	694 390	700 500	—110		16 94	<u> </u>
649	5,900	2,400	3,500	393	350	43	1.8	78	1,560
650	7,000	2,200	4,800	616	480	136	6.2	168	3,360
651 652	3,700	900	2,800 13,400	137	280	-143		130	
653	21,400	6,500	4,000	1,103 709	1,340 400	237 309	4.8	405	
654	3,000	900	2,100	366	210	156	17.3	169	
655	119,000	96,600	22,400	5,359	2,240	3,119	3.2	4,549	
656	11,300	4,700	6,600	1000			14.3	743	
657 658	16,300 18,100	13,500	2,800 8,000	639 632	280 800	359 168	2.7	559	
659	14,000	.4,700	9,300	993		63			
660	7,900	3,200	4,700	720	470	250	7.8	133	
661	51,000	28,000	23,000		2,300	— 355		59	1,180
662 663	53,000 36,500	28,000 17,200	25,000 19,300	2,816 1,860	2,500 1,930	316 70	1.1	730 185	
664	11,500	5,700	5,800	930	1	350	6.1	434	
665	9,700	3,700	6,000	756				211	
666	8,000	5,000	3,000			302	6.	376	
667 668	5,500 6,000	2,400 2,200	3,100 3,800		310 380	1,059	44·I 6.	1,095	
669	5,500	2,000	3,500				14.4	319	
670	24,000	11,500	12,500		1,250	— <u>5</u>		165	3,300
671	15,500	5,800	9,700					86	
672 673	27,000 20,000	15,500	11,500 8,100			750 694	4.8 5.8	979 870	19,580
674	50,000	37,000	13,000			1,460	4.	2,008	17,400 40,160
675	20,500	14,300	6,200	1,297	620	677	4.7	889	
676	20,000	12,000	8,000			— 376		198	0.2
677 678	8,700 12,700	5,500 4,800	3,200 7,900		320 790	451	8.2	532	
679	8,700	3,900	4,800		480		7.5	93	
680	11,000	7.700	3,300	557	330	227	2.9	341	6,820
681	11,000	6,000	5,000		500	1,800	J .	1,889	37,780
682 683	12,500 40,400	7,500 24,900	5,000 15,500					1,911	
684	8,100	5,300	2,800					478	
685	6,800	3,900	2,900	679	290	1 1		447	8,940
686	9,400	3,900	5,500			511	13.1.	569	11,380
687 688	23,000 27,000	11,800	11,200 16,000				1.2	315	
689	24,000	10,700	13,300					163 327	
690	, 17,000	8,600	8,400	1,348	840	508	6.	635	
691	16,000	9,200	6,800	1,163	680	483	5.2	619	12,380
692 693	4,500 30,000	2,300 18,600	2,200 11,400					748	
694	17,500	8,000	9,500					491	
695	26,500	10,8co	15,700	2,108	1,570	538	5.	698	13,960
6961	25,500	11,200	14,300	1,323	1,430			59	

	Α.	в.	С.	ъ.	Less to per ct.	F.	G.	What the User pays for the	I. Gross
	-				ings for		of Net	use of the	Value
rs.		Assessed	Assessed	Net			Land, i.e., the Net	of Land, the User's	
nbe	Total	Valuation	Valuation	Rental	insurance, repairs,	Income	Assessed	Ground	Rent
Numbers.	Assessed Valuation.	of Land.	of Building.	after pay- ing Taxes.	and depre-	from Land.	Valuation of Land.	Rent plus	Capitalized at 5 per cent.
4	varuation.	Lanu.	Bunding.	ing raxes.	Ciation,	Band.	OI Dand.	the Tax.	at 5 per cent.
697	\$11,800	\$5,000	\$6,800	\$1,025	\$68o	\$345	6.9	\$419	\$8,380
698	123,000	106,000	18,000	19,165	1,800	7,365	6.9	8,934	178 680
699	182,000	172,000	10,000	1 .		9,000	5.2	11,546	230,920
700 701	64,400 71,000	38,400	26,000 19 000	0.0.7	2,600 1,900	947	2.5	2,719	30,300 54,380
702	141,000	52,000 120,800	20,200	3,849	2,020	1,949 7,093	3·7 5 9	8,881	177,620
703	165,400	151,400	14,000		1,400	8,227	5·4	10,468	209,360
704	52,500	37,500	15,000		,	1,223		1,778	
705	30,000	21,500	8,500	2,556	850	1,706	3·3 8.	2,024	40,480
706	30,100	21,600	8,500	2,555	850	1,705	7.9	2,024	40,480
707	61,500	53,000	8,500	3,590	850	2,740	5.2	3,524	70,480
708	104,800	53,800	51,000	8,000	5,100	2,900	5.4	3,696	73.920
709	58,800	40,800	18,000	4,130	1,800	2,330	5.7	2,934	58,680
710 711	48,400 48,000	34,400 36,000	14,000	3,284	I,400 I,200	1,884	5·5 6.4	2,393	47,860 56,660
712	77,500	62,500	15,000	3,500 5,853	1,500	2,300	7.	2,833 5,278	
713	136,800	121,800	15,000	4,725	1,500	4,353 3,225	2.6	5,028	
714	19,500	14,500	5,000	1,351	500	851	5.9	1,066	
715	47,600	29,600	18,000	9,936	. 1,800	8,136	27.5	8,574	171,480
716	5,100	1,100	4,000	417	400	17	1.5	33	660
717	5,100	1,100	4,000	417	400	17	1.5	33	660
718	5,000	1,000	4,000		400	18	1.8	33	660
719	5,100 7,000	1,100	4,000	417	400	17 262	1.5	33	660 5,980
720 721	3,200	2,500 2,600	4,500 600	712	450 60		2.8	290	2,220
722	3,000	1,100	1,900	172	190	— 73 — 18	2.0	2	40
723	2,800	800	2,000	151	200	49		37	740
724	4,900	1,800	3,100	263	310	- 47		20	400
725	7,000	3,000	4,000	544	400	144	4.8	188	
726	5,800	1,300	4,500	490	450	40	3.1	59	1,180
727 728	6,900	900	6,000	341 1,857	600	259	٠.	246	
729	24,500 22,400	7,500 6,400	16,000	1,888	1,700	157 288	2. I	268 383	5,360 7,600
730	4,600	1,200	3,400		340	- 8	4.5	303	
731	4,800	1,200	3,600	329	360	— 3I		13	
732	4,600	1,200	3,400	332	340	— 8		10	1
733	4,600	1,200	3,400	332	340	8		10	200
734	4,500	1,100	3,400	333	340	<u> </u>		9	. 180
735	4,600	1,200	3,400	332	340	— 8		IO	
736 737	4,600 5,400	I,200 J,400	3,400 4,000	332 412	340 400	8 12	.8	10	200 660
738	5,400 5,100	1,100	4,000	417	400	17	1	33	660
739	5,100	1,100	4,000	417	400	17	1.5 1.5	33 33	660
740	5,100	1,100	4,000	417	400	17	1.5	33	660
741	5,100	1,100	4,000	417	400	17	1.5	33	660
742	5,100	1,500	3,600	297	360	63		41	820
743	45,700	8,200	37,500	4,124	3,750	374	4.6	495	9,900
744	44,800	7,300	37,500		3,750	387	5.3	495	9,900
745	1,300	700	600		60	²⁵⁷	36.7	267	
746 747	4,900 7,000	4,300 2,200	600 4,800	527 616	j 60 480	467	10.9	531	10,620
747	1,800	500	1,300		130	136	6.2 11.8	169	3,380 1,320
749	7,700	2,400	5,300	636	530	59 106	4.4	142	
750	6,900	900	6,000		600	-259		246	4,920
751	1,900	400	1,500		150	17	4.2	23	460
T'l	35,808,800	25,067,800	10,741,000	2,277,222	1,071,800	1,205,422	4.8	1,577,425	31,548,500

In the above totals the net ground rent plus the tax (column H) represents more than five per cent. of the total assessed valuation, which in the previous table averages less than five-sixths of the selling price, and only two-thirds of the estimated gross value.

In the absence of contradictory or correcting testimony, you are asked to accept these lists of one hundred and twenty estate sales and seven hundred and fifty-one estate rentals respectively, as an indication of what the real ground rent of Boston is, but it is desired now to submit to you a re-calculation, based upon the assessed valuation alone, for an estimate of the

Gross Land Value of Boston.

The assessed valuation of Boston's land for 1902 is more than Adding to this the capitalized value of the amount of tax now on the land (\$573,000,000, at \$14.80 per thousand, \$8,480,400 at 20 years' purchase)	\$573,000,000 169,600,000
Would give as an actual capitalized ground rental value, not less than	\$742,600,000 100,000,000
And we should have as a basis of assessment under the land value tax a total capitalized ground rental value of at least	\$842,600,000
On this basis of \$842,600,000	
The rate per thousand would be	
For Local Taxes less than \$21.50 For National, State, and Local 22.50	•
Five per cent. upon the above estimate of \$842,600,000 would give as the	
Gross Ground Rent of Boston	\$42,000,000

This \$42,000.000 is the natural tax which the people of Boston pay for the occupancy and use of their land. This, it is submitted, is tax enough for them to pay. But, since only \$8,480,000 of this natural tax is taken for public purposes, while \$33,600,000 is absorbed by the "private appropriation of ground rent" into private incomes, the people of Boston have to pay an additional tax of \$9,486,000 on buildings and personal property, with the result that the occupancy of their land, with its benefits of good government and public service, costs the people of Boston to-day in round numbers

A natural tax (ground rent) of	of .	•	\$42,000,000 9,486,000
Total burden of taxation	•		\$51,486,000
		•	\$42,000,000
Boston now takes in taxation two-tenths, or		•	8,480,000
While Boston's whole tax is much less than five-tenths	or		T8 000 000

Even if \$6,000,000 be deducted from this \$42,000,000 for error in estimate, there will still be left \$36,000,000, or double the amount of present taxes, the ratio that has been claimed from the first.

It is believed that sufficient reason is found for taking in taxation this fivetenths, instead of two-tenths, in the fact that since ground rent is a SOCIAL PRODUCT its taxation is in no way a burden upon business or industry.

A Word to the Landlords.

Having now finished the special task of trying to explain ground rent in its leading features, it is a privilege to pay a few words of tribute and suggestion to those landlords of Boston who are open to a discussion of this vexed question of taxation.

Next to that of the farmer, the province and function of the landlord would seem to be one of the greatest in its importance to his fellow-men. The farmer is the commissary of subsistence, the landlord is quartermaster of the camp. The farmer feeds the world. The landlord houses the world. Besides being the natural housers and the natural tax gatherers, the landlords are also the natural assessors. "Nobody runs after the assessor to tell him what property is worth. Everybody runs after the landlord to tell him what his land is worth." With this triple responsibility and privilege of housing and tax collecting and tax assessing, landlords ought to be, as, if they paid all the taxes, they would be, the natural guardians of the public treasury against wastefulness and misapplication, for the simple reason that ground rent, while increased by every wise outlay is decreased by every expenditure which is unwise.

We beg to lay before you briefly five points of special application to the land-lord's interest.

VII. The Taxation of Real Estate only.

Every single taxer, no doubt, may be relied upon to vote for the concentration of all taxes upon real estate (land and buildings), as a rapid transit measure toward his preferred exemption of buildings also. Such a course would secure a basis for honest assessment and collection, and would eliminate the possibility of evasion, but how much of an advance would this be toward a just equalization of the burden? The landlord of the new building would still be paying, as he does now, the taxes of the adjoining landlord of old buildings or of none at all. He would be worse off by his disproportionate share of those taxes transferred from personal property.

If Smith owns land and buildings in equal amount he will pay,	
for each \$1,000 of land, taxes upon	\$2,000
If Jones owns land with worthless buildings, or none at all, he	
will pay, for each \$1,000 of land, taxes upon	1,000
If Brown owns his own house, worth three times as much as	
his land, he will pay, for each \$1,000 of land, taxes upon .	4,000

Under the theory that taxes are spent to maintain the value of the land, as indicated by the equal or even greater price which the land often commands when practically unimproved rather than improved, and, municipal expenditure being practically the same for similar lots similarly situated, regardless of whether they are improved fully or not at all—under this theory it is held that the proportion of advantage afforded by the public outlay is fairly represented by the value of the land.

If this theory is sound, then neither Smith, who pays twice as much, nor Brown, who pays four times as much tax as Jones, has any greater command than he per \$1,000 of the facilities afforded by society for the promotion of private business.

VIII. The Tax which Time Imposes.

One of your own prophets has said that the lifetime of the best new buildings in Boston to-day cannot be figured to exceed two score years, that with swiftly accelerating changes in forty years these will have to give way to a new and better order. Granting these facts, if during the forty years the new buildings shall yield to the landlord interest upon their cost and two and a half per cent. annually for depreciation, he is at no disadvantage from the necessity, at the end of forty years, of tearing down and building greater, while both labor, which builds buildings, and business, which uses buildings, will be greatly benefited by such a process. Think what a Paradise Boston would be if built over new every forty years; yet the users of the buildings can well afford to pay two and a half per cent. a year for such a luxury.

Any sensible readjustment and equalization of taxation should, it is thought, take directly into the account this annual depreciation as a tax imposed by time upon all products of labor, a tax so heavy as to seem an instant excuse for exempting them from all other taxes.

On the other hand while Time is engaged in the destruction of the building it is occupied in the construction of the land value. In the case of Boston's land this addition happens to have been since 1888 almost exactly five per cent. a year on its value of fifteen years ago.

The inequality of the present system is made apparent in the following calculation (based upon the above assumption of two and a half per cent. depreciation) regarding the land and buildings of Boston for the last fifteen years, bearing in mind that it is not the rent, either of buildings or land, that is under consideration, but only the effect of taxes and depreciation upon the one, and the opposite effects of taxes and appreciation upon the other.

Buildings.

The valuation of Boston's buildings in 1888 was Time's annual tax or depreciation (besides the city's tax of 1½% which is paid by the owner only when he is also the tenant)	\$234,000,000
2½%. For fifteen years it has been 37½% or	88,750,000
And the value of same buildings in 1902 is	\$146,000,000
Land.	
The valuation of Boston's land in 1888 was Time's average net annual appreciation has been (after paying city's tax of 1½%) for one year 5%. For fifteen years	\$328,000,000
75%, or	245,000,000
And the value of the same land in 1902 is	\$573,000,000

Thus the increase in the valuation of land in fifteen years more than equals the valuation of all the buildings fifteen years ago.

Five per cent. on this fifteen years' increase of two hundred and forty-five million would be more than twelve million, which added to the four million assessed upon the land in 1888 would be sixteen million, as compared with Boston's taxes of eighteen million in 1902.

Those persons who agree with John Stuart Mill that it would be sound public policy and no injustice to land owners to take for public purposes the *future* increase in ground rent will be interested to note what an opportunity is shown by the above figures to have been lost fifteen years ago for putting such a plan in operation in Boston.

IX. Corresponding Exemptions.

In any calculation of the effect of this imposition of all taxes upon ground rent, it must be borne in mind that the landlords, who are the owners of the ground rents of Boston, also own buildings and other improvements upon the land, together with a large per cent. of the personal property, so that considered as an *entire class* the additional tax upon their land would be offset by the exemption of buildings and personal property.

If the total tax of \$18,000,000 for 1902 were to be paid by the landlords out of their estimated ground rent of \$42,000,000, they would still have left \$24,000,000 a year of ground rent, besides enjoying the exemption of \$384,000,000 buildings, and

the exemption of all their personal property.

X. The Exemption of Assessed Values.

One reason why, under a just system of taxation, large-hearted landlords of Boston would cheerfully offer their necks to the tax yoke is the fact that so far as concerns their investment in land most of them are now privileged to be entirely exempt. In other words, the present tax of \$8,480,000 upon Boston land is not a tax burden upon them, though even this fact is not to their prejudice. But while it is true that the capitalized value of any tax on land is deducted from its selling price, and that any purchaser, after the tax is once imposed, gets his land tax free, the land-owners of Boston who have bought their holdings since the present tax rate was reached are practically exempt from taxation, it is also true that the appreciation in the value of their land may be fairly reckoned as an offset to any injustice in the imposition of a new tax. One simple illustration of this point, and we leave it to your own contemplation and judgment.

If you would pay to-day \$800 for a lot of land, it is because that land would net you \$40, or five per cent. on \$800. If that land were relieved of a present tax of \$10 you would give \$1,000, because it would net you \$10 more, \$50, instead of

\$40, or five per cent. on \$1,000.

If landlords would pay to-day \$573,000,000 for the land of Boston it is because that land would net them \$28,650,000, or five per cent. on \$573,000,000. If it were relieved of the present tax of \$8,480,000 they would pay \$742,600,000 because it would net them \$8,480,000 more, \$37,130,000, instead of \$28,650,000, or five per cent. on \$742,600,000.

This present exemption, however, is not offered as a reason for additional taxation, but it is offered as a justification for taking the opportunity to transfer the present load from the head and the tail to the back and shoulders of the horse. As an anti-single-tax professor of political economy happily puts it: "The beauty, to my mind, of a tax upon land values is that in a few years nobody pays it."

XI. The Single Tax as an Income Tax.

An income tax has always been a favorite form of tax, because thought well calculated to bear upon "each according to his ability." The taxation of ground rent would surely be the purest possible exemplification and application of the principle of the income tax, because it would fall upon all those incomes which are unearned, and which are in their nature perpetual, and which are amply able to bear the

whole burden of taxation. Of course, such an income tax should have impartial application, that is to say, a large unearned income should be taxed at the same rate as a small income of the same nature and derived from the same source. If it is right that corporations or other aggregations of capital should engage in business enterprises for profit upon equal terms with individuals, then it is right that an impartial income tax should impose at least the same rate upon the many million dollar incomes of the railroads and the coal operators, and the United States steel companies, as upon smaller unearned incomes of one, five, or ten thousand, derived from the same source. If eight hundred and fifty industrial combinations or trusts have a capital stock of nine billion, of which five billion is common stock, and that common stock is water, it means that every one per cent. (\$50,000,000) or every five per cent. (\$250,000,000) received in dividend on this common stock is, as an income from rent, unearned by the people who receive it.

An income from special privilege is usually part and parcel with an income from rent, and, as such, belongs to the class of unearned incomes. As ground rent is a social product, its private appropriation is a special privilege, which affords large private profit at public expense. Why not then at least tax such a privilege upon what it is worth?

If the ground rent of Boston is					•	\$42,000,000
And there is now taken in taxation only					•	8,500,000
The amount that is distributed annually in	unea	rned	incor	nes		
(if rent is an unearned income) is		•	•	•	•	\$33,500,000
						. ,
Or per capita for the 560,000 population						\$6 o
Or for each of the 117,000 families of less						\$300

Is it even apparently fair to let so much common wealth escape taxation at the expense of individual wealth?

This forty-two million is, we submit, the "income" in very truth earned by the city and people of Boston,—created by their actual labor and actual expenditure. Under the single tax Boston would pay all its current expenses out of this legitimate forty-two million income of its own, earned by itself, instead of allowing four-fifths, or thirty-four millions, of this amount to be divided, through the channel of special privilege, into unearned incomes, thus aggravating those inequalities in distribution of wealth which people are wont to declaim against as partial and wrong.

While that part of the forty-two million ground rent of Boston that goes to individuals may be said to be unearned by them, the whole forty-two million can hardly be said to be unearned, because, having been produced by society, it may, in common parlance, be said to be earned by society, and hence it may go to it as its wages, just as properly as his earnings go to the individual who works for wages. If a railroad has the special privilege of a monopoly in the transportation of coal from the Pennsylvania coal mines, or in the transportation of people to and from Boston, why not tax the railroad in proportion to the value of its franchise? The private monopoly of a natural resource is a special privilege. If the private ownership of the two or three billion tons of unmined anthracite coal is a special privilege, why not tax it what others would give for the privilege of mining and marketing it to the relief of a great coal famine, thus making all the people sharers in what is called a natural bounty? If the private appropriation of a billion dollars' worth of iron ore is a special privilege, would it not be "proportionate and reasonable" for its owners to pay in taxation one half at least of the value of that privilege?

Almost everybody scolds about trusts and monopolies, coal barons, oil magnates, and railroad kings, but many people do not think of the perfectly natural resort of

taxing them to the same extent even that other people are being taxed.

This bugbear of monopoly is the central point at which numberless palliations are ineffectively aimed. Taxation, it is insisted, is the only "power to destroy" what there is of wrong, and the only "power to build up" what is right in these complained of conditions.

A Word in Closing.

Throughout this paper, as throughout the late propaganda work of the League, the impelling aim has been to invite and promote the understanding of *ground rent*, an agency clear to few, very obscure to many, but as subtle and powerful in the

social organism as is the life-blood in the human organism.

Legislatures and Congresses are prevented by inconvenient distance from revising and improving the planetary laws, but they busy themselves with the enactment of statute after statute designed to keep men and women in their natural orbits. Discerning, as we surely do, a natural law in the material world, established by a law giver greater than any state or nation, we urge you simply to repeal one by one all artificial tax laws, leaving upon the statute book a single one, and that an enacting clause to this natural law, under which Boston may begin at once to administer, in doses, be they ever so small, the single tax remedy, and watch its effect.

We thank you, gentle sirs and ladies, for your encouraging attention and patience, with the hope that those problems which have not been solved to your satisfaction you will continue to study until able at some early day to solve them both

to your own satisfaction and to ours.

EDITORIAL COMMENTS.

THE SINGLE TAX.

The Massachusetts Single Tax League will have as guests at the Vendome this evening some of the landlords of Boston, with others interested, and after dinner the talk will be about ground rent. This is in pursuance of the policy instituted, we believe, by Mr. C. B. Fillebrown, president of the league, of education through discussion under those most favorable conditions existing when good digestion has waited upon appetite.

At the dinner of the league last December, this subject—the nature and source of ground rent, its volume, and its adaptation to bear all the burden of taxation—was discussed by professional economists. Its treatment at the symposium this evening will undoubtedly have at least equal interest, as the point of view will be that of the practical

man of affairs rather than of the scholar and theorist.

The single tax advocates must in time make the Legislature listen to them. Every one admits that our system of taxation in Massachusetts is faulty and unequal. No Legislature as yet has had the courage to undertake the revision which ought to be made, and the elaborate reports of special commissions go into the archives unacted upon. But here is a plan, indorsed by highest authority, for which it is only asked that a trial shall be allowed in such local communities as may wish to try it. It is a modest request. It ought to be granted.— Boston Post.

THE LANDLORDS AND THE SINGLE TAX.

The president of the Massachusetts Single Tax League proved last evening that he possesses the courage of his convictions by expounding the single-tax proposal to a company of Boston landlords. The occasion was the seventeenth — and, it is announced, the last — of the interesting series of dinners which the league has given during the past seven years to representatives of various interests, business and professional. The league

deserves only commendation for its enterprise, the gatherings have unquestionably helped to arouse and educate the public on the subject of tax reform. The dinner of last evening was, in one respect, a most ambitious undertaking. The single tax is commonly supposed to be sharply opposed to the interests of the land-owning class. From their point of view the plan to transfer the entire tax burden to the land looks, at first sight, like a scheme of sheer confiscation. To invite representatives of this class to listen to a presentation of the case for the single tax was, therefore, a novel and daring stroke of propagandism.

It is impossible at this time to comment upon all phases of President Fillebrown's elaborate and encyclopædic discussion of ground rent. We shall confine ourselves to the part of his paper which was addressed particularly to the landlords. In defending the single tax, from the point of view of its effects on the landlords' interests, President Fillebrown emphasizes two points. In the first place, he points out that the landlords would get the benefit of the exemption of buildings, improvements, and personal property under the single tax. He says: "In any calculation of the effect of this imposition of all taxes upon ground rent, it must be borne in mind that the landlords, who are the owners of the ground rents of Boston, also own all the buildings and other improvements upon the land, together with a large per cent. of the personal property, so that considered as an entire class, the additional tax upon their land would be balanced by an exemption of buildings and personal property to an equal amount."

This argument is overdrawn. In the case of an individual whose wealth is about equally distributed between land and other property, the single tax would, to be sure, involve no hardship. It would make no difference to such a man whether the amount of his taxes were all assessed on land or were distributed between land and the other half of his property holdings. But in the case of a man whose money is invested mainly in land, the single tax would bring a large increase of his tax burden. Such a person would not be benefited appreciably by the exemption of buildings, improvements, and personal property, and would be heavily mulcted by the increased land tax. So landlords as a class would be hard hit by the single tax, for they would have to bear the added tax burden that would be transferred from the non-land-owning class, which would be entirely exempt from

taxation.

In the second place, Mr. Fillebrown tells the landlords that under the present system they are entirely exempt from taxation. He says: "One reason why, under a just system of taxation, large-hearted landlords of Boston would cheerfully offer their necks to the tax yoke is the fact that so far as concerns their investment in land they are now privileged to be entirely exempt. In other words, the present tax of \$8,480,000 upon Boston land is

not a tax burden upon them, though even this fact is not to their prejudice."

Here again President Fillebrown's contention is too sweeping. It is true that the capitalized value of any tax on land is deducted from its selling price, and that any purchaser, after the tax is once imposed, gets his land tax free. The land-owners of Boston who have bought their holdings since the present tax rate was reached are practically exempt from taxation. But this does not hold true of those who have held their land for a long period of years. Certain individual landlords may enjoy exemption, by reason of recent purchase, but landlords as a class are not exempt. Examination of an illustration used by President Fillebrown in this connection will make it plain that the single tax would make a vast difference to Boston landlords. He states: "If landlords would pay to-day \$573,000,000 for the land of Boston, it is because that land would net them \$28,650,000, or five per cent. on \$573,000,000. If it were relieved of the present tax of \$8,480,000, they would pay \$742,600,000, because it would net them \$8,480,000 more, \$37,130,000 instead of \$28,650,000, or five per cent. on \$742,600,000." But if the land were burdened with an additional tax of \$9,486,000, they would pay only \$383,280,000, because it would net them \$9,486,000 less, \$19,164,000, or five per cent. on \$383,280,000.

It cannot be denied, then, that the single tax would inflict serious hardship on land-lords as a class. The single taxer may admit this, however, without destroying his case. He may still urge in justification of his plan that the increment of land values which it is proposed to appropriate by taxation is a social product, unearned and undeserved by individual landlords, and should go to the community. As applied to the future increase of land values, indeed, this proposal is ethically unobjectionable. That is, if the State should announce to-day that hereafter enough of the increase in the value of the land would be taken to meet the expenses of government, no injustice would be done to any one. John Stuart Mill conceded that this policy would be perfectly just. And doubtless most present-day economists would make the same admission. Whether the policy is economically and

fiscally expedient is another question. However this may be, we have previously expressed an opinion that an increasing proportion of the expenses of municipal administration should be collected by taxation of land values. Without resorting to the single tax, pure and simple, a practical beginning in this direction could be made by assessing land for taxation at its full selling value. — Boston Transcript.

GROUND RENT.

The theory of the single tax had an admirable exposition in the paper read last evening by Mr. C. B. Fillebrown, president of the Massachusetts Single Tax League, at the banquet of that association, upon the subject of ground rent. Mr. Fillebrown's paper was largely concerned with the application of the general theory to the concrete case of taxation here in Boston, and very interesting it is. Ground rent is not simply what land is worth for use; as defined by the late Thomas G. Shearman, it is "a tribute which natural laws levy upon every occupant of land as the market price of all the social as well as natural advantages appertaining to that land, including necessarily his just share of the cost of government." It is calculable, not on the basis of the price paid for the land, perhaps, several generations ago, but upon the increment due to all public and private improvements, and to the growth of the community.

It is upon this that the single taxers propose to base taxation, as the only equitable standard of obligation. Land value, said Mr. Fillebrown, being a social creation, and its rent a social maintenance, equal access to the rights and privileges of the land can be promoted by the taxation of ground rent alone, and by this means alone. The demonstration of this proposition is complete in theory; the weight of scientific authority is strongly in its favor as a principle of economics. But is it possible to readjust taxation practically to such a system without imposing an excessive burden upon trade and industry?

In this respect the figures presented by Mr. Fillebrown, showing by actual sales and actual rentals how much ground rent there is in the city of Boston, are most illuminating. Nearly one thousand items are collected, forming the most vivid object lesson that has been presented. It is a strong plea for the natural law of taxation in the place of the artificial

methods now prevailing. - Boston Post.

THE SINGLE-TAX ARGUMENT.

The address which Mr. C. B. Fillebrown made at the meeting on Monday night of the Massachusetts Single Tax League contained a great deal of highly valuable statistical information. Mr. Fillebrown, as president of the league, was endeavoring to bring to the attention of his guests of the evening, who represented some of the large real estate interests of the city, the economic as well as social advantage which would accrue to the citizens of Boston if our city were permitted by the Legislature to raise the money needed for public expenditures by confining its assessments entirely to ground rents and public-service franchises.

The basis of Henry George's doctrine, upon which the single-tax propaganda rests, is the conviction which he entertained, and which others before him have professed, that the absolute ownership of land by individuals is just as unnatural and wrong as would be the control by individuals of the air which we breathe. Whatever man may do to improve land, whether by reclaiming it, irrigating it, or building upon it, represents an outgo of time, labor, and money, the results of which he might fairly assert to be his own; but the value of land is something which is ordinarily beyond the control of any individual land There is a large quantity of land, even in this thickly settled State of Massachusetts, which can be bought for from \$1 to \$2 per acre, but the erection upon such land of a building like the Exchange or the Ames buildings would not raise the value of the area thus covered to \$50, \$75 or \$100 per square foot. That land in this city has values even greater than those just named is due to the fact that ours is a great community, a business centre having tributary to it a million and a quarter of people. It is these, and the multifarious demands which their social and industrial conditions occasion, which make the difference in value between a corner lot on State street or Washington street and an equal area on Cape Cod or among the Berkshire hills.

Land values are thus created, not by the individual owner, but by his fellow-citizens, and are based upon the rent or income which may be obtained by those who possess these real estate monopolies. The logical deduction to be drawn from Henry George's line of reasoning would be that those possessing these monopolies should be deprived of them for

the purpose of having the gains in value created by the community distributed among the community. Under existing conditions such a change would be looked upon as confiscation, and hence Henry George, and more particularly his successors, have confined themselves, as Mr. Fillebrown has, to the work of endeavoring to show that, if the income from land values, that is, the so-called ground rent, were divided between the owner of real estate and the community as represented by the local government, local taxes of all kinds could be entirely abolished.

It has been sometimes said that the entire income from land values, apart from improvements, would not be sufficient to pay the running expenses of a city such as Boston, and it is to the work of disproving this statement that Mr. Fillebrown has of late turned his attention. The statistical part of his address indicated that he had spent a great deal of time and trouble in collecting the data needed to demonstrate the correctness of his judgment. One of these tests was made by obtaining the price at which 120 pieces of real estate in various parts of the city had been sold, these indicating that the assessed valuations were less than five-sixths of the selling price. Still another test was the collection of 751 rentals and their subdivision for the purpose of showing the part which represented interest, etc., upon buildings and improvements, and the part which represented an income on land values. Mr. Fillebrown must have gone to a great deal of trouble and expense in procuring this information, by which it appears that in these 751 cases the value of the

income from land was, taken in the aggregate, largely over a million dollars.

Taking the city as a whole, his estimate is, based on the proportions established in the instances referred to, that the gross ground rent of Boston is fully \$42,000,000 a year; in other words, that this is the natural tax which the people of Boston pay for the use and occupancy of land upon which the city is built. At the present time, from this large annual payment, the city takes about \$8,500,000 in taxes; and, if the entire tax were collected from this source, it would take instead about \$18,000,000. But in this way the improvements that have been made in the way of buildings and the like, together with all personal property, would be exempted from taxation. If such a division of land rent were made, it appears to be Mr. Fillebrown's opinion that the landlord who improved his property would not lose by the division. There would then be a new incentive to carry on business of all kinds in Boston, as such operations would be free from tax burdens, while this exemption from taxation would apply to all buildings that were put up for the purpose of utilizing the land which they covered. It is, we believe, a conceded fact that a large number of economists are of the opinion that a change in our tax system, analogous in a number of respects with that which Mr. Fillebrown proposes, would be of great general advantage. Some of our citizens, representing large real estate interests, have been of the opinion that the value of their property would be materially increased if the system of taxing personal property was brought to an end and all taxes were levied upon real estate, in this case including buildings as well as land. Those taking this ground have urged that, while the contributions of those owning real estate would under such circumstances be increased, there could be no evasion of taxation, while the knowledge that business of all kinds could be carried on in Boston with no tax burden, except such as was assessed on the real estate, would act as an inducement to bring to this city a large number of new industries. But in spite of these advantages, it has not yet been possible to induce our Legislature to take the least step in the direction of this reform, and we fear, considering the opposition of local assessors all over the State, that Mr. Fillebrown's more radical measure of change is even more difficult of accomplishment.— Boston Herald.

SINGLE TAX EDUCATION.

The Massachusetts Single Tax League is now preparing to send copies of its pamphlet report of last Monday evening's Hotel Vendome banquet to the presidents and professors connected with colleges and universities. This report will contain the address of President Fillebrown, together with newspaper editorials treating of the occasion.

The extent to which the teachers of political economy in educational institutions have lately shown a lively interest in the question of the single tax is very notable. We understand that the report of last Monday evening's dinner is to be sent as a supplement to that of the last previous one, the two reports being intended to form a fairly complete presentation of the doctrine of "ground rent," which doctrine is fundamental in the single tax system.

Some idea as to what this "campaign of education" is likely to amount to may be gathered from the number of copies of these reports which have already been asked for,

and the sources from which the requests nave come. For instance, II2 copies have been requested by two professors in Harvard, presumably for class-room use. Boston University comes second, Ioo; while Tufts, Amherst, Williams, and Mt. Holyoke follow in due proportion. In all parts of the United States it is apparent that interest in this question has been keenly aroused among leading educators. Prof. R. T. Ely, University of Wisconsin, celebrated as an author of works on sociology, calls for Ioo copies, and 25 are to go to the University of California. It appears that no fewer than I,268 copies of each of the two reports of the "ground-rent" discussion will have been distributed among teachers in 44 colleges and universities, two of which institutions are Oxford and Cambridge in England.

We cannot wonder that the members of the league have been a good deal encouraged by a note from Prof. Alfred Marshall, of Cambridge University, in which that foremost, or certainly one of the foremost, of English economists expresses his appreciation of the "considerable historical value" of these discussions, and his intention of "putting gradu-

ally into the hands of students" the additional copies for which he writes.

Mr. C. F. Adams, whose statement that "the single tax would make Massachusetts the paradise of manufacturers" was the first clear indication that the class which Mr. Adams represents was thinking sympathetically along this line, has lately said that it must be the work of the Massachusetts Single Tax League "to teach the teachers." It appears that it is endeavoring to do it.

Since the banquet last Monday evening, which was announced as the closing one in a series of seventeen begun seven years ago, there has been a good deal of regret expressed that there are, seemingly, to be no more of them. It is highly suggestive of what they have accomplished that some of the keenest regrets are expressed by men who have been the sharpest critics of the single tax idea. It is not to be expected that another series will be planned if the burden of labor and expense must fall upon those who have heretofore chiefly borne it, particularly as that means, in great degree, a single individual, as is pretty well known to those who are at all in the secret. But why may there not be something done by voluntary coöperation among people who are interested, quite regardless of their being or not being single taxers, to secure in the future an occasional event of a kind such as has been, by universal judgment, so very enlightening as well as delightful? — Daily Advertiser.

AN EFFECTIVE SENTENCE.

The most effective single sentence of the single taxers at their latest appeal declares that if Boston's tax of \$18,000,000 for 1902 were to be paid by the landlords out of their estimated ground rent of \$42,000,000, they would still have left \$24,000,000 a year of ground rent, besides the exemption of \$384,000,000 on buildings, and the exemption of all their personal property. None of the Boston landlords present when Chief Priest Fillebrown made them this generous offer were moved to agree to settle as proposed. Instead, R. T. Paine replied: "I am going to ask the chairman if he thinks single tax will work. Are you ready to have it tried now?" "I live in Newton," smilingly replied Mr. Fillebrown, "and I am ready to have its operation begun in Boston at once." The applause was hearty and unrestrained. If single tax could be coaxed along by a gentle sense of humor it would have invaded the city, to stay, long ago. — Boston Record.

THE SINGLE TAX SYSTEM.

At the single tax dinner in Boston last evening the volley of questions fired at the president of the league, Charles B. Fillebrown, would have disconcerted either a less able defender of that theory of taxation or him who undertook to answer for a weaker doctrine. Present methods of taxation are undeniably unjust and there is a universal groping for something fairer and better, but so long as human avarice exists so long will advantage be taken by some members of society over others. The single tax method is in line with the socialistic schemes that are to-day so popular in many quarters, but under its operation individual thrift and enterprise would still earn their reward.

Permission to enjoy that system of taxation, if a town or city so desires, it would seem, should now be granted. Complete proof of its advantages or disadvantages would not, of course, be obtainable so long as the consumer was burdened by a tariff and the state tax would also be levied in the ordinary way, but the ground rent system seems so much better in many respects than the methods now in vogue that it should have a chance to win its way. In those isolated cases where it has been tried it has succeeded. Why may it not succeed on a larger scale? The theory has been gaining recruits for years and there have

been no backsliders. Like an avalanche, steadily increasing in force, it seems as if it would one day sweep all before it. If it would accomplish half of the good claimed for it, it would be a boon to humanity. — Worcester Post.

THE LAND TAX IN BOSTON.

The president of the Massachusetts Single Tax League, C. B. Fillebrown, recently addressed a company of Boston landlords on the nature of ground rent, and more particularly the volume of such rent existing in the city of Boston at present. As a basis of calculation he secured the records of 120 sales of real estate and 751 rentals of estates; from which pretty broad groundwork he reached the conclusion that Boston land values (or capitalized ground rental values) aggregate \$842,600,000, 5 per cent. of which would give

about \$42,000,000 as the gross ground rent of the city.

Accepting this calculation as approximately correct, then it would follow that the people of the city pay \$42,000,000 annually for the use of the land. Of this sum going to the land-owners, about \$8,480,000 is given back to the public in taxes as now levied, and the rest is retained. Additional to this present tax on land, there is annually collected in taxes on buildings and personal property the sum of about \$9,486,000, making a total present tax on land, buildings, and personality of about \$18,000,000, or considerably less than five-tenths of the estimated yearly yield of land values alone to the landlords of the city. Mr. Fillebrown advocates the centralization of taxes upon ground rent, which would mean, in the case of Boston, that the landlords be required to give up to the public — on the basis of present public expenditure - less than five-tenths of their ground rent instead of the two-tenths (\$8,480,000) now taken. As ground rent is a value created by the community as a whole, and not by the land-owners, he bases his demand on grounds of simple justice; but presumes to be dealing gently with the landlords in still leaving to them over one-half their ground rent and in exempting their buildings and personal property from further taxation. We are not told that the company of landlords present were so far impressed as to be willing to accede to this proposal.

There is much to be said in favor of this disposal of the tax question, or the appropriation to the State of so much of the annual yield of land values (ground apart from improvements) as is needed to meet public expenses. As Henry George has required a whole book to present these favorable considerations, we shall not undertake even to summarize them. Granting their general soundness, the question still remains: Can the land-owner ever be brought voluntarily to consent to the arrangement? and should it be forced

upon him without his consent — supposing that were possible?

Both of these questions must be answered in the negative; and the impossibility, in this country, where the land-owner forms so large a part of the electorate, of forcing the arrangement upon him is recognized by the land-taxers themselves. Their task is now to convince the landlords of the desirability of the changes from their standpoint, which is an uphill undertaking. That it can ever succeed is to be doubted. It is idle to urge as full compensation the relief to the land-owner from other taxes. In some cases he might gain from exemption on buildings, other improvements and personal property what he would lose in increased land taxes; but in most cases probably he would not; and the State, in taxing land values alone, has put itself in the way of appropriating the whole unearned increment, which is the one thing in real estate investment that attracts and enriches.

The single taxers are fighting from high motives, on strong economic grounds, and with a persistence that excites admiration. But so deeply is private land-ownership imbedded in the industrial establishment of the country, and so widespread is it among the people, that practical considerations alone, apart from a question of right and justice, must bring into the land-tax campaign the matter of a more or less full compensation to land-

owners, if it is ever to make great headway. — Springfield Republican.

AN EQUITABLE TAX.

Questions of economics are of far more importance than the public generally realizes. The average man is apt to turn aside from a bit of abstract economic reasoning, yet when, in a presidential campaign, he meets an economic question, as the tariff or the silver question, draped in a political form, it appeals to him as of the utmost practicability. In national affairs economic questions have always been of great public interest. To-day, besides the tariff and monetary questions, there is another problem which is fully as wide in scope as either. It is the question of taxation.

At the dinner of the Massachusetts Single Tax League, held last Monday evening at the Hotel Vendome, President Fillebrown discussed the question of land taxation from a local point of view. In general the single tax theory is based on "the unearned increment theory" of the economists. A popular, though perhaps not a strictly scientific, illustration of what an unearned increment is may be gathered from the following illustration: Powderhorn Hill, in Chelsea, the most beautiful situation in that city, from whose crest the whole surrounding country, the harbor and islands and beaches, lay spread out like a panorama, was bought from the Indians, we are told, for a paltry horn of powder. To-day its land value is immense. The difference between the value of a horn of powder and the present value, exclusive of the improvement made there by buildings, is "the unearned increment." This enhanced value comes chiefly because people have gathered around this spot of land, and have, merely because of their presence, increased its value. The labor of the original owner and his successors have done little or nothing to make the land so much more valuable. Human society and the public, the presence of neighboring communities and modern improvements, have made it worth what it is to-day, All this unearned increase of valuation goes into the pockets of private owners. Those believing that a single tax on land should be the basis of all taxation pertinently ask: Why should not this increased valuation, due solely to the public, be the basis of present taxation? In other words, what the public has made valuable should yield the public revenue.

Such a large question cannot well be discussed in a column. A proper consideration of it would require, not only pages, but volumes. At the dinner, however, President Fillebrown presented such facts regarding the past and present valuation of real estate in

Boston, as to show the local advantages of a single land tax.

Adam Smith, in his "Wealth of Nations," defined the perfect tax as follows: First, it must be equitable; second, it must be certain; third, it must be convenient and throw as slight a burden as possible on the citizens; fourth, it should be of such a nature as to be easily levied and collected. The single tax theory, as expounded by President Fillebrown, possesses these advantages in a marked degree. It is equitably levied on the assessed valuation of land; it is a certain tax; it is not burdensome; and it is easy and sure of collection.

Perhaps the chief benefit of this tax is that it exempts such things from taxation as would tend to develop the business of the country. As buildings would not be taxed,—since the levy would be made wholly on the ground valuation,—this would be an incentive for land owners to build structures commensurate with the value of their land. On Washington street, for example, instead of a line of dingy blocks on valuable land, we should

soon find a row of modern buildings.

The theory of this tax is interesting, and it has so much to recommend it that a single tax bill was recently favored by a large number of legislators. With a local option feature, as the proposed bill had, there is every prospect that within a few years this form of taxation will be given a practical test in Massachusetts. Under the leadership of President Fillebrown — who has gone into the matter in a business-like way, and whose influence is opposed to annexing any Socialistic fallacies, such as the undesirability of private ownership to the single tax theory — there is every prospect that it will grow in popular favor. The only serious danger to its popularity can come from its too eager supporters who tend toward Socialistic views. At present the influence of these is in the minority. Their opinions bear little weight when compared with the host of sound thinking economists, many of them professors in the leading universities of the country, who favor a temperate practical test. It is fortunate for the Massachusetts Single Tax League that its leader represents this class of men, and that his plans are sound and business-like. — Everett Republican.

GROUND RENT AS A SOCIAL PRODUCT.

Rarely if ever has the subject of ground rent as a social product been treated in so luminous a way as by President Fillebrown of the Massachusetts Single Tax League at the banquet to some of the landlords of Boston last Monday evening. For seven years Mr. Fillebrown has been conducting an active propaganda in behalf of the single tax, and this banquet was the seventeenth in a series of symposiums that have been productive in the economical sense of a great deal of good. Mr. Fillebrown at this last meeting was armed with an abundance of carefully compiled statistics to uphold his assertion that "the true office of ground rent is that of equalization of taxation, of distribution and of opportunity;" and that "land value, being a social creation, and its rent a social maintenance, equal access to the rights and privileges pertaining to the land can be promoted by the taxation

of ground rent alone." Of perhaps more immediate practical interest is Mr. Fillebrown's estimate of the gross ground rent of Boston at \$42,000,000, and his argument that if taxes were laid upon ground rent alone the landlords of Boston would benefit largely through the exemption of buildings and personal property. Putting this point aside, Mr. Fillebrown's address is important because it shows in a very conclusive way the unused power of taxation in restricting special privileges. "Almost everybody," says Mr. Fillebrown, "scolds about trusts and monopolies, coal barons, oil magnates, and railroad kings, but they seldom think of the perfectly natural resort of taxing them to the same extent even that other people are being taxed." One of the greatest problems — perhaps the greatest problem — now confronting the people of Massachusetts is the devising of an equitable system of taxation, and in the task of arriving at a right solution the principles formulated and illustrated by Mr. Fillebrown are at least deserving of very careful consideration. — Boston Beacon.

GROUND RENTS AND THE PEOPLE.

Many people complain of increasing land rent. It is useless. Such increase is one of the logical necessities of an ever-increasing population. Every decade makes land prices higher, because while the land does not increase in amount, the number of people

who must live off from it is constantly growing larger.

Many people who make no complaints about land rents do make complaints about land prices. They say the price of (some) land is enormously high. They cite whole tracts of land that were bought a few generations ago for, say, \$5, but are now selling at a million times that sum. By the term "price" they really mean rent. Land can't be sold. It is a fixture. It is like air and water—a natural agent, subject to man's use to sustain life, but not subject to bargain and sale.

What people can buy is a certain right to use the soil for foundations of buildings, or roadways, and its properties for the raising of food products. This is rent, but there is no just sense in which they can be regarded as buying and owning the land. How could this generation be regarded as the absolute owners of that on which coming generations must

live and have their being?

If there be any such thing as real ownership of land, then the title is vested in everybody. That is to say, there is no real ownership, but the public — the State — is the trustee of the land and is bound to hold and administer it for the public use and welfare. If the public sells the use of a piece of land to individuals or corporations — rents it to them — for private use, that is right. The rental in such cases, since it belongs to the public, should be used to defray necessary public expenses, like the maintaining of roads, postal facilities, schools, etc., in whose benefits everybody can share. In proportion as this income from land rents relieved people from the necessity of contributing to the support of the public, or of the State, in other forms, the land would be doing its legitimate part along with air and water in supporting all life, and we would have the "single tax" in operation without any jar.

Increasing ground rent is a necessity, because population is always increasing, and man is always doing things, and it is both the increase and the doing that increase the rent. The speculator is always in a sense a prophet. He foresees both the swarming human hosts and the things that they are bound to do, and he knows that the increasing demand will stand for higher rentals. We sometimes think he over-exercises the prophetic instinct and places his rents too high, but when the habitable land is as full of people as one of our elevated trains at eight o'clock in the morning, individuals will be glad to pay still higher ground rents for room to stand on. Park-Street Church and the Old South will both have

to go before that time.

A piece of land fronting sixty feet on Broadway, New York, has been sold for \$1,030-000, being at the rate of \$17,333.33 per foot. It originally cost three cents a foot, and before squirrels and Indians had multiplied very much it was worth less than that. Now this increased value has been created by what man has done, as well as because there was more and more of him. Good streets, good transportation facilities, good schools and churches, good business blocks, a good water supply, a good fire department, — all these put a premium on the land and increase its rental value. These are what ground rents pay for.

As the drama of population develops we must submit either to higher and higher ground rents or to such checks — whether in the form of famine, pestilence, earthquakes, war, epidemic, or suppression of the social instinct — as will reduce the demand for land.

— The Morning Star.

The delightful dinners given by the Single Tax League in Boston have come to an end. The last banquet was held at Hotel Vendome in Boston, with President Fillebrown in the chair. No social and political propagandism has been more genial and persuasive than this. The method has been to invite on each occasion some selected class of ladies and gentlemen, to give them an hour or two of pleasant social intercourse, including a good dinner, then to submit to them the propositions which the League is prepared to defend, asking for questions, corrections, and general discussion. Seventeen dinners have been given in this way, of which the total effect, if one were to judge by the apparent disposition of those in attendance at this final banquet, was to bring them to the place where, without being certain what the result would be, they were entirely willing to see the experiment tried in the gradual way proposed by the president of the league. That is, let there be a slight reduction in all other taxes, and a slight yearly increase in the land tax, noting results year by year, and changing the proportions according to the working of the plan. The lamp of experience must be lighted before we know whether the path before us shall turn in this direction or that, or be safe for all travellers. — The Christian Register.



NOTE 1. As many copies of this pamphlet as professors would like for use will be sent them free of expense.

NOTE 2. Through the kind co-operation of the publishers, Messrs. Doubleday, Page & Co., Mr. Thomas G. Shearman's book, "Natural Taxation," will also be sent to those professors who desire it, free of expense.