J2360
235

TAX POLICY LEAGUE
309 East 34th Street, New York, N. Y.

Membership, including all publications, $3.00 per year. Single copies of bulletin, 25c.

May, 1936
Vol. III, No. 7

COMPLIMENTARY

TAX OPINION SURVEY

There appear to be three major groups of persons whose study, thought, and experience in matters of taxation entitle them to a role of authority in this field. Each group in a different way has a practical contribution to make to the science of public finance.

First are the tax administrators who develop techniques for carrying out the laws; second are the agents (usually lawyers and accountants) who acquire a knowledge of the intricacies of tax law for the purpose of advising utilities, corporations and business men with respect to the payment of taxes; and third are the academic group. Neither of the first two groups is ordinarily concerned with underlying theories of taxation or with questions of the equity of the system as a whole. The very intensity with which those two groups must concentrate on difficult points involved in interpreting and administering the law precludes the larger, more general and more detached point of view which is necessary for the working out of equitable and well-balanced tax systems.

This point of view (with rare exceptions) cannot be found among business men or politicians. The business man almost invariably advocates policies that he thinks will be beneficial to him, and the politician is an ever present example of the resultant of forces acting upon him. No criticism is intended of either the business man or the politician. It would be unreasonable to expect otherwise of them. The much more serious indictment can be brought against both that very seldom do they know very much concerning the subject of public finance. They are therefore not included in the three major groups referred to previously.

The bulk of the contri utions to public finance theory have come from the academic group and are likely to do so in the future. The college professor is freed from some of the technical details that absorb the attention of the corporation lawyer and the administrator. Since tax policies are apt to interfere less with his daily life than with any other groups, he can adopt a much more impersonal attitude than the business man or his agents, or the politician. His training in research methods and his familiarity with related fields of study give him an added advantage. If with these attributes he combines a firsthand contact with practical problems by performing special services which bring him in touch with practical legislative and administrative realities, he may be in a position to perform a very useful function in the working out and perfecting of general theories of taxation.

Important Notice. . . . . page 10
Legislative Notes 11
Timely Tax Thoughts 13
New Publications. 14

TAX BITS

No hard and fast lines exist between the groups mentioned. There are of course individual administrators, politicians, business men and lawyers who have a sound grasp of theoretical principles just as there are individuals in the academic group who are familiar with administrative details. The preceding statements relate to groups rather than to exceptional individuals. The numerous research bureaus in the field are usually affiliated with academic, political or business organizations and may be classified accordingly.

One frequently hears the statement that such and such a thing is the "consensus among tax authorities." Almost anyone reasonably familiar with tax literature can name at least five or six questions on which he considers that students of taxation generally agree. It has seemed that it might be of interest to see to what extent such agreement does exist among tax students.

To this end a questionnaire survey of tax opinion among professors of public finance was undertaken some months ago by the Tax Policy League at the request of the editor of "Tax Systems of the World."

Several difficulties are patent in such an undertaking. These relate to the selection and wording of the questions and to the selection of the individuals to whom the questionnaire is submitted.

The questionnaire was prepared jointly by the editor of "Tax Systems of the World" and the secretary of the Tax Policy League. It was submitted to several officers and members of the League for criticism before being used. The questions were designed, so far as possible, to permit each respondent to answer categorically Yes or No with a minimum of reservations and qualifications. It was suggested that in those cases where the respondent felt that a categorical affirmative or negative was not a satisfactory st tement of his opinions, he insert an asterick (*) indicating that he had too many doubts to care to answer Yes or No, or that he would prefer to make so many reservations and qualifications as would expand the table beyond the space limitations contemplated.

Purely objective methods were used in selecting the persons to whom the questionnaires were to be sent. The president of each of the 100 largest[1] colleges and universities in the country was asked to give the name of the senior professor of public finance in his institution. The questionnaires were sent to the professors indicated and a total of 54 questionnaires were filled in and returned. Eight other professors sent letters regretting their inability to cooperate, as they did not feel that the bulk of the questions lent themselves to categorical answers. The total number of responses, therefore, amounted to almost two-thirds of the number to whom questionnaires were sent.

Some very interesting results are apparent. There is a substantial uniformity of opinion on a number of questions involving principles generally accepted by economists. There is much difference of opinion concerning other questions. Many of the answers could not be satisfactorily reduced to a yes or no basis and numerous qualifications were made. The extent of the qualified answers is indicated.

A word of caution is necessary in interpreting this report. The answers are more significant in connection with questions that indicate broad policies, such as whether there should be income taxes, for example, than in response to highly technical questions such as the scale of graduation to be employed.

The 100 questions asked probably represent the bulk of the most vital tax problems of the present time. Extensive research is necessary before a final answer can be given to many of them.

---

1. Size was judged by number of faculty.

The following table indicates the composite findings. Owing to the inclusion of some additional questionnaires which were received too late to be included in the yearbook, this table does not tally exactly with the one published in the 1935 edition of "Tax Systems of the World."

Opinion of American Professors of Public Finance on Important Tax Questions

	Yes	No	Non-committal or modified answers
TARIFF			
In general, high protective tarrif on agricultural products?	1	49	4
Ditto, manufactured products?		50	4
Tariff to equalize difference in cost of production at home and abroad?	8	39	7
Tariff at uniform rate on all imports?		49	5
In general, tariff for revenue only?	29	18	7
In general, free trade with only incidental tariffs?	30	17	7
If Constitution were changed, various export duties by U. S. ?	10	39	5
PROPERTY TAXATION			
Retention of property tax as major source of local revenue?	43	8	3
Should general property tax include intangibles?	4	46	4
Should it include tangible personalty?	18	26	10
Should it be restricted to realty?	29	20	5
Should improvements be taxed at a lower rate than land?	28	20	6
Should improvements be exempted?	2	47	5
Special tax on unearned increment of land values?	30	16	8
What percentage of unearned increment should such tax take?	See footnote 1		
Tax classification of tangible personalty?	24	14	16
Classified property tax for intangibles?	18	21	15
Classified property tax for real estate?	30	17	7
Special yield tax in place of property tax for forest properties?	42	5	7
Should there be homestead exemptions?	9	33	12
INHERITANCE AND ESTATE TAXES			
Should inheritances be taxed by the Federal government?	47	4	3
What percentage of the inheritance should be taken by the Federal government by taxation from a $100,000 estate? A $500,000 estate? A $10,000,000 estate?	See footnote 2		
Should inheritances be taxed by the states?	39	9	6
What percentage of the inheritance should be taken by the state government by taxation from a $100,000 estate? A $500,000 estate? A $10,000,000 estate?	See footnote 3		
Should gifts, whether or not in contemplation of death, be taxed in order to avoid evasion of the inheritance tax?	41	4	9

	Yes	No	Non-committal or modified answers
PERSONAL INCOME TAXES			
Graduated personal income tax?	50		4
What should be personal exemptions in Federal law: Single? Married? Dependent?		See footnote 4	
What should be personal exemptions in state law: Single? Married? Dependent?		See footnote 5	
How much should rates increase per step in Federal law?		See footnote 6	
How much should rates increase per step in state law?		See footnote 7	
How wide should steps be in Federal law? In state law?		See footnote 8	
How many steps in Federal law? In state law?		See footnote 9	
Minimum filing fee for personal income in Federal law?	18	18	18
In state law?	21	14	19
Could a poll tax be so fitted into our general tax scheme (under the income tax) as to make it a desirable element thereof?	17	27	10
Personal income tax to include capital gains and losses provision?	15	27	13
Ditto only at moderate rate?	11	22	21
Immediate abolition of capital gains and losses provision?	24	19	11
Or abolition when stock market next reaches peak?	2	16	36
Higher income tax rates for unearned income?	30	14	10
All future Federal, state and local government securities to be issued fully taxable as to income?	47	2	5
Should cash dividends be taxed to the stockholder if there is a corporate income tax?	27	12	15
Should stock dividends be taxed?	17	31	6
BUSINESS TAXES			
Net income tax on corporations?	50	2	2
Graduated or flat rate?	Flat - 38.		Graduated - 11.
Gross tax on business incomes?	4	30	20
Higher annual rates on incorporated than unincorporated business?	12	36	6
Such occupational business taxes as those in the Southern States?	6	35	13
Banking business taxed in different way than general incorporated business?	23	19	12
Insurance business taxed in different way than general incorporated business?	36	12	6
Railway and public utility business ditto?	29	15	10
Special taxes to discourage chain store?	3	50	1
GASOLINE AND MOTOR VEHICLE TAXES			
Motor vehicle fees approximately equal to cost of police regulation of motor traffic?	24	20	10
Tax on motor vehicles as such with exemption from general property tax?	34	15	5
Gasoline tax to pay for all highway construction (Federal, state and local)?	21	22	11
Gasoline tax to pay for all highway construction and maintenance?	19	22	13

		Yes	No	Non-committal or modified answers
Should any highway cost be paid by levies on property?		29	13	12
Should it be mandatory that all proceeds from gasoline and motor vehicle taxes be devoted to highways? (including streets and bridges)		29	19	6
Entire highway system financed, constructed and maintained by states instead of left under jurisdiction of local governments?		28	14	12
SALES TAXES				
General retail sales tax:	Federal?	9	41	4
	State?	8	39	7
	Local?		49	5
Producers sales tax:	Federal?	4	40	10
	State?	1	44	9
	Local?		47	7
LUXURY TAXES				
Tobacco tax?		50	2	2
High tax on tobacco?		33	14	7
Such luxury taxes as can be practicably administered?		47	5	2
LIQUOR TAXES				
Should all taxation of liquor imports and manufacturing be by Federal government?		40	9	5
If so, what percentage should be distributed to states?		See footnote 10		
On what basis should distribution be made?		See footnote 11		
Should all retail distribution be under a state authority plan?		31	7	16
What rates do you suggest for Federal gallonage taxes on whiskey; beer; sparking wines; still wines?		See footnote 12		
OTHER TAXES				
Tax on billboards?		42	7	5
Special tax on oleomargarine?		6	40	8
In general, severance taxes on various commodities, such as oil, coal, ore and timber?		45	4	5
RELATIONSHIP OF FEDERAL; STATE AND LOCAL JURISDICTIONS				
What governmental unit should assess real estate?		See footnote 13		
Should the state supervise local assessment ?		50	2	2
Should state constitutions contain tax limit provisions?		5	46	3
Should state statutes contain tax limit provisions?		9	32	13
Should constitutional uniformity clauses be abolished?		44	4	6
Should education be a part of and subject to the fiscal control of the regular local government?		18	19	17
Should education be independent of the regular local government?		17	27	10
Should state raise all taxes for and administer entire system of public education?		16	33	5

	Yes	No	Non-committal or modified answers
What proportion of the cost of education, if any, should be borne by local governments? By the state? By the Federal government?	See footnote 14		
Should state and federal aids be distributed on the basis of need?			
If not, then on what basis?	30	7	17
Should states limit debt incurring powers of local governments?	See footnote 15		
Should utility earnings be used for tax reduction?	43	3	8
Abolition of towns with transfer of functions to county or state?*	17	23	14
1926 80% abatement principle in case of death taxes?	29	18	7
Abolishing all except Federal personal income taxes with distribution of part of proceeds to states?	36	5	13
Ditto Federal corporate income taxes?	19	23	12
Ditto Federal gasoline taxes?	21	20	13
	20	21	13
WAR COSTS			
Entire cost of next war financed by current taxation?	12	22	20
Entire cost of next war financed largely by bonds?	4	34	16
Cost of next war financed largely by tax on profits of munition makers?	21	8	25

* This question may have been misunderstood by some of the respondents because of the different meanings attached to the term "town." The question referred to the small rural subdivision of a county prevalent in Northeastern and Western States. The term in the South applies to villages.

Footnotes

1. Non-committal (34); others suggest rates of from 10% to 100% as follows - 10% (1); 25% (2); 30% (1); graduated (3); 50% (6); over 50% (1); 100% (3). Others answered "substantial amount", "probably high", "nearly all."

2. From $100,000 estate: Non-committal (25); 0 (4); 1% (1); 2% (1); 3% on excess over $50,000 (1); 5% (5); 10% (6); 15% (1); 20% (4); 25% (4); 30% (1); 40% (1).

   From $500,000 estate: Non-committal (25); 3% (2); 5% (2); 6% (1); 10% (5); 15% (1). 20% (2); 25% (5); 30% (3); 40% (1); 45% (1); 50% (6).

   From $10,000,000 estate: Non-committal (26); 7½ to 30% above $500,000 (1); 10% (3) 20% (1); 25% (1); 30% (1); 40% (3); 45% (1); 50% (8); 60% (1); 75% (5); 80% (1); 95% (1); 100% (1).

3. From $100,000 estate: Non-committal (29); 0 (1); 2% (2); 4% (1); 5% (7); 8% (1); 10% (4); 15% (3); 16% (1); 20% (1); 25% (1); 45% (2); 80% of Federal (1).

   From $500,000 estate: Non-committal (31); 4% (1); 9% (1); 10% (5); 12% (2); 15% (2); 20% (4); 25% (4); 35% (1); 45% (1); 50% (1); 80% of Federal (1).

   From $10,000,000 estate: Non-committal (29); 10% (2); 15% (3); 20% (5); 25% (4); 30% (1); 40% (4); 45% (1); 50% (2); 60% (1); 75% (1); 80% of Federal (1).

4. Personal exemptions in Federal law.

Single: Non-committal (14); $400 (1); $500 (2); $750 (3); $800 (2); $900 (1); $1,000 (22); $1,500 (5); $2,000 (3); $15 deduction from tax (1).

Married: Non-committal (13); $800 (1); $1,000 (1); $1,200 (1); $1,500 (6); $1,600 (1); $2,000 (15); $2,500 (11); $3,000 (3); $4,000 (1); $37.50 deduction from tax (1).

For dependent: Non-committal (14); $200 (8); $250 (3); $300 (2); $350 (1); $400 (15); $500 (9); $2,000 (1); $6 deduction from tax (1).

5. Personal exemptions in state law.

Single: Non-committal (15); $400 (1); $500 (4); $600 (1); $750 (3); $800 (4); $900 (1); $1,000 (19); $1,200 (1); $1,500 (1); $15 deduction from tax (1); one-half of Federal (2); lower than Federal (1).

Married: Non-committal (20); $800 (1); $1,000 (2); $1,500 (10); $1,600 (2); $2,000 (10): $2,500 (6); $3,000 (2); $37.50 deduction from tax (1).

For dependent: Non-committal (18); $200 (12); $250 (2); $300 (4); $350 (1); $400 (9); $500 (6); $2,000 (1); $6 deduction from tax (1).

6. Non-committal (27); 1% (8); 1-2% (1); 1% up (2); 1% surtax (1); 2% (5); 2-4% (1); 4-5% (1); 5% with surtax (1); 5 to 70% (1); 10% (2); copy English law (1); 1926 (1); as at present (2).

7. Non-committal (31); ½% (1); ½ to 2% (1); 1% (11); 1% up (1); 2% (1); 1-3-5% (1); 1% surtax (1); 5% (1); 10% (1); 2-30% (1); 1-70% (1); copy English law (1); model law of National Tax Association (1).

8. Federal: Non-committal (33); $1,000 (5); $1,000 up to $5,800 (1); $2,000 (4); $2,000-$5,000 (1); $3,000 (2); $5,000 (2); $10,000 (1); $10,000 to $100,000 above $100,000 (1); $100,000 (1); $2,000-$5,000, $25,000-$100,000, $100,000-$500,000 (1); variable (1); 1926 law (1).

State: Non-committal (37); $1,000 (5); $1,000 up to $5,800 (1); $2,000 (5); $2,000-$5,000 (1); $10,000 (1); $500,000 (1); first $10,000, next $40,000 (1); model law of National Tax Association (1); variable (1).

9. Federal: Non-committal (39); 5 (1); 10-15 (1); 15 (1); 20 (3); 30 (1); 35 (1); 50 (1); 60 (1); 65 (2); 100 (1); as many as necessary (1); 1926 law (1).

State: Non-committal (41); 3 (1); 5 (3); 6 (1); 10 (1); 10-15 (1); 15 (2); 20 (1); 20-30 (1); 70 (1); model law National Tax Association (1).

10. Non-committal (33); none (1); 25% (1); 33 1/3% (1); 40% (1); 50% (10); 60-70% including local (1); 75% (3); 90% (1); 100% (1); bulk (1).

11. Non-committal (32); population (7); liquor sales (7); for education in proportion to population under 21 years of age at last preceding census; contribution to Federal income tax; school census; some measure of need; per capita basis and proportion of national liquor sales within state; population one-half and gross sales one-half; amount produced and imported; in inverse percentage to drunkenness (state consuming least getting most revenue).

12. Whiskey: Non-committal (42); $1 (2); $1.50 (1); $2 (4); $3 (2); $3-5 (1); $5 (1); ad valorem 50% (1).

Beer: Non-committal (44); 5¢ (1); 10¢ (3); 25¢ (2); 20-40¢ (1); 50¢ (1); $5 bbl. (1); ad valorem 25% (1).

Sparkling wines: Non-committal (45); 15¢ (1); 50¢ (1); $1 (2); $2 (2); $3 (1); $5-10 (1); ad valorem 25% (1).

Still wines: Non-committal (46); 25¢ (1); 40¢ (1); 50¢ (1); 60¢ (1); $1-3 (1); $2 (2); ad valorem 25% (1).

13. Non-committal (6); local (16); county (13); state (16); municipality (1); state and local (2).

14. By local government: Non-committal (29); none (2); 10% or less (1); 25% (2); 40% (1); 50% (13); optional 50% to 66 2/3% (1); 66 2/3% (2); 75% (1); major part(1); all, if possible (1).

By state government: Non-committal (29); minor part (1); 25% (5); 30% (1); 33 1/3% (3); 33 1/3% to 50% (1); 35% (1); 40% (3); 50% (7); 50% or more (1); 60% (1); 100% to equalize opportunity and such special features as may be locally desired (1).

By Federal government: Non-committal (31); none(8); 10% (4); 15% (2); 25% (5); 30% (1); 40% (1); 50% (1); substantial aid (1).

15. Non-committal (42); school census, mileage, etc. (1); percentage of population in public schools (1); need, qualified by effort (1); general economic welfare (1); local support (1); according to school load (1); some smaller portion on per capita (1); depends on purpose of aid (1); need and financial ability (2); enrollment with state approval of standards (1); each government should finance itself.(1)

Some of the most nearly unanimous verdicts appear to be the following: practically unanimous opposition to high protective tarrifs; advocacy of the retention of the property tax as a major source of local revenue; removal of intangibles from general property tax; opposition to total exemption of improvements; advocacy of special yield tax for forest properties; advocacy of the use of graduated income and inheritance taxes by both Federal and state governments; and the adoption of corporate taxes based on net income; abolition of tax exempt securities; opposition to special taxes to discourage chain stores; opposition to general sales taxes (Federal, state and local); advocacy of tobacco and luxury and billboard taxes; restriction of taxation of all liquor imports and manufacturing to Federal government; advocacy of severance taxes on mineral products; advocacy of state supervision of local real estate assessment; opposition to uniformity clauses and tax limit provisions; and advocacy of state limitation of debt incurring powers of local governments.

A majority favored the taxing of improvements at a lower rate than land; a special tax on the unearned increment of land values; a classified property tax for real estate; higher income tax rates for unearned income; a flat rate of tax on corporate incomes; taxing insurance companies and public utilities in a different way than general incorporated business; tax on motor vehicles as such with exemption from general property tax; payment of some part of street and highway cost by levies on property; making it mandatory that proceeds from gasoline and motor vehicle taxes be devoted to highways (including streets and bridges); financing, maintenance and construction of highway system by states instead of local governments; high tax on tobacco; all retail liquor distribution under a state authority plan; distribution of state and federal aids on basis of need; abolition of towns with transfer of functions to county or state; and retention of 80% abatement principle in case of death taxes.

A majority opposed homestead exemptions; gross tax on business incomes; higher annual rates on incorporated than unincorporated businesses; occupational taxes such as those in the Southern states; special tax on oleomargarine; statutory tax limit provisions; entire state financing and administration of public education; and cost of next war being financed largely by bonds.

The income tax exemptions favored by the greatest number of respondents were for the Federal tax: Single, $1,000; married, $2,000; dependents, $400. For the state income tax they were: Single, $1,000; married, $1,500 or $2,000; dependents, $400.

Opinion was rather evenly divided concerning the classified property tax for intangibles, motor vehicle fees approximately equal to cost of police regulation of motor traffic; a gasoline tax sufficient to pay for all highway construction and maintenance (Federal, state and local); and making education a part of and subject to the fiscal control of the regular local government.

Within limits it appears that the results of the questionnaire give some indication of the progress of economists in formulating fiscal theories. The lack of substantial agreement concerning certain phases of property taxation, rates and exemptions of income and inheritance taxes, much business taxation and the relation of Federal, state and local governments is probably the result of inconclusive findings in these fields.

The writer visualizes taxation as a great wilderness in which a few highways rather well marked out are supplemented by some more or less uncertain side roads and some very rough trails, but in great regions of which there are no markers at all. Much reconnoitering, surveying and engineering are necessary in the entire area and the whole proceeding is subject to continuous change. It may even be that some of the highways which are so efficacious for the present generation will be supplanted by a railroad tunnelling through an entirely different course in succeeding generations. It is important that a conception of the dynamic and relative nature of tax science underlie the whole approach to the subject.

The professors returning questionnaires who have not specified objections to the publication of their names are as follows:

Professor	University
F. B. Clark	Agricultural and Mechanical College of Texas
Edwin H. Spengler	Brooklyn College
Harry E. Miller	Brown University
William B. Munro	California Institute of Technology
M. Slade Kendrick	Cornell University
Lloyd P. Rice	Dartmouth College
W. A. Rawles	Indiana University
Wallace Wright	Iowa State College
C. R. Thompson	Kansas State College of Agriculture and Applied Science
Edwin S. Todd	Miami University
Paul Studenski	New York University
Arthur B. Montgomery	Northeastern University
Herbert D. Simpson	Northwestern University
Robert S. Holmes	Oberlin College
F. E. Jewett	Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College
Paul H. Wueller	Pennsylvania State College
C. L. Heyerdahl	Purdue University
Eugene E. Agger	Rutgers University
Elmer D. Fagan	Stanford University
Russell H. Mack	Temple University
Raymond Phelan	Tufts College

Professor	University
Paul E. Alyea	University of Alabama
C. C. Fichtner	University of Arkansas
Shaw Livermore	University of Buffalo
R. P. Brooks and M. H. Bryan	University of Georgia
M. H. Hunter	University of Illinois
Richard W. Nelson	University of Iowa
Jens P. Jensen	University of Kansas
James W. Martin	University of Kentucky
Charles W. Williams	University of Louisville
W. W. Chadbourne	University of Maine
Robert S. Ford	University of Michigan
Harry Gunnison Brown	University of Missouri
Harry W. Smith	University of New Hampshire
Clarence Heer	University of North Carolina
Gilbert W. Cooke	University of North Dakota
LeClair Herold Eells	University of Notre Dame
James H. Gilbert	University of Oregon
Marion K. McKay	University of Pittsburgh
Donald W. Gilbert	University of Rochester
E. T. Miller	University of Texas
Alfred G. Buehler	University of Vermont
Tipton R. Snavely	University of Virginia
James K. Hall	University of Washington
Harold M. Groves	University of Wisconsin
Mabel Newcomer	Vassar College
B. O. Miller	Virginia Polytechnic Institute
Richard B. Heflebower	State College of Washington
Samuel Levin	Wayne University
Lucy W. Killough	Wellesley College
E. H. Vickers	West Virginia University
Fred R. Fairchild	Yale University

The Tax Policy League is extremely grateful to the professors who have cooperated by filling in and returning these questionnaires.

Important Notice

A number of very excellent manuscripts have been submitted to the Tax Policy League during the last few months.

We appreciate the interest of the members who have sent these articles and we realize that they have been of outstanding quality. TAXBITS, however, is not a magazine and we have tried to adhere to a policy of not using signed articles. Exceptions have been made in the case of the annual meeting papers (and in one or two other special instances), but it is hoped that next year and thereafter such papers can be brought out in a separate volume and that TAXBITS can be restricted to its original and normal purpose of presenting each month an impersonal analysis of some outstanding tax problem. TAXBITS is meant to be a factual service.

When the Tax Policy League becomes financially able to issue a quarterly or monthly magazine (which we hope may be in the not too distant future) we shall welcome contributed articles, but at the present time we do not have an appropriate organ for handling them.

LEGISLATIVE NOTES

The following legislatures are in session: Illinois, Louisiana, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, Ohio, Pennsylvania and South Carolina.

Income Tax

Kentucky. See Kentucky Tax Program.

Pennsylvania. See Pennsylvania Tax Program.

Sales Tax

California. The Retail Sales Tax Act has been held constitutional by the California District Court of Appeals in Roth Drugs, Inc. et al. v. Johnson et al.

Idaho. Certain provisions of the Sales Tax Act (H.B.76, L.1935) were held unconstitutional by the Idaho Supreme Court on May 1, 1936, but as these provisions are separable they do not invalidate the remainder of the Act. The referendum on the Act does not suspend the statute until the November, 1936 election since the sales tax is an emergency measure. Johnson v. Diefendorf.

Oregon. An initiative petition is being circulated prohibiting the imposition of a sales tax, excise tax or license tax on the privilege of growing, producing, manufacturing, processing, selling or dealing in any article of food for human consumption. The petition will be submitted to the electorate in November. Oregon does not have a sales tax as legislation of that kind has always been overwhelmingly defeated in popular referendum.

Chain Store Tax

Kentucky. See Kentucky Tax Program.

Pennsylvania. See Pennsylvania Tax Program.

Property Tax

Alabama. H.B.20 requires that homesteads must be separately listed and valued. Approved March 12, 1936.

Kentucky. See Kentucky Tax Program.

Pennsylvania. See Pennsylvania Tax Program.

Tax Limits

Oregon. A petition is being circulated which proposes a constitutional amendment limiting property taxes to a flat $10 on $2,500 or less of real property.

Alcoholic Beverages

Rhode Island. H.B. 624 decreases state tax on wines from 20¢ to 5¢ a gallon.

Kentucky. See Kentucky Tax Program.

Pennsylvania. See Pennsylvania Tax Program.

Luxury Tax

Kentucky. See Kentucky Tax Program.