

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1928

Should the Utah Law as it Applies to Inheritance be Modified

Lorenzo H. Hatch

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Finance and Financial Management Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Hatch, Lorenzo H., "Should the Utah Law as it Applies to Inheritance be Modified" (1928). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 1791.

<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/1791>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



**Should the Utah Law as it Applied to Inheritances
Be Modified?**

Lorenzo H. Hatch

Submitted as part of the requirements for the degree
of Master of Arts in the Department of Business Adminis-
tration of the Utah Agricultural College 1928.

Approved by _____

Date _____

Preface

The purpose of this study is to contrast the Utah Estate Tax Law, as it has been applied, with the laws of other states, in an effort to determine its weaknesses and strength.

The method followed in the study has been the selection, at random, of twenty-two estates paying inheritance taxes to the state of Utah. The reports of the probate proceedings on these estates were copied from the files in the office of the County Clerk of Cache and Salt Lake Counties and the office of the Attorney General of the state of Utah. The various wills, where transfers were made by will, have been studied and the transfers made to each beneficiary, noted. The amount of tax paid to the state of Utah has been recorded and contrast made with the amount that would have been payable had the property been located in any one of the following states: Colorado, Idaho, or Montana. Where the property was not left by will it has been assumed, in each case, that one-third of the net estate would have been transferred to the wife or husband and the remainder to the other direct heirs, share and share alike.

The rates levied in Utah on inheritances have been contrasted with the rates levied in other states. The number of estates paying taxes and the amount of the individual tax paid between January 1921 and June 1928 inclusive, were secured from the files in the office of the Attorney General of the state of Utah. These amounts were classified as to the tax paid, and the amount and percentage paid by each group was contrasted with the entire tax collected. The individual tax payments were used for a second study.

The net estate was determined by using the individual tax as a base. A progressive tax schedule was proposed and its levy applied to all estates paying taxes during this period. The tax collectable was contrasted with the actual tax paid in each of the segregations made, and the total revenue possible under the proposed schedule of rates was contrasted with the total tax collected.

It is a pleasure to acknowledge the assistance given by Dr. Joseph A. Geddes,

II

of the Agricultural College of Utah, and other members of the Graduate Committee; also the assistance given by Assistant Attorney General, L. A. Miner, in the preparation of the proposed schedule, and Dr. N. A. Pederson, of the Agricultural College of Utah, who read the manuscript. Appreciation is also extended to other friends who have materially assisted in the making of this study.

Lorenzo H. Hatch.

III

Problem: Should the Utah law as it applies to inheritances be modified if so, in what respect?

I. History of Inheritance Taxation.	Page 1
II. The Utah Estate Tax Law.	3
III. Development in tax theory and elements essential in Inheritance Taxation.	6
IV. Weaknesses of the Utah Estate Tax System.	14
V. Desirable features in the Utah Inheritance Tax Law.	36
VI. Conclusion.	46
VII. Recommendations.	49
VIII. Appendix.	54
I. History of Inheritance Taxation.	1
A. Egypt exacted one tenth as early as 654 and 616 B. C.	
B. Rome imposed the tax for the support of her veteran soldiers.	
C. Early European States charged probate duties.	
D. The United States has consistently used the inheritance tax as a war measure.	
II. The Utah Estate Tax Law.	3
A. Law first written in 1901.	
1. Extract of chapter 62, section 1.	
B. Amended 1903.	
1. Object. (Exemption)	
C. Law repealed in 1905, and a new law written.	
1. Note of changes vital to this study.	
D. Amended 1915.	
1. Object. (Additional rate added)	
E. Amended 1919.	
1. Object. (Transfer in contemplation of death)	

III. Development in Tax Theory and Elements Essential in
Inheritance Taxation

Page 6

- A. The rates should be stable, seldom changed and moderate.
- B. The tax should never reduce the amount going to a dependent to such an extent as to make of him a public charge.
- C. The rate should not be so high as to stimulate avoidance and evasion.
- D. The rates should not be so high so as to cause forced sales of assets, or liquidation of going concerns.
- E. The tax should intrench as little as possible on capital.
- F. Multiple taxation should be avoided.

IV. Weaknesses of the Utah Estate Tax System.

14

- A. Are the tax rates sufficiently progressive?
 - 1. Are the tax rates sufficiently progressive as they relate to direct heirs when compared with the rates applied by other states? 14
 - 2. Are the tax rates sufficiently progressive as they relate to collateral heirs when compared with the rates applied by other states? 17
 - 3. Are the tax rates sufficiently progressive as they relate to estates valued below \$25,000, as compared with the rates imposed by other states? 20
 - 4. Are the tax rates sufficiently progressive as they relate to estates valued in excess of \$25,000, as compared with the rates imposed by other states? 25

B. What portion of the total revenue collected on inheritances is paid (1) by relatively small estates? (2) by the larger estates?	Page 29
C. Is the Utah Inheritance Tax levied on the principle of ability to pay?	31
D. Is evasion reduced or encouraged?	33
V. Desirable Features in the Utah Inheritance Tax Law.	36
A. Are the tax rates as they apply to direct heirs, for estates valued in excess of \$25,000, reasonably moderate?	36
B. Is the Utah Inheritance Tax Law relatively simple?	39
C. Is the law capable of efficient and economical administration?	40
D. Is there danger of confiscation of property by the imposition of the tax?	42
E. Is there sufficient effort made to avoid multiple taxation of property?	43
VI. Conclusion.	46
VII. Recommendations.	49
VIII. Appendix.	54

History of the Question

Inheritance taxation is not new. It is one of the oldest forms of taxation that we have any record of.

We find evidences of an inheritance tax in Egypt as early as 654 and 616 B. C. of which the rate was not less than a tenth.

"And from which even direct heirs were not exempt. A papyrus has been found which relates that a certain Hermias was sentenced to pay a heavy penalty for failing to pay the tax upon succeeding to his father's house. Another inscription records a sale of property by an old man to his sons at a nominal price, apparently for the purpose of evading the inheritance tax."¹

"In Rome, *vicesima hereditarium*, the tax of a twentieth part of inheritance was imposed at the beginning of the empire to pay the pensions of the veteran soldiers. In the middle ages the relief and the heriot were exacted by the overlord in return for the privilege of succeeding to the possession of property."²

"In Holland, France, and even in England parts of the existing inheritance tax are survivals of the system of charges on transfers and transactions. In many English speaking states the term 'probate duties' is still employed signifying that the original conception was a charge for the privilege of having the will probated, and in some places the various forms of the inheritance tax are included among the stamp taxes or taxes on transactions."²

In the United States, until recently, the inheritance tax has been employed principally as a war measure. The first one imposed was the Stamp Act of July 6, 1797, which was repealed five years later. The war revenue act of July 1, 1862, was repealed July 14, 1870. The revenue act of August 27, 1894 was declared unconstitutional because of its income tax feature. The war revenue act of June 13, 1898 was repealed April 13, 1902. The present federal estate tax was formed September 8, 1916. It was later amended March 3, 1917, and was altered appreciably in the revenue act of October 3, 1917. The amendment increased the rates of the tax. The revenue acts of 1918, 1921, and 1924 changed the rates in varying ways and also changed many of the fundamental provisions. The revenue act of 1926, however, contains a retroactive provision which has the effect of nullifying the rates of the 1924 act and makes the rates of the 1921 act applicable until the

1 Inheritance and Estate Taxes-Pinkerton and Millsaps, 1926, p. 9.

2 Essays on Taxation-Seligman, 1921, p. 126.

effective date of the act of 1926 after which lower rates apply.¹

Although the inheritance tax is one of the oldest forms of taxation it has remained for the United States, according to A. W. Mellon, within the last ten years to bring it to a point of complication never equalled. "Forty-seven inheritance tax laws, including that of the Federal Government, are in force today, levying taxes upon a taxpayer's property at death, and because of their overlapping jurisdiction, it is a matter of grave concern to the taxpayer to know how many of these tax levies his estate will be subject to at death. These laws are all different and are constantly changing, either from legislative action or judicial decision, so that it would be foolhardy to attempt to forecast the future."²

The inheritance tax of today is a modified tax of the past. The early system placed the tax on the transfer of property to collateral heirs whereas the modern tax is placed on direct heirs as well as distant relatives. Utah makes no distinction in the relationship of the heirs of the decedent. The modern inheritance tax theory approves a progressive rate (1) levied upon the heirs in proportion to their relationship to the decedent and (2) increases as the size of the inheritance increases.

1 Inheritance and Estate Taxes-Pinkerton and Millsaps, 1926, pp. 9,10.

2 Ibid.

The Utah Inheritance Tax Law

The system employed in Utah is what is known as an "estate tax". The word "estate" is sometimes used interchangeably with "inheritance" or "succession" although there is a distinct difference in the definitions that would be placed on such terms.

Pinkerton and Millsaps in their recent book on Inheritance and Estate Taxes, published in 1926, give the following definitions:

Estate tax "is computed on the total amount which passes to all heirs, devisees or legatees from a single decedent." Inheritance tax "is computed upon the amount which passes to each individual heir, devisee or legatee separately or upon the amount passing to a beneficiary of a certain degree of relationship as a whole...It will thus be seen that the distinction between inheritance and estate taxes is one which for purposes of its practical application is merely a distinction of degree of division of the estate in computing the tax. In a pure estate tax there is no division. In a pure inheritance tax, there is the finest separation of each beneficial interest from every other beneficial interest; there are numerous shadings in between".¹

John L. Kuhn, of the New York Bar Association, in his report on Inheritance and Income Taxes in Relation to Investments, published in 1927, makes a similar distinction: "an estate tax is one which is calculated on the entire net estate and imposed usually on the right to transfer property. An inheritance tax is one which is calculated on the separate shares of the beneficiaries and is imposed as a rule on the right to receive the decedent's property. The term 'inheritance tax' is frequently used for convenience to designate the entire group of death duties".²

It is likely for convenience, not for accuracy or precision, that the term "inheritance tax" is used in the Utah laws. The Utah system is an estate tax and Utah is one of the four states in the United States using this system in preference to the income or succession tax system, the other three states being Rhode Island, North Dakota, and Mississippi.

The Utah Inheritance Tax law has much that can be said in its favor. The law, as written, clearly indicates that those who framed it had no intention of doing

1. Inheritance and Estate Taxes-Pinkerton and Millsaps, 1926, pp. 24-26.

2. Inheritance and Income Taxes in Relation to Investments, 1927. Compiled under the direction of John L. Kuhn, member of the New York Bar.

serious harm to any individual. The rate was made moderate and, as the law now stands, is not excessively oppressive. The application of the law has revealed a number of weaknesses and their correction has from time to time been attempted. That certain weaknesses have been observed is evidenced by the number of times the law has been amended since it was placed on the statutes March 14, 1901. The law as written in 1901 placed a tax of 5% on all property transferred having a market value in excess of \$10,000.00. Chapter 62 of the Laws of Utah, 1901, Section 1, follows:

"Section 1. All property in excess of ten thousand dollars subject to inheritance tax. All property within the jurisdiction of this state and any interest therein, whether belonging to the inhabitants of this state or not, and whether tangible or intangible, which shall pass by will or by the statutes of inheritance of this or any other state, or by deed, grant, sale or gift made or intended to take effect in possession or in enjoyment after the death of the grantor or donor, to any person in trust or otherwise, shall be subject to a tax of five percentum of its value above the sum of ten thousand dollars, after the payment of all debts, for the use of the state, and all administrators, executors, and trustees, and any such grantees under a conveyance, and any such donee under a gift made during the grantor's or donor's life, shall respectively be liable for all such taxes to be paid by them respectively, except as herein otherwise provided, with lawful interest as hereinafter set forth until the same shall have been paid. The tax aforesaid shall be and remain a lien on such estate from the death of the decedent until paid."

This section was amended in 1903 in an effort to clearly define the law with reference to the \$10,000 exemption. The opinion of local courts as well as of individuals seemed to be in conflict. Certain courts held that the law allowed an exemption of \$10,000 on each individual inheritance, while the decision of the supreme court in the case of Dixon v. Richetts held that the exemption was a single amount deductible from the entire estate. The amendment of 1903 limited the exemption to the single deduction of \$10,000, this deduction to be made from the entire estate. The legislature of 1905 repealed the Inheritance Tax law of 1903 and placed upon the statutes a new Inheritance Tax law. This action was taken in an attempt to clarify the various sections. Section 1 of the law of 1903 remained the same in the new law.

The Inheritance Tax law of 1905 was amended in 1915 granting a 3% rate on transfers of property having a market value of less than \$25,000. Section 1 of

the Compiled Laws of Utah, 1917, as they relate to Inheritance Taxation, reads as follows:

"Section 1. All property within the jurisdiction of this state, and any interests therein, whether belonging to the inhabitants of this state or not, and whether tangible or intangible, which shall pass by will or by the statutes of inheritance of this or any other state, or by deed, grant, bargain, sale or gift, made in contemplation of death of the grantor, donor, or vendor, to any person in trust or otherwise, shall be subject to the following tax, after the payment of all debts, for the use of the state: Three per cent of its market value in excess of \$10,000, and not exceeding \$25,000, and 5 per cent of its market value in excess of \$25,000; and all administrators, executors, and trustees, and any such grantees under conveyance, and such donees under a gift made during the grantor's or donor's life, shall respectively be liable for all such taxes to be paid by them respectively, except as herein otherwise provided, with lawful interest as hereinafter set forth, until the same shall have been paid. In determining the amount of tax to be paid under the provision of this section, the debts of the estate shall first be deducted, and the remainder shall be the net estate. Upon all that portion of the net estate in excess of \$25,000, the tax of five per cent shall be computed. Upon all that portion of the net estate in excess of \$10,000 and not exceeding \$25,000 the tax of three per cent shall be computed; and the court shall determine the amount of the tax to be paid by the several devisees, legatees, grantees, or donees of the decedent".

This section left room for conflict of opinion. As a sample case: An estate having a net value, after deduction for debts and court costs amounting to \$2,309.97, of \$28,954.18 was allowed, by the district court, to deduct the \$10,000 allowed as an exemption and then levy a 3% rate on the remaining \$18,954.18. An appeal was made by the State Treasurer to the Supreme Court. The decision of the lower court was reversed and the \$28,954.18 was regarded as the net estate. The excess over \$25,000, or \$3,954.18, was ordered to carry a levy of 5% and the \$15,000, or the amount above \$10,000 and below \$25,000, was assessed at the 3% rate.¹

The Inheritance Tax law of 1915 was amended in 1919 in an attempt to prevent the transfer of property made in "contemplation of death". The addition to Section 3185 follows:

Chapter 64, Laws of Utah. Inheritance Tax laws, 1919. Amending 3185. Subject Property-rate-lien on estate added, "and for the purpose of this act any transfer of a material part of any such property in the nature of a final disposition or

¹ Report of Hone's Estate, Utah Reports, Volume 50, p. 52.

distribution thereof, made by the decedent within three years prior to his death, except in the case of a bona fide sale for a fair consideration in money or money's worth, unless shown to the contrary, shall be deemed to have been made in contemplation of death".

Section 3186 was amended allowing a further deduction, not to exceed \$200, for a tombstone, provided it be erected before the settlement of the estate. Other sections were amended transferring the duty for collection of the inheritance tax for this state, from the State Treasurer to the Attorney General.

Development in Tax Theory and the Elements Essential in Inheritance Taxation

The development in theories governing taxation has moved forward very rapidly during the last half century. Adam Smith presented canons of taxation that have been developed to a point he possibly would have thought it impossible to exceed. He says ability to pay "is in proportion to the revenue which they respectively enjoy".¹ Proportional taxation is fast losing its supporters. Development in theories has extended so far since the time of Adam Smith that proponents of the theory of progression would hesitate to accept proportional taxation as even approaching the theory of "ability to pay".

Criticism of the general property tax had gained such momentum by 1893 that its advocates were ready to admit that some radical change must be made in the tax system. The tax on general property had been worn to such an extent that its weaknesses were evident even to those only casually interested. The writers of most state constitutions believed in equality in taxation. They, therefore, attempted to write that provision into their laws. Utah made the following provision:

"Section 2. (What property taxable. Definitions. Revenues.) All property in the State, not exempt under the laws of the United States, or under this Constitution, shall be taxed in proportion to its value, to be ascertained as provided by law. The word property, as used in this article, is hereby declared

1 Wealth of Nation-Adam Smith, pp. 414-416.

to include monies, credits, bonds, stocks, franchises and all matters and things (real, personal and mixed) capable of private ownership; but this shall not be construed as to authorize the taxation of the stocks of any company or corporation, when the property of such company or corporation represented by such stocks, has been taxed. The Legislature shall provide by law for an annual tax sufficient, with other sources of revenue, to defray the estimated ordinary expenses of the state for each fiscal year. For the purpose of paying the State debt, if any there be, the Legislature shall provide for levying a tax annually, sufficient to pay the annual interest and principal of such debt, within twenty years from the final passage of the law creating the debt".¹

The terms of the constitution further provide that there shall be "equality in taxation".

"Section 3. (Legislature to provide uniform tax. Exemptions.) The Legislature shall provide by law a uniform and equal rate of assessment and taxation on all property in the State, according to its value in money, and shall prescribe by general law such regulations as shall secure a just valuation for taxation of all property, so that every person and corporation shall pay a tax in proportion to the value of his, her or its property: Provided, That a deduction of debits and credits may be authorized: Provided further, That the property of the United States, of the libraries, lots with buildings and places of burial not held or used for private corporate benefit, shall be exempt from taxation. Ditches, canals, reservoirs, pipes and flumes owned and used by individuals or corporations for irrigating lands owned by such individuals or corporations, or the individual members thereof, shall not be separately taxed as long as they shall be owned and used exclusively for such purpose: Provided further, That mortgages upon both real and personal property shall be exempt from taxation: Provided further, That taxes of the indigent poor may be remitted or abated at such time and in such manner as may be provided by law. (As amended November 6, 1906.)"²

Under the provisions of this constitution, all property including "monies, credits, bonds, stocks, franchises and all matters and things, (real, personal and mixed) capable of private ownership", should be taxed under a uniform rate. Experience has shown that to carry out the provisions of this constitution fully would defeat the very intention of its writers. Equal taxation was interpreted to mean possibly the same tax levy, "a uniform and equal rate". Its application has not been carried out fully even in relation to the tax on real property. This property has not been assessed at the value the property would bring upon the open market. The assessment has varied all the way from 5 to 10% to 100%, even exceeding 100% in many cases. Professor Seligman in referring to the tax on real estate says:

1 Compiled Laws of Utah, 1917, Utah Constitution, Article XIII, Section 2.

2 Ibid.

"The abolition of the state tax on real estate is perhaps the most necessary reform in the American system; to this all other changes must be subordinated. If the commonwealth treasury should be supplied through other sources, such as a state inheritance tax or a state income tax or a state tax on other elements, it would be possible not only to abandon the state taxation of real estate, but also to relinquish to the local bodies a portion of the state corporation taxes."¹

Speaking of the reforms of the period between 1893-1895 he says:

"In such cases there was no pretense of equity even in the original imposition of the system. It did not need to grow bad, because it was bad from the very start. It was based not on justice, but on might. With the growth of industrial democracy, however, the maintenance of the old-time abuses became increasingly difficult; one by one they were recognized as such, to be lopped off at the first opportunity. In order to establish the long-delayed equities, it was necessary not only to pull down but to build up. Some, at least, of the recent changes which in themselves seem extremely radical, will therefore appear less extreme when regarded as parts of a larger whole—as a sort of compensation for what there is still left of injustice in existing systems.

"Thus it is that tax reform is everywhere in the air. Demanded in some countries because of the divergence between economic conditions and fiscal methods, it is urged in others as a concession to those who have hitherto had less than justice. In both cases it is a product of modern industry and of modern democracy."²

The principle behind the assessment and collection of taxes until recently seems to have been correctly stated by McCulloch when he said:

"It would, no doubt, be in various respects desirable that the inhabitants of a country should contribute to the support of its government in proportion to their means. This is obviously, however, a matter of secondary importance. It is the business of the legislator to look at the practical influence of different taxes, and to resort in preference to those by which the revenue may be raised with the least inconvenience. Should the taxes least adverse to the public interests fall on the contributors according to their respective abilities, it will be an additional recommendation in their favor. But the SALUS POPULI is in this, as it should be in every similar matter, the prime consideration; and the tax which is best fitted to promote, or least opposed to, this great end, though it may not press quite equally on different orders of society, is to be preferred to a more equal but otherwise less advantageous tax.

"..The distinguishing characteristic of the best tax is, not that it is the most nearly proportioned to the means of individuals, but that it is easily assessed and collected, and is, at the same time, most conducive, all things considered, to the public interests."³

Professor Lutz' writings in 1925 give us his Requisites of a Sound System under the following canons: (1) Fiscal adequacy. It must provide ample revenue during long as well as short periods, during times of peace as well as times of emergency.

(2) Economy. Under economy Professor Lutz had in mind the same principle that

1 Essays on Taxation-Seligman, 1911, p. 261.

2 Ibid. p. 452, Ninth ed.

3 Taxation and the Funding System, p. 19. London 1845. Copied from Carver's Principles of National Economy, pp. 651-52. 1921.

prompted Adam Smith to write his fourth canon. A tax should not "discourage production, lower the morals of the community, provoke discontent, and check the accumulation of wealth. It should be given up for others that will not produce these unfortunate results, or that will produce them to a less degree."¹ (3) Equity. It must appeal to the citizens as being based on justice and equality. (4) Elasticity. Possibly there is over-lapping with fiscal adequacy, yet, if so, a restatement is not detrimental. The system as a whole must be so elastic as to meet the needs of the state, without at the same time unduly burdening the citizens. (5) Simplicity. The tax should be easily assessed and collected. (6) Diversity. The sound tax system will be diversified--there will be a number of different taxes, properly coordinated together to form a unified and consistent whole...Only through a proper diversity in the tax system can the burden of government be brought home to the rank and file of the citizenship, each individual member of which should contribute something toward the cost of the government under which he lives. (7) Flexibility. A rigid, inflexible tax system, based on antiquated constitutional rules and restricting legislature to forms of taxation quite inadequate for either the current needs or for the proper distribution of the tax burden, does not safeguard the interests of the taxpayers and does not promote greater justice and equity in the distribution of the burden...Inequality and injustice are natural and necessary products of a rigid constitutional tax system.²

Continuing, Professor Lutz says:

"It should be emphasized that these standards are relative rather than absolute. They represent goals of ultimate achievement toward which the tax system may be moving for an indefinite period without serious danger of over-perfection. No tax system can ever attain perfection, as many persons have confidently assured us. However great the progress in the direction of wiser and sounder methods, there will doubtless always be room for further improvement."³

Professor Flehm suggests what he consider and Ideal Inheritance Tax System

1 Public Finance-Lutz, 1925, p. 257.

2 Ibid. 1925, pp. 257-271.

3 Ibid.

for the United States:

"First. These taxes should be substantially uniform wherever the flag flies.

"Second. The rates of these should be stable, seldom changed and moderate... What constitutes moderation in rates is hard to determine. But the following points seem clear: (1) The tax should never reduce the amount passing to the family and dependents below what is necessary to prevent them from becoming a public charge. (2) The rates should not be so high as to stimulate avoidance and evasion. (3) The rates should not be so high as to cause forced sales of assets, or liquidation of going concerns. (4) The tax should trench as little as possible on capital.

"Third. On account of its simplicity an estate tax with either a flat exemption which would cover the amount necessary for dependents, or with exemptions of fixed amounts for each of the members of the family, is preferable to the complicated successions taxes now used.

"Fourth. Multiple taxation of the same property by several states...should cease. The aim should be interstate comity, uniformity, and equity."¹

And then we have the Model Succession and Estate Tax Laws as suggested by the National Committee on Inheritance Taxation, as reported to the National Conference on Estate and Inheritance Taxation, held at New Orleans, Louisiana, November 10, 1925. They suggest (1) Inheritance taxes should be substantially uniform throughout the United States. (2) Inheritance Tax Laws and rates should be stable. (3) Inheritance tax rates should be moderate. (4) The Federal Estate Tax should be repealed. (5) The rate structure of the present Federal Estate tax should be immediately revised downward. (This has been done, 1926.) (6) The credit provision of the present law should be extended to allow a credit of all inheritance taxes paid to the several states up to eighty per cent of the Federal tax. (This recommendation has been adopted, 1926.) (7) The Federal gift tax should be abolished. (Was abolished, 1926.) (8) Substitution by the states of Estate Tax laws for the succession tax laws now generally employed by the states is desirable. (9) Multiple taxation of the same property by states should be abandoned. (10) Intangible Personal Property should be taxed only by the state of domicile of the decedent.

From the information given above it is evident that much progress has been made in the theories governing taxation in general. For the purpose of this

1 Introduction to Public Finance-Flehn, p. 216.

study let us analyze the systems suggested for Inheritance Taxation by Professor Plehn and the National Committee on Inheritance Taxation. The suggestions made by the National Committee with reference to uniform rates, stability in rates, moderation in the tax levy, the adoption of the Estate tax in preference to other forms of successions taxes, and the prevention of multiple taxation, were also suggested by Professor Plehn. The National Committee's suggestions with reference to the Federal Estate Tax are foreign to this study, and the reference to the taxation of intangible personal property was not contained in the suggestions of Professor Plehn.

Let us now consider the Ideal Inheritance Tax System for the United States by Professor Plehn and adapt it to the needs of our local government. (1) That nationally it is desirable to have uniform rates in all states. Such action would be a step forward. Until the suggestion is adopted multiple taxation of personal property must continue. The state governments are jealously guarding the prospective funds of the treasury, and are unwilling to relinquish any possible power they now possess. Utah taxes personalty on the domicile of the decedent as well as the corporate property of the state. Changes will not be made until state officials reach the conviction that there will be as much gained as lost under any reciprocal agreement.

(2) "The rates should be stable, seldom changed, and moderate". The Utah tax rate has remained upon the statute since it was adopted in 1901, with the exception of the addition of the lower rate by the amendment of 1915. The law as a whole has not been criticized due to the belief the rate was too high. In fact, Utah is one of few states having maximum rates as low as 5%.

(3) The tax should never reduce the amount going to dependents to such an extent as to make of them public charges. Rates of three and five per cent are not excessive, especially upon values above \$25,000. Individuals falling heir

to property valued in excess of \$25,000 are in little danger of becoming public charges by a levy of 5% on all property valued above that amount. Where the property value is below \$25,000 and the heirs become public charges it could not be claimed that the tax of \$450 was responsible for the condition. Of course, \$450 would materially assist any individual or estate where there was danger of such a result. An increase in the amount of the statutory exemption would remove such a contention.

The third element of an Ideal Inheritance Tax System was also recommended by the National Committee on Inheritance Taxation reported to the National Conference held at New Orleans, November 10, 1925. There are many arguments favoring the Estate Tax. The majority of the elements of good tax concur in this conclusion. The fact that the tax falls upon the estate as a whole and can be levied and collected in a very short time after the estate is probated establishes the estate tax as worthy of serious consideration. Utah is one of four states in the United States collecting taxes on inheritance under an Estate Tax law. New York, Oregon, and others use both methods a practise which has complicated the matter materially.

Professor Flehn, in his defense on the estate tax, says:

"But practically the distinction is of no great significance, and since we shall see in a moment the successions tax involves many complexities of administration and of law, the estate tax form is more satisfactory. In the first place a man who consults the inheritance tax law, especially if he takes expert advice thereon, will naturally in either case figure out how much the taxes are going to be in the aggregate, and make such provision in his will as to result in carrying out his wishes as to the disposition of his property less the taxes so as to give each beneficiary what he wishes each to have, not perhaps what the lawmaker imagined, in his elaborate scale, each class should have. Thus the classification of heirs in a successions tax law works as intended only in the case of intestate estates or where a will has been drawn without consideration of the death duties. Since these two cases however include a very considerable number of estates and especially include those who are unable, or unwilling to take care of their affairs properly, there is still some reason for looking with favour on the successions tax. This reason is however largely offset by some other practical difficulties, not involved in the estate tax."¹

1 Introduction to Public Finance-Flehn, pp.206-207.

"On account of its simplicity an estate tax with either a flat exemption which would cover the amount necessary for dependents, or with exemptions of fixed amounts for each of the members of the family, is preferable to the complicated successions taxes now used."¹

Uniform rates and multiple taxation are closely related. When the local governments are able to reach an agreement on rates then they will be able to consider the question of multiple taxation. Uniform rates and reciprocal exemptions are so closely inter-related that the removal of one without the other seems impossible. The large eastern states will hesitate to exempt securities owned by their residents in foreign states until such a time as they are able to realize equal benefits in return.

The application of these theories to the Utah Law governing the taxation of transfers will reveal its weaknesses as well as point out its desirable features. The study will be approached through an examination of the rates applied in Utah and contrasted with those applied in other states; but particularly those applied in Colorado, Idaho, and Montana. From such an examination it will be possible to determine rather conclusively whether there should be any modification in the Utah system.

¹ Introduction to Public Finance-Flehm, p. 217.

Weakness of the Utah Inheritance Tax Law

1. Are the tax rates sufficiently progressive as they relate to direct heirs when compared with the rates levied by other states?

The Utah Inheritance tax is regarded as a progressive tax due to the fact that there is more than one rate. In 1901 the Utah law placed a 5% tax on all estates regardless of the size of the estate or the nearness of relationship of the beneficiary to the decedent. This levy remained as the only rate of tax until the law was amended in 1915, placing a levy of 3% on all estates for that portion of the estate exceeding \$10,000 and not exceeding \$25,000 above the deductions allowed. These rates are in force today and are the only rates operative. There is no distinction made between the rate of tax levied on an estate of \$35,000 and the levy on an estate of \$350,000. The rates are 3% on that portion of the estate below \$25,000 and 5% on the amount above \$25,000 in excess of deductions. It is assumed that the \$35,000 estate is equally as able to pay the same rate of tax as the \$350,000 estate. The element of sacrifice has not been considered as vital in the framing of this law. The levy of 3% and 5% may not be oppressive to either estate, yet it is admitted by most economists that the elements of sacrifice and ability to pay should be factors in the assessment and collection of all taxes.

The Utah Law was amended in 1915 for the purpose of easing the burden on the beneficiaries of estates of \$25,000 or less. To accomplish this result the same reduction was also allowed on large estates. Of course, this lower rate benefited the beneficiaries of the small estates. However, recent writers favor a lower rate on small estates with an increase in the rate of the tax as the estate increases in value. The law as amended in 1915 does this to a limited degree in Utah. Two rates are allowed on the estate. The usual policy in other states provided for greater progression.

Colorado uses four groups for inheritance tax purposes. Idaho makes even greater segregations, using five groups; Montana has four, and Arizona five. Con-

sidering the nation at large as to the provision made for segregations with reference to inheritance tax one is confronted with sufficient evidence to draw the conclusion that Utah is far behind her sister states in this particular. There are five states who segregate beneficiaries into five groups. Sixteen states make four segregations, thirty-five provide three groups, and forty, at least two groups. Utah is not ranked as one of the forty.

The rate of tax varies almost equally as much. Kansas has a levy as low as $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent and reaches her maximum at 15 per cent. Arizona, Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Indiana, Iowa, Kentucky, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, New Mexico, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Vermont, Virginia, and Washington begin their levy at one per cent on direct heirs, or heirs they have placed in their first group. This group usually contains as heirs the father, mother, husband, wife, child, adopted child, and lineal descendant. Of course, there is also great variation as to the heirs composing the various groups in the different states. The highest maximum on heirs of the first group is reached in the states of Kentucky, New Jersey, and Oklahoma, where the levy runs up to 16 per cent. This maximum levy is reached in Kentucky on estates above \$9,000,000; in New Jersey on estates above \$3,700,000, while in Oklahoma it is not reached until above \$10,000,000.

The states of Maryland and New Hampshire exempt all heirs in group one, while the states of Louisiana and Texas exempt certain amounts in group one and reach their maximum at 3 and 6 per cent respectively. Louisiana levies three per cent on estates above \$20,000 while Texas levies six per cent on estates above \$1,000,000. Colorado, Illinois, West Virginia, and Wisconsin have an initial tax of 2% and reach their maximum at \$500,000; Pennsylvania and Wyoming have a flat rate of 2% for heirs of this group, whereas Utah is the lone state with an initial rate as

high as 3%.¹

The tax levy for heirs in group two offers equally as great a diversification. The heirs in this group usually consist of the brother or sister or descendant thereof, wife or widow of son, husband of daughter. (Montana's classification.) Colorado places in this group wife or widow of son, husband or widower of daughter, grandfather, grandmother, brother or sister, both full and half-blood, mutually acknowledged child, step-child. Idaho uses the following classification: Brother or sister, descendant of brother or sister, wife or widow of son, husband of daughter.

The initial levy for group two is spread between 0 and 6%. Texas does not tax the first \$10,000. Kansas, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, and Oregon levy as low as 1%; Idaho and Minnesota take 1½%; Arizona, Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Arkansas, Kentucky, Montana, New York, North Carolina, South Carolina, South Dakota, and Virginia all levy 2%; California, Colorado, and Missouri, 3%; Maine, West Virginia, and Wisconsin, 4%; Louisiana, Iowa, New Jersey, Ohio, Tennessee, and Washington, 5%, and Illinois levies 6% as her minimum rate on inheritances below \$20,000.

The maximum rates vary equally as much. Idaho levies the minimum rate as the high rate of 4½%. Connecticut, Delaware, Kansas, Maine, and New York, 5%; Minnesota and Oklahoma, 6%; Louisiana, Iowa, and South Carolina, 7%; Indiana, Montana, Ohio, and South Dakota, 8%; Massachusetts, 9%; Arizona, Colorado, Tennessee, Texas, and Virginia, 10%; North Carolina, 12%; West Virginia, 14%; Oregon, 15%; Illinois, Kentucky, and New Jersey, 16%; California and Missouri, 18%; Arkansas, Washington, and Wisconsin, 20%.

Eight states levy flat rates on this group. Nebraska and Wyoming take 4%; Maryland, New Hampshire, New Mexico, and Vermont, 5%; Pennsylvania, 10%, and

¹ Inheritance and Income Taxes in Relation to Investments, compiled by John L. Kuhn, 1927. (This reference has been used throughout this report wherever rates levied by states are referred to.)

Michigan, 25%. Michigan's 25% is not as excessive as it appears from the levy. Her group segregation is really between direct and collateral heirs and group 2 in which the beneficiaries are as follows: "Non-resident alien collaterals or strangers in blood, corporations not incorporated in the United States."¹ In order to contrast Michigan's levy for corresponding heirs it would be necessary to use from 1-3%, the levy for her group one. The highest maximum in group 2 is 20% levied by the states of Arkansas, Washington, and Wisconsin on estates above \$1,000,000, \$500,000, and \$500,000 respectively.

The rates for group 2, in the states used for comparison, place a maximum of 10% on estates above \$25,000 value in Colorado; 4 1/2% for estates above \$500,000 value in Idaho, and 8% on estates valued above \$100,000 in Montana. Utah reaches her maximum on estates valued in excess of \$25,000. It is, therefore, evident that Utah is far behind in regard to the progressiveness in her rates on inheritance as compared with rates levied by her sister states.

2. Are the rates sufficiently progressive as they relate to collateral heirs when compared with the rates applied by other states?

This question immediately presupposes that direct heirs should not pay the same rate of tax as collateral heirs or total strangers. Placing a heavier burden for the transfer of property to collateral heirs, than that placed on the transfer of property to direct heirs has become practically universally accepted.

Bastable made the observation that the transfer of property in the United States was based upon two principles: "(1) That near relatives should pay less than remote ones or total strangers, and (2) the later idea that large successions should pay a higher rate of duty than small ones, or progression in the usual sense."²

1 Inheritance and Income Taxes in Relation to Investments-Kuhn, 1927, p. 17.

2 Public Finance-G. F. Bastable, 1903, p. 595.

Professor Seligman says: "It is more just and more practical for the state to take away a small part from the direct relatives and an increasingly larger sum from the more remote relatives. The tax, in other words, would be graduated according to the degree of relationship."¹

Professor Plehn elaborates a little more on the subject. He says: "At first sight it appears rather reasonable, in fact quite attractive to use the succession tax, and levy low rates with large exemptions on those near and dear to the deceased, with high rates on collateral heirs and still higher rates on strangers of the blood. In fact, many an inheritance tax began with a tax on collateral heirs and strangers only, letting all direct heirs go scot free."²

Authorities holding similar opinions are numerous. In fact the general public looks with favor upon the idea that it is only natural for the decedent to leave property to his near kin. The one difficulty seems to present itself in the effort to distinguish between direct and collateral heirs. It was for that reason that Professor Seligman said to take a small amount from the direct heirs and an increasing amount from collateral heirs. The states generally have followed this principle. Utah is one state of four failing to make this segregation.

It is difficult to make any accurate report on the levies made on transfers to collateral heirs and remote strangers. The various heirs or beneficiaries are classified by one state in one or two groups while others extend the same classification into five groups. Usually, however, groups two, three, and four cover these beneficiaries. A review of the rates levied on these groups reveals the following lack of uniformity:

The initial levy for beneficiaries in group 3 ranges from an exemption of \$1,000 in Texas to 10% in Illinois on the first \$20,000. As initial rates Oregon

1 Essays in Taxation-Seligman, 1921, p. 129.

2 Introduction to Public Finance-Carl C. Plehn, 1926, p. 206.

levies 2½%; Arizona, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, and South Dakota, 3%; Arkansas, California, Colorado, Missouri, and South Carolina, 4%; Connecticut, Delaware, Louisiana, Michigan, New York, and Virginia, 5%; Kentucky, Maine, Nebraska, Oklahoma, West Virginia, and Wisconsin, 6%; North Carolina and Ohio, 7%; Illinois and Washington, 10%. Four states levy flat rates on the entire group. New Jersey and New Mexico take 5%; Wyoming, 6%, and Iowa, 10%.

As maximum rates on this group Arkansas takes 40% on that amount in excess of \$1,000,000, while Washington reaches her maximum of 40% on estates in excess of \$500,000. In reviewing the other states we find the following levies: Maine levies the lowest maximum, taking 7% on estates above \$100,000. Connecticut, Delaware, and New York take 8%; Idaho, 9%; Indiana, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Montana, Nebraska, and South Dakota, 12%; Kansas, 12½%; Colorado and South Carolina, 14%; Arizona, Michigan, Texas, and Virginia, 15%; Kentucky, North Carolina, and Oklahoma, 16%; California, 20%; West Virginia, 21%; Missouri, 24%; Oregon, 25%; Illinois and Wisconsin, 30%, and Washington, 40%.

Colorado reaches her maximum of 14% on estates in excess of \$500,000; Idaho levies a maximum of 9% on estates in excess of \$500,000, while Montana takes 12% on estates in excess of \$100,000. Utah, as noted before, levies on but one group, reaching her maximum on estates in excess of \$25,000.

Sixteen states make four or more groups. The beneficiaries in this group include the most remote kindred relatives or all others not included in the former three groups. Arizona, Idaho, Indiana, Minnesota, Montana, South Dakota, levy as the initial rate a minimum of 4%. California, Kansas, Massachusetts, and Missouri take 5%; Colorado, 7%; New Jersey and Wisconsin, 8%; and West Virginia, 10%. Texas again exempts \$500 but reaches 5% on the next \$500.

The maximum rates increase more rapidly than in any of the other groups,

although the rates seldom exceed the high rates in group 3. Massachusetts reaches her maximum, 12%, on estates in excess of \$1,000,000. Kansas takes 15%, Colorado, Indiana, Minnesota, Montana, New Jersey, South Dakota, take 16%; Arizona, California, and Texas take 20%; Missouri, 30%; West Virginia, 35%, and Wisconsin, 40%. Iowa levies 20% as a flat rate on the entire group. Colorado reaches her maximum, 16%, on estates in excess of \$500,000. Idaho takes 12% in excess of \$500,000, while Montana reaches 16% at \$100,000.

Arizona, Idaho, Indiana, Minnesota, and South Dakota segregate the beneficiaries into more than four groups. The beneficiaries are in each case strangers in blood. The initial tax in each case is 5%. Idaho levies 15% on estates in excess of \$500,000. Indiana, Minnesota, and South Dakota reach their maximum of 20% on estates in excess of \$300,000; \$100,000; \$100,000 respectively.

It is evident that Utah's position with reference to the progressiveness of her tax is not in harmony with that of the great majority of the other states using the inheritance tax as a portion of their tax system. Utah does have a progressive tax but the rates of 3 and 5 per cent are not sufficiently progressive either with reference to the nearness of kin or the amount of the inheritance. A good tax system demands that the revenue be collected as far as possible from people in proportion to their "abilities to pay". In relation to the tax on inheritance this element can be investigated under the caption:

3. Are the rates sufficiently progressive, as they relate to estates valued below \$25,000, as compared with other states?

Utah has one levy, a tax of 3%, on estates below \$25,000. The statute allows a single exemption of \$10,000 on the entire estate, leaving \$15,000 taxable at 3%. The states of Colorado, Idaho, and Montana have been used for this study. These states were selected due to the fact that the writer believed their economic resources, their climatic conditions, their geographical location and the character

of their business enterprises were comparable to those in Utah. The industrial development in each of the four states is running hand in hand. The interests of one are largely the interests of the others. The revenue for the state is obtained from similar sources.

The state of Colorado has classed the beneficiaries, for the purpose of inheritance taxation, into four groups:

Group 1. Father, mother, wife, child, adopted child, lineal descendant.

Group 2. Wife or widow of son, husband or widower of daughter, grandfather, grandmother, brother or sister, both full and half-blood, mutually acknowledged child, step-child.

Group 3. Uncle, aunt, nephew, niece, or lineal descendant thereof.

Group 4. All beneficiaries not included in Groups 1 to 3, unless exempt.

Exemptions

Group 1. Wife, \$20,000; other beneficiaries of group, \$10,000 each.

Group 2. \$2,000 each.

Group 3. \$500 each unless share exceeds that amount. If share exceeds that amount then no exemption is allowed.

Group 4. (Same as group 3.)¹

The beneficiaries in Idaho are grouped for inheritance tax purposes into five groups.

Group 1. Husband, wife, lineal issue, lineal ancestor, adopted or mutually acknowledged child, or lineal issue thereof.

Group 2. Brother, sister, descendant of brother or sister, wife or widow of son, husband of daughter.

Group 3. Uncle, aunt, or descendant thereof.

Group 4. Brother or sister of grandfather or grandmother, or descendant thereof.

¹ Inheritance and Income Taxes-Kuhn, 1927, p. 10.

Group 5. All beneficiaries not included in groups 1 to 4.¹

Exemptions are allowed in the groups as follows:

Group 1. Wife or minor child, \$10,000 each; other beneficiaries of group \$4,000 each.

Group 2. \$2,000 each.

Group 3. \$1,500 each.

Group 4. \$1,000 each.

Group 5. \$500 each.

Idaho levies a tax ranging from 1% to 5% on transfers on the first \$25,000.²

Montana makes four classifications for inheritance tax purposes:

Group 1. Husband, wife, lineal issue, lineal ancestor, adopted or mutually acknowledged child, or lineal issue thereof.

Group 2. Brother, sister, descendant of brother or sister, wife of son, husband of daughter.

Group 3. Uncle, aunt, first cousin.

Group 4. All beneficiaries not included in groups 1 to 3.

Montana allows the following exemptions:

Group 1. Wife, \$17,500; husband, \$5,000; other beneficiaries of group, \$2,000 each.

Group 2. \$500 each.

Group 3. No exemption.

Group 4. No exemption.

Montana taxes the first \$25,000 from 1% for group one to 4% for group four.³

The author has made a study of twenty-two estates probated in Utah courts. The twenty-two estates have been divided into two groups: (1) Those with net estates of less than \$25,000, and (2) those with net estates above \$25,000. In order to more

1 Inheritance and Income Taxes in Relation to Investments-Kuhn, 1927.

2 Ibid. p. 12.

3 Ibid. p. 19.

clearly visualize the levies made by Utah, Colorado, Idaho, and Montana, as they apply to estates, Table I, below, has been prepared.

Table I.

A table of nine estates taxed in Utah showing net estates of less than \$25,000. Also the tax that would have been returned in Colorado, Idaho, and Montana, had the property been located in any one of the states named.

NO.	NET ESTATE	TAX COLLECTED IN UTAH	AMOUNT POSSIBLE COLORADO	ON GIVEN NET ESTATE IN IDAHO	ESTATE IN MONTANA
1	\$10,541.02	\$ 16.23	\$	\$ 5.41	\$
2	11,217.08	36.51			
3	13,035.88	91.07	60.70	90.35	80.35
4	15,248.44	157.45		52.48	
5	15,505.04	165.15		55.05	
6	17,809.29	234.27	156.18	138.09	128.09
7	21,519.91	345.59			64.44
8	22,207.42	366.22	244.18	182.07	172.07
9	24,871.07	446.13			76.72
Totals		\$1,958.62	\$ 461.06	\$ 523.45	\$ 521.69
The Utah Collection Exceeds			\$1,497.56	\$1,435.17	\$1,436.03

Nine estates probated in Utah, showing net estates of less than \$25,000, are given. The wills in each case have been reviewed in an effort to determine the shares left to each beneficiary. The Utah deductions covering court costs, funeral expenses, unpaid debts, and unpaid taxes, have been allowed in order to determine the net estate. This net estate has been used as a base on which the total tax has been determined in Colorado, Idaho, and Montana. The statutory exemption allowed in each state has been deducted from the net estate. Utah shows that the revenue collected varies from \$16.23 to \$446.13, or a total of \$1,958.62. Colorado exempts six of

the nine estates and levies a tax of \$60.70, \$156.18, and \$244.18 respectively on the other three giving a total of \$461.06. Idaho exempted only two of the nine estates but her minimum tax was \$5.41 and her maximum, \$182.07, making a total of \$523.45. Montana exempted four of the nine estates. Her minimum was \$64.44 and her maximum, \$172.07, giving a total of \$521.07. Utah collected \$1,497.56 more than Colorado, \$1,435.17 more than Idaho, and \$1,436.93 more than Montana. Considering the comparison in percentage, Utah collected 22 $\frac{1}{4}$ % more than Colorado would take, 17 $\frac{1}{4}$ % more than Idaho, and 175% more than Montana. Yet, Utah's levy would not necessarily appear excessive provided her exemptions were equal to the exemptions allowable in the three other states.

All other states levying inheritance taxes with the exception of Arkansas, Illinois, Louisiana, Minnesota, Missouri, Iowa, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming, levy 1% on the first \$25,000 inherited by direct heirs or heirs of group one. The exemption allowed in each of these states is upon shares and with the possible exception of Pennsylvania, where no exemption is allowed, the exemption is equal to or above that allowed in Utah. Utah, however, is the only state levying as high as three per cent on inheritances below \$25,000 going to direct heirs.

In the case of collateral heirs and strangers the tax on the first \$25,000 reaches as high as 20% in Iowa and extends as low as 1% in Mississippi and North Dakota. Montana takes 4%; Arizona, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Maryland, Michigan, Missouri, New Hampshire, New York, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Vermont, and Virginia all levy 5%; Kentucky, Massachusetts, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Texas, and Wyoming, 6%; Ohio, 7%; New Jersey, North Carolina, and Wisconsin, 8%; Colorado, 9%; Louisiana, Nebraska, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Tennessee, Washington, West Virginia, 10%; Minnesota, 12 $\frac{1}{2}$ %; Oregon, 15%; Utah's maximum remains at 3%.

It is clearly evident that Utah's rates for estates below \$25,000 are not as

progressive as the rates of her sister states. Although the rate of three per cent is the highest rate levied by any state in the United States, it is not advocated by the writer as being too high for all estates. It is impossible to change the levy for one group of heirs without making a similar change for all heirs. If lower rates are desirable for direct heirs where the estates are small, some modification must be made in the Utah Inheritance law. These changes can be made in one or more of the following methods. (1) The rates may be made progressive as they relate to the relationship of heirs to the decedent. (2) The rates may be made more progressive as they relate to the amount of the inheritance. (3) Greater exemption may be made on all estates. To increase the exemption accomplishes the same purpose as to reduce the tax and would be equally as effective for estates falling under the lower levy. The writer believes this plan is equally effective and perhaps preferable to lowering the rate on this group.

4. Are the rates sufficiently progressive as they relate to estates valued in excess of \$25,000, as compared with the rates imposed by other states?

Such a question would have been answered affirmatively without further investigation a few years ago. The state constitutions required that all property should be taxed equally. The interpretation placed upon the word "equally" has changed greatly in recent years. All inheritance tax laws now operating in states having progressive rates are testimonials to the recent application of the word "equality" in the tax rate. The new equality bears strong marks of the ability of the taxed to bear the burden, or the ability to pay. The levy on estates in excess of \$25,000 presents an interesting study. Utah places a flat rate of 5% on all estates in excess of this amount, regardless of the nearness of kinship of the heirs to the decedent. Utah is not alone in making such a levy. Table II, page 54, Showing the Tax Levies of all States Collecting Taxes on Transfers of Property, presents the levy

of all states collecting taxes on inheritances, segregated into groups classified as to beneficiaries. Arizona shows a spread of 25%, one per cent being levied on estates transferred to heirs in group 1, and below the appraised value of \$25,000. Twenty-five per cent is levied on property having an appraised value in excess of \$500,000 transferred to friends or strangers. Kansas levies one-half of one per cent on the first \$25,000 transferred to heirs in group 1, after the deduction of the exemption allowed heirs of this group, of \$75,000. In other words, a Kansas estate falling to direct heirs must exceed the appraised value of \$100,000 before the tax exceeds \$250. Individuals in Utah pay a tax of \$250 on a net estate of \$18,333. The Kansas maximum rate of 15% falls on beneficiaries of group 4, on all property valued in excess of \$500,000. Her maximum tax for group 1 is 2½ per cent on estates above \$500,000. New York levies 1% on the first \$25,000 in group 1 and reaches her maximum of 4% for this group at \$200,000. However, in group 3 New York takes 8% on all property above \$200,000. New York also levies an estate tax of 80% of the Federal Estate Tax on all property valued in excess of \$100,000, provided the total estate exceeds \$1,000,000 value.¹

Colorado levies 2% on all property valued in excess of the exemptions allowed and below \$50,000 transferred to heirs in group 1, (See Table III, below) and reaches her maximum of 7% for this group on estates above \$500,000. For heirs of group 4 for the same amounts there is a spread from 7% to 16%.

Table III. Classification Made for Inheritance Tax Purposes²

		<u>COLORADO</u>			
Transfer in Excess of Exemption					
Exceeding	Not Exceeding	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
\$	\$ 5,000	2%	3%	4%	7%
5,000	10,000	2%	3%	5%	8%
10,000	25,000	2%	5%	6%	9%
25,000	50,000	2%	7%	8%	10%
50,000	100,000	3%	7%	8%	10%
100,000	150,000	4%	8%	10%	12%
150,000	200,000	5%	8%	10%	12%
200,000	250,000	5%	10%	10%	12%
250,000	500,000	6%	10%	12%	14%
Excess over	500,000	7%	10%	14%	16%

1 Inheritance and Income Taxes in Relation to Investments-Kuhn, 1927, p. 21.
 2 Ibid. p. 10.

Idaho levies a minimum rate of 1% for heirs of group 1 for the first \$25,000 and reaches a 3% maximum for the same group at \$500,000. Group 5 carries an initial levy of 5% and reaches 15% for corresponding amounts. Table IV follows:

Table IV. Classification Made for Inheritance Tax Purposes¹

IDAHO

Transfer in Excess of Exemption

		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
First	\$ 25,000	1%	1%	3%	4%	5%
Next	25,000	1½%	2%	4½%	6%	7½%
Next	50,000	2%	3%	6%	8%	10%
Next	400,000	2½%	3 ¾%	7½%	10%	12½%
Remainder		3%	4½%	9%	12%	15%

Montana takes 1% from heirs in group 1, up to \$25,000 and reaches her maximum of 4% at \$100,000. Transfers in group 4 carry a levy of 4% to 16% for corresponding amounts. Table V follows:

Table V. Classification Made for Inheritance Tax Purposes²

MONTANA

Transfer in Excess of Exemption

		Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4
First	\$25,000	1%	2%	3%	4%
Next	25,000	2%	4%	6%	8%
Next	50,000	3%	6%	9%	12%
Remainder		4%	8%	12%	16%

A study of thirteen cases probated in Utah courts, having a net estate valued in excess of \$25,000, shows that Utah collected \$121,204.88 as inheritance taxes. Assuming that these estates were transferred as net estates to Colorado, Idaho, and Montana, and there taxed as local estates, the writer finds that Colorado would collect \$85,622.34, Idaho, \$48,554.37, and Montana, \$67,991.07. See Table VI.

1 Inheritance and Income Taxes-Kuhn, 1927, p. 12.

2 Ibid. p. 19.

Table VI.

A table of thirteen estates taxed in Utah showing a net estate of more than \$25,000. Also the tax that would have been returned in Colorado, Idaho, and Montana had the property been located in any one of the States named.

NO.	NET ESTATE	TAX COLLECTED IN UTAH	AMOUNT POSSIBLE ON GIVEN NET ESTATE IN COLORADO	IDAHO	NET ESTATE IN MONTANA
1	\$ 35,804.86	\$ 990.24	\$ 316.08	\$ 312.06	\$ 291.08
2	36,680.06	1,034.00	274.88	140.83	283.73
3	43,698.32	1,384.90	73.92	276.96	356.96
4	53,134.04	1,856.70	682.68	607.68	699.02
5	56,239.33	2,011.96	724.78	649.78	762.17
6	60,421.98	2,221.10	111.21	344.19	372.23
7	83,281.83	3,364.09	1,397.94	1,190.38	1,572.94
8	126,272.75	5,513.64	1,915.46	1,391.57	1,725.45
9	134,261.08	5,913.05	2,085.18	1,518.87	1,875.18
10	202,841.65	9,342.08	3,156.08	2,307.60	2,916.80
11	341,317.04	16,265.85	5,264.05	3,824.78	5,016.77
12	358,024.30	17,101.21	9,550.42	6,402.14	9,958.92
13	1,102,121.21	54,306.06	60,069.70	29,588.63	42,159.84
Totals		\$121,204.88	\$85,622.34	\$48,554.37	\$67,991.07
The Utah Collection Exceeds			\$35,582.54	\$72,650.51	\$53,213.81

Table VII, page 55, presents a combination of the information given in Table I, page 23, and Table VI, page 28. Twenty-two estates ranging in value from \$10,541.02 to \$1,102,121.21, show that Utah collected \$123,163.50. For the purpose of this study let us assume that the estates referred to in this table were the estates of decedents of Colorado, Idaho, and Montana. Under those conditions Colorado would collect \$86,083.40; Idaho, \$49,078.82, and Montana, \$68,512.76. Utah collected \$37,080.10 more than Colorado, \$74,084.68 more than Idaho, and \$54,650.74 more than Montana would have collected.

The wide variation in the amounts collectable under the inheritance tax in these four states forces the conclusion that a taxpayer in Utah would criticize the tax levy if taxpayers in states similarly located pay lower rates. There is little evidence of justice in the different levies. Thirteen estates of decedents who have lived in Utah pay \$121,204.88 on inheritances that would have been taxed a little more than one-third that amount had their property been located in the state of Idaho; a little more than half that amount had the same property been located in Montana, and seventy per cent of the amount collected in Utah had the same property been located in Colorado.

It is, therefore, quite obvious that the Utah tax rates as they apply to estates in excess of \$25,000 are not sufficiently progressive as compared with the rates used in Colorado, Idaho, and Montana.

B. What portion of the total revenue collected on inheritances is paid (1) by relatively small estates; (2) by the larger estates?

In connection with the above study of variations in rates the author obtained from the reports made by the Attorney General of the State of Utah the amount paid to the state by 1672 individual estates covering the period between January 1921 and June 1928 inclusive. From this amount the net estate was determined. These estates were grouped into classes according to the amount of inheritance taxes paid during the given year. Estates paying taxes below \$300 have been placed in the first group; then follow the amounts between \$300-\$500; \$500-\$1,000; \$1,000-\$1,500; \$1,500-\$3,000; \$3,000-\$10,000, and those above \$10,000. Table VIII, pages 56 and 57, shows Total Revenue Collected Under the Utah Inheritance Tax Law, Covering the Period Between January 1921 to June 30, 1928, Inclusive, and Segregated into Groups as Indicated, According to the Amounts Paid.

The compiled report of the local estates shows:

324 estates paid	\$ 41,877.36
410 estates paid	75,468.05
503 estates paid	142,096.04
555 estates paid	203,959.37
626 estates paid	351,487.24
683 estates paid	669,099.19
719 estates paid	1,475,597.42

The foreign estates paid Utah the following amounts:

549 estates paid	\$ 63,182.86
667 estates paid	109,801.90
781 estates paid	186,099.43
836 estates paid	252,275.58
946 estates paid	649,176.48
953 estates paid	772,528.64

The totals show that:

873 estates paid	\$ 105,060.24
1077 estates paid	185,269.95
1284 estates paid	328,195.45
1391 estates paid	456,134.95
1526 estates paid	742,708.36
1629 estates paid	1,318,275.67
1672 estates paid	2,248,126.06

It is interesting to note that 36 Utah estates paid \$806,498.23, or \$137,399.04 more than the other 683 estates. Combining the Utah estates with the foreign estates the author finds that 43 estates paid \$929,850.39 while the other 1629 paid \$1,318,275.67. One hundred estates paid \$1,247,462.34 or \$70,813.33 more than was paid by the other 1572 estates.

It has been observed that 40 of the states of the United States have made their tax rates on inheritances progressive (1) as they apply to the relationship of the beneficiary to the decedent and (2) as they apply to the size of the inheritance. There are many arguments favoring tax progression as it applies to nearness of kinship. Few people, regardless of their social position, would attempt to prevent the transfer of property to near relatives. Many even go so far as to advocate the complete exemption of all inheritances passing to the wife or lineal descendant of the decedent. Maryland and New Hampshire have

adopted this principle as part of their tax law. Kansas does not tax direct relatives unless the inheritance exceeds \$75,000, and Georgia fails to tax any transfer under \$100,000.

The drawing of a line between heirs who are entitled to receive property at lower rates and those who must pay higher rates has caused much discussion, and the argument continues. However, there is but one fundamental reason for a progressive tax rate on the transfer of property and that reason is the ability of the individual taxed to bear the burden of the tax. Ability to pay occupies a position in the tax system second only to the demand of the state for revenue. There is no other basic reason for increasing the rate of tax on transfers of large inheritances.

Secretary of the Treasury, Andrew W. Mellon, quotes President Coolidge as follows: "I agree perfectly with those who wish to relieve the small taxpayer by getting the largest possible contribution from the people with the large incomes. But if the rates on large incomes are so high that they disappear, the small taxpayer will be left to bear the entire burden. If, on the other hand, the rates are placed where they will produce the most revenue from large incomes, then the small taxpayer will be relieved."¹

Inheritance taxation operates on the same basis of justice. The tax burden should fall in proportion to the ability of the individual to pay, but, as stated by President Coolidge, it does not work out that large estates bear the tax burden in proportion to their ability to pay, even in inheritance taxation. However, the old fundamental practise of "charging what the traffic will bear" has its defense here.

C. Is the Utah Inheritance tax levied on the principle of ability to pay?

Let the question be answered by the application of the tax law. The Utah law levies a tax of $\frac{3}{8}$ on net estates below the value of \$25,000. There are certain deductions permitted before this levy is assessed. Court costs are deducted as are funeral expenses, debts of the decedent, unpaid taxes, and the expense of the adminis-

¹ Taxation: The People's Business-Mellon, 1924, p. 133.

trator, executor, or trustee. This 3% levy is assessed upon all estates, regardless of size, for the amount not in excess of \$25,000. There is no distinction as to the heirs. Widow and children or total strangers are allowed the same exemptions. Similar conditions apply for the estates in excess of \$25,000, with the exception of the increase in the levy to 5%. All estates above \$25,000 pay five per cent regardless of size or relationship to the decedent. It is recognized that the rates as levied were not written into the law with the intention of collecting revenues from the estates most able to pay. The lower levy could have been the result of a desire to ease the burden falling on the estates valued below \$25,000; but in order to grant this relief to these small estates the rate was also lowered for the larger estates.

Estate number 2 in Table I, page 23, is an illustration of the burden falling upon an estate which would have been exempted in Colorado, Idaho, and Montana. If taxed in any of the other states the rates would not have been in excess of 1%, with the exception of Pennsylvania and Wisconsin where the rate is 2% for this group. It is interesting to note that the funeral expense in this case amounts to more than one-half of what is regarded in Utah as the net estate. The administrator's fee amounted to more than one-fourth of the net estate, and the general taxes unpaid, plus the inheritance tax, more than one-tenth of the net estate. The division of the estate was made to five direct heirs, the largest amount going to any one beneficiary being \$3,739.02.

Estate number 13, Table VI, page 28, showing an estate valued at \$1,102,121.21, paid a similar amount of tax on that portion of the estate falling below \$25,000. A levy of three per cent was made on each estate for the amount in the lower bracket. The funeral expenses alone in this case exceeded what Utah termed the net estate in case 2. The executor's fee exceeded the net estate in case 2 by \$842.02; this figure includes the \$10,000 statutory exemption allowed in Utah. Yet, case 13 paid the same per cent of tax for corresponding amounts on that property below the value of \$25,000 and was allowed a similar exemption of \$10,000. The highest amount passing to an

heir in case 2 was \$3,739.02, whereas in case 13 the entire estate was deemed to have passed to a single heir and amounted to \$1,092,121.21. It seems utterly hopeless to contend that these two cases were taxed on the ability of the taxed to pay.

Of course, the two extremes were used in the cases above. Yet, of the twenty-two cases studied, nine were valued below \$25,000 and paid the same proportional rate of tax for the amounts falling in the lower brackets as the thirteen estates having property in the upper brackets.

The writer realizes that it is impossible to levy inheritance taxes precisely on the basis of ability to pay. Professor Ely says: "At the present time a great majority of economists agree that taxes should be apportioned according to 'faculty' or ability to pay. It must be confessed that the rule is not very satisfactory. No simple measure of ability exists, and many taxes, which under a superficial examination seem to conform to the rule, such as the general property or income tax, are found upon closer examination to violate the rule in many ways. Despite all these defects, however, the ability principle has elements of great strength. It satisfies our sense of justice, in the first place, when explicit reasons cannot be given for departing from a general rule; and it expresses the ideal toward which we strive in voluntary contributions."¹

It does satisfy our sense of justice to approach as near as is possible the ability to pay theory. Revenue must be provided and there is no good reason why this revenue should be obtained from sources that are at present over burdened with other obligations. This movement in taxation has run hand in hand with the movement in education. Compulsory education was not forced upon the children of the poor at the expense of the rich for social or ethical reasons alone. Economically it is advisable to educate all classes. Taxes should be placed on the same basis. It is possible that we should approach the element of ability to pay, as near as is possible, without encouraging the evasion or avoidance of the tax by the larger estates.

D. Is evasion reduced or encouraged?

It is interesting to observe that if inheritance taxes are evaded the evasion is made by the large estates. The smaller estates are not usually in a financial

¹ Outlines of Economics-Ely, 1926, p. 665.

position to "make gifts in contemplation of death" or to employ the aid of competent legal advice to counsel them as to legal means of evasion. The smaller estates seem destined to pay their taxes as they seem destined to meet death, unless, relief comes to them through their state legislatures.

There is little encouragement to evade the payment of inheritance taxes in Utah. The large estates are taxed at a maximum rate of 5% which is not excessive. This rate is little if any above the normal earnings of any well established business over a period of one year, yet the law allows an extension of time for the payment of the tax, if necessary. Even under such conditions there are some attempts made to evade the tax. Usually these attempts are made by the owners of large estates who organize corporations to which they transfer their property or make "gifts in contemplation of death".

In a recent case probated in Utah courts an entire estate valued in excess of \$1,000,000 was transferred to investment companies for stock in these corporations. The capital stock in these companies was then transferred to the heirs of the holder. The dividends paid on these stocks were paid to the then holders of the stock certificates who in turn loaned the money to the corporations. Under the law then in operation there was no provision for transfers made "in contemplation of death" and the subsequent law was not retroactive. The court held that a transfer in contemplation of death was made only under the following conditions:

"A gift is made 'in contemplation of death' when it is made in expectation of that event or with that event in view. The term does not mean that they must die sometime, but refers more particularly to that apprehension of death which arises from some existing infirmity of such a character as would prompt an ordinary prudent person to make a disposition of his property and bestow it upon those whom he regards as most entitled to be the recipients of his bounty."¹

The court held that there was not sufficient evidence to support the contention of this transfer being made in contemplation of death. This decision was made by the State Supreme Court by a three to two vote.

1 In the People v. Banks, 289, 111, 542.

It is safe to say that few other states levy as low a rate on large estates as the five per cent levied by the State of Utah. Avoidance, therefore, must be made by gifts or sales made prior to three years before the death of the testator.

Of the total cases studied, all gifts to other than near relatives were made by testators of large estates. There were few cases upon which to base an intelligent conclusion, but from the evidence available one would be impressed by the small amount of property passed by any testator to other than near relatives. Collateral heirs received a considerable amount but very little was transferred to heirs classed by most states in groups four and five.

In reviewing the study thus far it has been observed first that the rates levied upon inheritances under the laws of Utah are not as progressive as the rates levied by other states similarly located, (1) as they relate to direct heirs (2) as they relate to collateral heirs.

Second, that the rates now levied upon inheritances are not sufficiently progressive (1) as they relate to estates valued below \$25,000. (2) As they relate to estates valued in excess of \$25,000.

Third, that little effort has been made to levy the tax according to the ability to pay, but that small estates pay the same rate of tax paid by the larger estates.

Fourth, that there is little stimulus to force large estates to seek legal means of evasion. The maximum tax rate is below the high rate levied by the vast majority of other local governments.

Desirable Features in the Utah Inheritance Tax Law

We now turn our attention to that part of the Utah Inheritance Tax law which is functioning properly and compare it, as it is applied, with the application of the law of other states, particularly Colorado, Idaho, and Montana.

A. Are the tax rates as they apply to direct heirs, for estates valued in excess of \$25,000, reasonably moderate?

It has been suggested by Professor Bastable that high death rates will stop savings.¹ The rate in Utah for direct heirs, on estates above \$25,000 is 5%. The rates in Colorado for similar amounts extend from 2% on amounts below \$50,000 to 7% on all property in excess of \$500,000. The rate of 5% is applied on property valued between \$150,000 and \$200,000. All property in excess of the latter amount carries a higher rate of tax than the one levied on the same heirs in Utah.

Idaho levies a rate of 1½% on property valued in excess of \$25,000 inherited by direct heirs. Her maximum tax on this group is 3% on that portion of the estate valued in excess of \$500,000. Idaho has one of the lowest taxes on heirs of this group found in the United States. Utah's rate of 3% is obviously much higher than the rate applied by Idaho.

Montana levies 2% on property valued immediately in excess of \$25,000 inherited by direct heirs. Her maximum tax levied on the transfer of property to heirs of this group is 4% for the amount in excess of \$100,000.

The maximum levy made on the transfer of property to heirs in group one (direct heirs) is as follows: Maryland and New Hampshire exempt the entire group; Nebraska, New Mexico, and Rhode Island take 1%; Maine, Pennsylvania, and Wyoming, 2%; Kansas, 2½%; Idaho and Louisiana, 3%; Connecticut, Delaware, Indiana, Minnesota, Montana, New York, Ohio, and South Dakota all take 4%; Arizona, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, and

¹ Public Finance-Bastable, 1903, p. 592.

Virginia, 5%; Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas, 6%; Colorado, Iowa, Massachusetts, North Dakota, and West Virginia, 7%; Michigan, 8%; Arkansas, Mississippi, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin, 10%; California, 12%; Illinois, 14%; Kentucky, New Jersey, and Oklahoma, 16%.

Although the maximum Utah rate is in excess of the rates of many of the other states as they apply to direct heirs, it will be observed that several of the other states exceed this levy of 5%. Utah's maximum rate is relatively moderate although the levy reaches 5%. There has been little effort to avoid the payment of the tax due to excessive rates, and the amount payable is not in excess of the rate of earnings on a normal business over the period of one year.

I. Are the rates moderate as considered from the right of inheritance?

The question of the right of inheritance has been raised by various exponents and opponents of the inheritance tax. Some have gone so far as to advocate that the state take the property of an individual at his death. Jeremy Bentham favored the plan as it applied to the property of an intestate, suggesting that where an individual died leaving no will that his property revert to the state. Professor Seligman says of Bentham's arguments:

"The solution of the problem according to Bentham, lay in the abolition of intestate succession except in the case of immediate relatives. To this he added the limitation of power of bequest of testators without direct heirs. The old principle of escheat was to be extended to include the inheritance or bequests then going to collateral heirs. But Bentham claimed, further, that the state should have an equal share in the sums going with or without a will to such close relatives as grandparents, uncles and aunts, and perhaps nephews and nieces, as well as revisionary interest in the succession of childless direct heirs without prospect of children.

"Bentham held that this was not a tax, and that precisely in this fact lay its chief advantage,—that of 'Unburthensomeness', or, as we would say, freedom from oppressiveness. According to the general principle of human nature, said he, a man is led in the case of a tax on successions to look upon the whole of what is left him as his own, of which he is then called upon to give up a part. But if under the law regulating successions he knows that nothing, or only a small share is due him, Bentham claimed that he would suffer no hardship. 'For hardship depends on disappointment; disappointment upon expectation, and if the law of succession leaves him nothing, he will not expect anything'.

"Exaggerated as Bentham's distinction undoubtedly is, it contains a kernel of truth; namely, that there is no such thing as a natural right of inheritance, and that the extension of intestate succession to collateral relatives is under existing social conditions defensible only to a very limited extent. Whatever may have been the original family theory of property, it may be argued with some force that the bonds of the wider patriarchal family life have been considerably loosened in modern times, and that the family consciousness nowadays extends only to the nearest relatives...

"Nevertheless, it may be said that most thinkers, as well as the mass of the public, would still today maintain the custom of inheritance, not indeed as a natural right or as a necessary consequence of the right of private property, but as an institution that is on the whole socially desirable."¹

This question is discussed at some length by Pinkerton and Millsaps, a portion of which follows:

"To the man who has achieved material success, even though it be only in a moderate way, there is a certain pride in leaving behind him an orderly state of affairs in respect to his finances so that his family and relatives will long remember him as a man who was thoughtful of his duty to his family and solicitous of their welfare. This element of pride is deep-rooted in the human race and is, in fact, part of that parental emotion which is instinctive in all of us.

"The motives that lead men to accumulate a competence are mixed but the strongest of them is the desire to provide for dependents. For most men a small amount would be sufficient provision for their declining years, but the desire to leave sufficient behind them to care for their dependents drives them on to accumulate much more than they would need for themselves."²

Professor Bastable contends that high death rates stop savings.

There is an "unwritten law" recognizing the natural rights of inheritance. Fathers work and sacrifice in order to provide for their heirs in case of death. This desire is openly expressed in the writing of every life insurance policy regardless of the amount or the life upon which the policy is written. The desire to save would be reduced if men were denied the privilege of leaving the property collected to their heirs. Few testators leave large amounts to other than direct heirs. Table VII, page 55, gives the total value of twenty-two net estates probated in Utah as \$2,786,053.60. Out of this amount the largest gift bequeathed to any beneficiary not classed as a legal heir to the decedent, was \$1,000. The problem is not a serious one as it relates to heirs other than those of blood relationship.

1 Essays in Taxation-Seligman, 1921, pp. 128-131.

2 Inheritance and Estate Taxes-Pinkerton and Millsaps, 1926, p. 2.

The segregation of beneficiaries into groups according to their relationship to the decedent by forty-three of the states levying a tax on inheritance is silent recognition of a natural right of inheritance. This right is further emphasized by the exceedingly low rates placed upon inheritances of beneficiaries in group one.

The Utah Inheritance Tax rates are not excessive, although the initial rate of tax levied upon the heirs placed in group one is higher than any other state collecting inheritance taxes. Only Colorado, Illinois, Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and Wyoming levy as high as 2% on beneficiaries of this group. However, the writer does not consider the tax of 3 and 5% excessive, even on direct heirs. It is much higher than the initial levy by other states, but falls below more than half of the maximum rates levied by these states.

B. Is the Utah Inheritance Tax Law Relatively Simple?

Utah is one of four states using the Estate Tax in preference to the Inheritance tax. The one great advantage in the Estate Tax over the Inheritance Tax is its simplicity. The tax is readily understood by any one who manifests even casual interest. This cannot be said for the Inheritance Tax. The Estate Tax system is simple, the Inheritance Tax system, complex. The rates of one are levied upon the estate as a whole, the rates of the other are levied upon one of the many shares possible under the second system. The first affords an opportunity of levying the tax and collecting the revenue shortly after the estate is probated. The second, by the nature of its system, forces a long drawn out contest in order to determine the amount of revenue passing to each heir before the rate of tax can be determined. Under the terms of one the tax can be collected prior to the close of the estate due to the fact that the levy can be made immediately after the appraisal of the property; under the terms of the other, extensions of time may be necessary before the estate is

divided into shares. So far as simplicity is concerned the advantages all seem to be in favor of the Estate Tax system.

It has already been observed that Professor Plehn favors the Estate Tax system, also that the National Committee on Inheritance Taxation favors the Estate Tax in preference to other succession taxes. New York found it necessary to publicly educate her citizens as to the workings of her system. Taxing officials in New York have said: "It is believed to be a matter of common understanding that the transfer tax is one of the most intricate statutes of the state and presents an almost unlimited number of questions difficult of interpretation."¹ Such action is unnecessary under the laws of Utah where the rate of tax has been the same since 1901 with the exception of the lower rate granted by the amendment of 1915. There is but one group of beneficiaries and the same rate of tax applies to all inheritances. The exemptions allowed are the same regardless of relationship of the heirs to the decedent or the value of the estate. The time allowed for the appraisal of the property and the payment of the tax is definitely stated. The law can therefore be regarded as being relatively simple.

C. Is the Law Capable of Efficient and Economical Administration?

The definiteness and simplicity of the Utah Inheritance Tax Law aids its effectiveness and reduces the costs of administration to the minimum. As stated elsewhere, Utah is one of four states using the Estate Tax in preference to other forms of succession taxes. We have also observed that Professor Plehn and the National Committee on Inheritance Taxation favor the Estate Tax. One of the arguments advanced in favor of the Estate Tax is the possibility of levying and collecting the tax shortly after the estate is probated. This could not be done under the Inheritance Tax law where the tax falls upon the share going to the beneficiary rather than upon the estate as a whole.

The Utah Inheritance Tax Law provides that the property shall be appraised within thirty days after the appointment of an executor, administrator, or trustee,² and

1 Inheritance and Estate Taxes-Pinkerton and Millsaps, 1926
2 Compiled Laws of Utah, 1917, Section 3193 (1220X8)

that the tax shall be paid within twelve months from the death of the testator or the intestate unless an extension of time is allowed by the Court.¹ The law further provides that the tax must be paid prior to the final distribution of the estate.² The tax under the inheritance form of succession could not be levied until the share was determined and then time for payment would of necessity have to be granted.

Inheritance taxes in Utah are collected under a system where costs are negligible. Practically the only expense forced upon the state of Utah directly as a result of the Inheritance Tax Law, is the fee of appraisal which is fixed by statute.³ The estate is depleted by costs of probation, consisting of court costs, and fees allowed the administrator or executor or trustee. These fees, however, are not the result of the law on inheritances. The estate must be probated whether left by will or by an intestate. As a result the costs to the estate are not increased materially by the imposition of a tax on inheritances.

The tax provided by the Utah Inheritance Tax Law is definite, three per cent being levied upon estates below an appraised value of \$25,000 and five per cent on that value of the estate above \$25,000. If any person interested in the estate appraised possesses evidence that the appraised value of the property is not that value which the property would bring on an open market "in the ordinary course of trade or was not fairly or in good faith made", objection can be filed within twenty days. Further objection may be taken to the Supreme Court.⁴ Such provisions allow an equitable appraisal at as little expense to the state, or the estate, as is consistent within the action taken.

Due to the simplicity of the Utah law and the possibility of determining the value of the entire estate much sooner than it would be possible to arrive at the value of a series of shares of the same estate, it is likewise possible to determine

1 Compiled Laws of Utah, 1917, Section 3193, (As amended in 1919)

2 Ibid. Section 3200 (1220X15)

3 Ibid. Section 3188 (1220X3)

4 Ibid. Section 3191 (1220X6)

the amount of the tax due on the transfer of the estate as a whole much sooner than on the shares of the same estate. It would be difficult to write a law capable of more efficient and economical administration than the Utah Inheritance Tax Law.

D. Is there Danger of Confiscation of Property by the Imposition of the Tax

One of the criticisms of the Inheritance Tax has been the danger of confiscating the property. In fact, some of the early advocates of this form of taxation favored it for the purpose now regarded as dangerous. Large estates have been accumulated and passed down from father to son until concentration of property has become an important problem in America. The Inheritance Tax was advocated for the purpose of reducing these large estates. With the passing into disfavor of the general property tax as the only source for public revenues, passed the advocacy of confiscation.

It is possible to tax property so heavily that it would be equal to confiscation. Usually, however, the danger is confined to the tax on personal property. Most states tax real estate on the situs of the property but adopt other principles when taxing personalty. Professor Bullock cites the report of the Committee on Double Taxation and Situs for the purposes of Taxation made to the Ninth National Tax Conference as an able treatment of the correct principle underlying taxation of personal property. The Committee says:

"We believe that the correct principle underlying taxation of inheritances is that the state which determines the devolution of property should levy the inheritance tax thereon. If this principle is adopted, most questions of situs with relation to inheritance taxation will have been settled. Real estate devolves in accordance with the laws of the state in which it is situated. Personal property devolves in accordance with the laws of the state of domicile of the former owner. Applying the principle states, it follows that real estate should be taxed by the state in which it is situated; personal property by the state in which its former owner was domiciled."¹

Excessively high rates could so reduce the liquid assets of a going concern as to drive the institution out of business. Utah has attempted to reduce the in-

1 Selected Readings in Public Finance-Bullock, pp. 695,96, 3rd ed.

convenience as a result of the inheritance tax by writing into her law a provision allowing an extension of time for the payment of the tax, where the court has concurred in the belief that an extension is necessary.¹

E. Is there Sufficient Effort Made to Avoid Multiple Taxation of Property?

There is little danger in Utah that Utah property will suffer materially as a result of her tax on inheritances. The rate of five per cent is not confiscatory. An institution doing a normal business under normal conditions will earn during the period of twelve months allowed for the payment of the tax² the five per cent levied. For the estates taxed under abnormal conditions the provision granting an extension is available.

Foreign estates may suffer danger of confiscation due to multiple taxation. Utah taxes property on its situs and on the domicile of the owner. This practise permits double taxation which is one of the weaknesses of our present system. Where the estate is confined wholly to one state multiple taxation is avoided; but the usual practise of the various local governments is to tax intangible personal property on the domicile of the owner as well as on the location of the property. Under such a system certain properties have been taxed in two or more states. Where the levies on property of this kind are high there is danger of confiscation. Utah makes no provision for exemption of any property taxed in any other state and as a result may participate with other states in a combination of rates bordering on, if not equal to, confiscation. The property thus taxed represents a very small percentage of the total property paying taxes on inheritances.

It seems utterly hopeless that multiple taxation will be materially relieved as long as there is such diversification in the tax systems of the various states. Alabama, District of Columbia, Florida, and Nevada³ do not tax inheritances. Connecticut, Maine, Maryland, New Hampshire, New York, Ohio, Oregon, and Pennsylvania⁴, have

1 Compiled Laws of Utah, 1917, Section 3193 (1220X3)

2 Ibid. (As amended 1919)

3 Inheritance and Income Taxes-Kuhn, 1927, p. 3.

4 Ibid. p. 3.

written into their laws provisions granting reciprocal exemptions, while Colorado, Georgia, Massachusetts, New Jersey, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Vermont exempt intangible property of all foreign estates.¹ Mississippi, North Dakota, Rhode Island, and Utah levy their tax on the estate as a whole while others tax shares passing to various beneficiaries and some states tax shares as well as the total estate. The one ray of hope for relief from the evils of multiple taxation is the possibility of an agreement by all states on a uniform system for inheritance taxation.

Attention has been called to the fact that little expense is involved in the administration of the Utah Inheritance Tax Law, due to the necessity that the estate of the deceased be probated regardless of the tax on inheritances. It is, however, interesting to note that between the period of January 1921 and June 1928 inclusive (Table VIII, Table showing total revenue collected under the Utah Inheritance Tax Law covering the period between January 1921 to June 30, 1928, inclusive, and segregated into groups as indicated, according to the amounts paid.) 324 local estates paid inheritance taxes of less than \$300 each, and 549 foreign estates paid taxes of less than \$300 each. 873 estates paid a total tax during the above period of \$105,060.24, or an average for each estate of \$120.28. 1074 estates paid only \$185,269.95. 1629 estates paid \$1,318,275.67, while 43 estates paid \$929,850.23. 100 estates paid \$1,247,463.34 or \$70,813.33 more than was paid by the remaining 1572 estates. 43 estates paid 8.85 times as much as 873 estates. It is recognized that the large estates pay the aggregate of the inheritance taxes received in Utah. Due to the fact that under the Utah Inheritance Tax system the maximum rate is five per cent, there is relatively little danger of confiscating the property left by the decedent as a result of the tax on the transfer of property.

In reviewing the desirable features of the Utah Inheritance Tax Law, the writer concludes:

1 Ibid.

First, that the rates as they apply to direct heirs, for estates valued in excess of \$25,000, are modest (1) when considered from the natural right of inheritance and (2) when compared with the rates levied by other states.

Second, that the system is relatively simple due to the provisions making the levy upon the estate as a whole in preference to the levy on shares, and the stability of the rates.

Third, that the law, due to its definiteness and simplicity, is capable of efficient and economical administration.

Fourth, that provision for an extension of time has been made for the payment of the tax where the court finds evidence of necessity. Furthermore, that due to the relatively low rates, there is little danger of confiscation of the property as a result of the imposition of the inheritance tax.

Conclusion

The writer has reviewed more or less systematically the Utah Inheritance Tax Law. Attention has been directed to what he regards as weaknesses of the law, also to that part of the law which, in his opinion, has worked well and conforms to the elements desirable in a system of inheritance taxation. It has been observed that Utah has not been entirely satisfied with the workings of her law and, as a result, has amended it on several occasions. It was found necessary to state definitely that the exemption is deductible only from the entire estate and not from each share, as is allowed under inheritance taxation. The law was rewritten in 1905 and again amended in 1915 granting a lower rate on estates appraised at less than \$25,000. It was again necessary to clarify the law, so it was amended in 1919 in an effort to define "Transfers made in contemplation of death". Other changes have been suggested and may possibly be added in the future.

The application of the provisions of the law has revealed that the tax rates are not sufficiently progressive as they relate to direct heirs when compared with the rates levied by other states. Colorado levies 2% on the first \$50,000 above all deductions and does not reach 5% until the value of the property exceeds \$150,000. Idaho levies only 1% on the value of the estate assessed in Utah at 3% and does not at any time exceed Utah's levy, in taxing her transfers to direct heirs. Montana levies only 1% on the value of the estate assessed in Utah at 3% and does not reach Utah's 5% levy at any time, using a rate of 4% on the value in excess of \$100,000. Utah alone levies as high as 3% on transfers valued below \$25,000, to direct heirs.

It has been observed that the tax rates are not sufficiently progressive as they relate to collateral heirs when compared with the rates applied by other states. Utah taxes collateral heirs on the same basis applied to direct heirs. Beneficiaries are grouped into one class and the same rates are applied on all transfers. Thirty-five other states use at least three groups; sixteen states have four, and five

states have five groups. The rates vary in the several states, from a maximum of 5% in Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Utah, and Vermont to 40% in Arkansas, Washington, and Wisconsin.

The tax rates are usually made progressive (1) as they relate to the size of the estate, and (2) as they apply to the relationship of the heir to the decedent. It was noted that Utah levies but two rates and reaches her maximum levy of 5% at \$25,000. No other state in the United States levies 3% on property valued below \$25,000, transferred to direct heirs. The rates on transfers to collateral heirs vary in other states from a complete exemption on the first \$25,000 in Georgia to 20% in Iowa. The variations in the rates levied on property valued in excess of \$25,000 are even more pronounced. Utah reaches her high rate of 5% at \$25,000. Thirty-four other states exceed this rate on transfers to direct heirs. It is clearly evident that rates as they apply to estates valued below \$25,000 are excessive as compared with the rates levied by other states, and that the rates levied on transfers of property in excess of \$25,000, made to direct heirs, are not sufficiently progressive, the maximum levy being 5%.

It has been further observed that little effort has been made in Utah to collect the revenue under the Inheritance Tax Law, from the estates most able to pay. All estates are allowed the same exemptions and the rates of 3% and 5% apply to all transfers regardless of size. The ability to pay principle is not a part of the Utah system.

Evasion has not been prevented in Utah. There are few states with levies as low as 5% on large transfers, yet it is these estates which seek legal means of escape. Although Utah's rates on transfers of property at the death of the decedent are somewhat in excess of the rates applied by some of the other states, these rates could not be said to be excessive. Five per cent is moderate especially on the larger estates. There has been little effort to avoid payment of the tax. The tax does not exceed the normal earnings of a normal business during the period allowed for its payment.

Utah is one of four states using the Estate Tax in preference to other forms of succession taxes. This system has the approval of the National Committee on Inheritance Taxation. It is relatively simple and capable of efficient and economical administration. Provision has been made for payment of the tax in instalments, if necessary, where its payment would greatly embarrass the estate, thereby preventing any immediate danger of confiscation of the property as a direct result of the collection of the tax.

Recommendations

The Utah Inheritance Tax Law has many desirable features, as well as some evident weaknesses. These weaknesses have been recognized by members of the State Legislature, and bills have been introduced in an attempt to modify the condition. In 1915, House Bill Number 176, "An act to amend Section 36 of the Compiled Laws of Utah, 1907, called Inheritance Tax Law; classifying and graduating same; lowering the same when small amounts are inherited by direct descendants, and increasing same when large amounts are inherited by those, not of the blood,"¹ was introduced by Thomas M. Page. This bill was not approved. However, the amendment of 1915 did reduce the rate on all estates having a value of less than \$25,000, from 5% to 3%.

The State Treasurer, in his Biennial report in 1919, said:

"As large fortunes are built up under the fostering protection of the State, it is entirely just and proper that transmitted and inherited wealth should bear a heavy share of the expenses of government. I recommend that the inheritance tax in this State be further graduated and that a higher rate of tax be imposed in proportion as the inheritance increases in amount."²

These recommendations are in harmony with the observations made by Bastable that the Inheritance Taxes are levied on two principles: "(1) that near relations should pay less than remote ones or total strangers, and (2) the later idea that large successions should pay a higher rate of duty than small ones, or progression in the usual sense."³

The fact that Inheritance taxation is popular is evidenced by the number of states now using the system in preference to the Estate Tax. The latter is much more simple but lacks the advantages (1) of levying the rates according to the relationship of the heirs to the decedent, and (2) the privilege of allowing greater exemptions to near relatives.

In the opinion of the writer, the Utah Law on Inheritance should be modified to include: (1) A provision making the rates progressive according to the relationship of the heirs to the decedent. (2) A provision making the rates more progressive as

1 House Journal, 1915, p. 267.

2 Biennial Report, State Treasurer, 1919, p. 7.

3 Public Finance-Bastable, 1903, p. 595.

the size of the estate increases. There is little argument in opposition to the foregoing suggestions. Thirty-nine of the forty-three states now collecting taxes on inheritances, embody the principles underlying these suggestions. The second suggestion is, in the opinion of the writer, the more important. This conclusion is not the result of lack of approval of the principle that near relatives should be taxed at a lower rate than remote heirs and strangers, but the result of the evidence produced in this study, that large bequests are seldom made to strangers in blood or even to collateral heirs. The tendency has been in those drawing wills to leave the most of their property to direct heirs. In the case of death without a disposition being made legal heirs are not recognized beyond blood relationship. For these reasons the author believes the advantages offered by the simplicity in the Estate Tax largely offset the arguments favoring a progressive levy on transfers of property made to more distant relatives. However, the principle is well founded and the suggestion is made solely from the point of view of justice in the collection of the tax.

The suggestion that the rate should be made more progressive as to the size of the estate is based on the principle of "ability to pay". This is one of the evident weaknesses of the Utah system. No attempt has been made in Utah to collect the tax on inheritances from those more favorably situated. Small estates, in excess of permitted deductions, pay the same rate as large estates. Although there are other states using the Estate Tax the rates levied by these states are much more progressive. Utah's tax seems to have been levied fundamentally for the purpose of collecting revenue.

It is the belief of the author that greater justice could be derived by a modified plan of taxing inheritances, embodying the principle of greater progression, without any appreciable loss of revenue to the state. The writer attempted to substantiate this belief by applying a new schedule of rates to the net estates of all property taxed in Utah during the period between January 1921 and June

1928 inclusive. This schedule of rates is an arbitrary one which has been drawn after consultation with Assistant Attorney General, L. A. Miner, who has direct charge of inheritance taxation for the state. Greater exemption has been allowed all estates in preference to lowering the rates. Table IX, embodying the proposal, follows:

Table IX.

A Proposed Schedule of Rates for Inheritance Taxation. The Levy is to be Made on the Entire Estate not on Shares.

Exceeding	Not Exceeding	Tax Rate
\$.....	\$ 20,000	Exempt
20,000	35,000	3%
35,000	75,000	4%
75,000	150,000	5%
150,000	250,000	6%
250,000	500,000	7%
500,000	750,000	8%
750,000	1,000,000	9%
Above	1,000,000	10%

An exemption of \$20,000 has been allowed all estates. This is equal to the exemption allowed a wife in Colorado, a wife and minor child in Idaho, and is \$2,500 higher than the exemption allowed a wife in Montana. This exemption is not in excess of the exemption usually allowed in other states. The next \$15,000 (equal to the amount now levied at the present low rate) carries a levy of 3%; the next \$40,000 of 4%; the next \$75,000 of 5%; the next \$100,000 of 6%; the next \$250,000 of 7%; the next \$250,000 of 8%; the next \$250,000 of 9% and the remainder, or the amount in excess of \$1,000,000, is to carry a levy of 10%.

The net estate in each case was found by using the tax paid to the state of Utah, by each individual estate during the period named above. The determination of the net estate, with the tax given, was only a matter of calculation. The net estate, the tax paid, and the tax possible of collection segregated by year, are reported in Table X, appendix. This report has been compiled into a second table showing the total revenue collectable under the proposed Inheritance Tax schedule and segregated into groups according to given amounts, Table XI, pages 58 and 59.

The first group contains the number of estates taxed under the present Estate Tax and the amounts paid by years, which would be exempt under the proposed schedule. The other segregations, giving the number of estates taxed and the total tax paid, by year, are as follows: \$300-\$500; \$500-\$1,000; \$1,000-\$1,500; \$1,500-\$3,000; \$3,000-\$10,000; and finally, those above \$10,000. The sub-totals present the total number of estates and the amount of the revenue returned on all estates paying a tax of less than \$10,000. It will be observed that 873 estates paying a total tax to the state of Utah of \$105,060.24 are exempted under the proposed schedule. The next 328 would pay only \$47,079.08. These 1201 estates are the estates entitled to relief that is not possible under our present law. Of the 1672 estates used in this table 1201 have a value of less than \$35,000 each. These 1201 estates paid a total tax of only \$152,139.32. This is an average payment of \$126.67 each. The next 91 estates paid \$35,588.60; 111 paid \$76,604.55; 75 paid \$94,775.90; 79 paid \$162,725.22; 72 paid \$386,422.00, whereas 43 estates, paying a tax of more than \$10,000 each, paid a total of \$1,202,430.35. This means that 43 estates would pay \$294,174.79 more than the other 1629 estates contained in this report. These 1629 estates would have paid, under the proposed system, \$908,255.59.

A review of this table establishes conclusively that the distribution of the tax burden is shifted to the larger estates. The highest possible levy is 10% on estates above \$1,000,000. Estates of this value are in a better position financially to pay a 10% levy than an estate of less than \$35,000 and above \$20,000 is able to pay 3%, which is the contrast of the two extremes.

As a further contrast Table XII, page 60, showing the tax collected under the present inheritance law, the tax possible under the proposed schedule, the total value of the property exempted, the gain by year (if a gain is recorded) and the loss sustained by year, is presented. It is interesting to note that, although the exemption under the proposed schedule is increased from \$10,000 to \$20,000, the

local estates would return to the state of Utah \$26,861.39 more than was paid during the seven and one-half year period considered. Reference to Table XI, pages 58 and 59, will show that 324 local estates, paying \$41,877.38, have been exempted. It will be remembered that the proposed schedule grants each estate an exemption of \$10,000 in excess of the exemption now allowed. 719 local estates paid inheritance taxes during the period considered. These estates have received a total additional exemption of \$7,190,000. Had the exemption remained the same in both schedules, the proposed schedule would show an additional credit of at least \$215,700 which is the tax possible on this property if assessed at the lowest Utah rate.

The foreign estates would return \$164,301.48 less under the proposed schedule than was collected under the present rates. It is natural that these estates should record a loss as they are only fractional estates, and would, in general, be taxed at lower rates. 953 foreign estates are granted an additional \$10,000 exemption giving a total property value, exempt, of \$9,530,000. If taxed at 3% (the lowest Utah levy) this property would return \$285,900, which would be an additional credit to the proposed schedule, if equal exemptions had been made. The total loss sustained by the proposed schedule is \$137,440.09 for a period covering 7½ years, and based on a study of 1672 estates, 873 of which have been totally exempted.

The writer believes serious consideration should be given to a revision of the rates now levied in Utah on transfers of property. The smaller estates should be granted relief and the above schedule, although presented only as a suggestion, offers an opportunity for study. The schedule proposed by the National Committee on Inheritance Taxation is presented in Table XIII, page 61, in the appendix. This schedule would not return as much revenue as the one used in the tables presented.

Appendix

Table II.

Table Showing the Tax Levies of all States Collecting Taxes on Transfers of Property.¹

	Group 1	Group 2	Group 3	Group 4	Group 5
Arizona	1-5	2-10	3-15	4-20	5-25
Arkansas	1-10	2-20	4-40		
California	1-12	3-18	4-20	5-20	
Colorado	2-7	3-10	4-14	7-16	
Connecticut	1-4	2-5	5-8		
Delaware	1-4	2-5	5-8		
Idaho	1-3	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ -4 $\frac{1}{2}$	3-9	4-12	5-15
Illinois	2-14	6-16	10-30		
Indiana	1-4	2-8	3-12	4-16	5-20
Iowa	1-7	5-7	10%	20%	
Kansas	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ -2 $\frac{1}{2}$	1-5	3-12 $\frac{1}{2}$	5-15	
Kentucky	1-16	2-16	6-16		
Louisiana	0-3	5-7	5-10		
Maine	1-2	4-5	5-7		
Maryland	Exempt	5%			
Massachusetts	1-7	1-9	3-12	5-12	
Michigan	1-8	25%	5-15		
Minnesota	1-4	1 $\frac{1}{2}$ -6	3-12	4-16	5-20
Mississippi	1-10	Estate Tax			
Missouri	1-6	3-18	4-24	5-30	
Montana	1-4	2-8	3-12	4-16	
Nebraska	1%	4%	6-12		
New Hampshire	Exempt	5%			
New Jersey	1-16	5-16	5%	8-16	
New Mexico	1%	5%	5%		
New York	1-4	2-5	5-8		
North Carolina	1-6	3-12	7-16		
North Dakota	1-7	Estate Tax			
Ohio	1-4	5-8	7-10		
Oklahoma	1-16	1-16	6-16		
Oregon	1-10	1-15	5-25		
Pennsylvania	Estate 2%	Shares 10%			
Rhode Island	*1% Estate				
South Carolina	1-6	2-7	4-14		
South Dakota	1-4	2-8	3-12	4-16	5-20
Tennessee	1-5	5-10			
Texas	0-6	0-10	0-15	0-20	
Utah	3-5				
Vermont	1-5	5%			
Virginia	1-5	2-10	5-15		
Washington	1-10	5-20	10-40		
West Virginia	2-7	4-14	6-21	10-35	
Wisconsin	2-10	4-20	6-30	8-40	
Wyoming	No tax may exceed 15% of beneficiaries' shares 2%	4%	6%		
	43	40	35	16	5

¹ Compiled from the publication: Inheritance and Income Taxes-Kuhn, 1927.

* Tax on individual shares: Group 1, $\frac{1}{2}$ -3%; Group 2, 5-8%.

Table VII.

Table of twenty-two estates taxed in Utah. Also the tax that would have been returned and the exemptions that would have been allowed in Colorado, Idaho, and Montana, had the property been located in any one of these states.

CASE NO.	VALUE OF NET ESTATE	EXEMPTIONS ALLOWED IN				REVENUE COLLECTABLE UNDER THE INHERITANCE TAX LAWS				
		UTAH	COLORADO	IDAHO	MONTANA	UTAH	COLORADO	IDAHO	MONTANA	
1	\$ 10,541.02	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 10,000.00	\$ 17,500.00	\$ 16.23	\$ -----	\$ 5.41	\$ -----	
2	11,217.08	10,000.00	10,000.00	4,000.00	5,000.00	36.51	-----	-----	-----	
3	13,035.88	10,000.00	10,000.00	4,000.00	5,000.00	91.07	60.70	90.35	80.35	
4	15,248.44	10,000.00	20,000.00	10,000.00	17,500.00	157.45	-----	52.48	-----	
5	15,505.04	10,000.00	20,000.00	10,000.00	17,500.00	165.15	-----	55.05	-----	
6	17,809.29	10,000.00	10,000.00	4,000.00	5,000.00	234.27	156.18	138.09	128.09	
7	21,519.21	10,000.00	10,000.00	4,000.00	2,000.00	345.59	-----	-----	64.44	
8	22,207.42	10,000.00	10,000.00	4,000.00	5,000.00	366.22	244.14	182.07	172.07	
9	24,871.07	10,000.00	24,871.07	24,871.07	17,193.93	446.13	-----	-----	76.72	
10	35,804.86	10,000.00	20,000.00	10,000.00	17,500.00	990.24	316.08	312.06	291.08	
11	36,680.06	10,000.00	22,925.00	22,584.98	6,000.00	1,034.00	274.88	140.83	283.73	
12	43,698.32	10,000.00	30,000.00	12,000.00	6,000.00	1,384.90	73.92	276.96	356.96	
13	53,134.04	10,000.00	20,000.00	10,000.00	17,500.00	1,856.70	682.68	607.68	699.02	
14	56,239.33	10,000.00	20,000.00	10,000.00	17,500.00	2,011.96	724.78	649.78	762.17	
15	60,421.98	10,000.00	54,860.68	26,000.00	23,196.45	2,221.10	111.21	344.19	372.23	
16	83,281.83	10,000.00	20,000.00	10,000.00	17,500.00	3,364.09	1,397.94	1,190.28	1,572.94	
17	126,272.75	10,000.00	30,000.00	12,000.00	6,000.00	5,513.64	1,915.46	1,391.57	1,725.45	
18	134,261.08	10,000.00	30,000.00	12,000.00	6,000.00	6,913.05	2,085.18	1,518.87	1,875.18	
19	202,841.65	10,000.00	45,000.00	21,000.00	10,500.00	9,342.08	3,156.08	2,307.60	2,916.80	
20	341,317.04	10,000.00	100,000.00	42,000.00	33,500.00	16,265.85	5,264.05	3,824.78	5,016.77	
21	358,024.30	10,000.00	46,800.00	37,800.00	15,500.00	17,101.21	9,550.42	6,402.14	9,958.92	
22	1,102,121.21	10,000.00	20,000.00	10,000.00	17,500.00	54,306.06	60,069.70	29,588.63	42,159.84	
	\$2,786,053.60	\$220,000.00	\$594,456.07	\$310,256.05	\$285,890.38	\$123,163.50	\$86,083.40	\$49,078.82	\$68,512.76	
The Utah Collection Exceeds							\$37,080.10	\$74,084.68	\$54,650.74	

Table VIII.

Table showing total revenue collected under the Utah Inheritance Tax Law covering the period between January 1921 to June 30, 1928, inclusive, and segregated into groups as indicated, according to the amounts paid.

<u>LOCAL TAX COLLECTED</u>										
YEAR	No.	000-300.	No.	300-500.	No.	500-1,000.	No.	1,000-1,500.	No.	1,500-3,000
1921	45	\$ 5,548.99	11	\$ 4,250.05	19	\$13,820.59	5	\$ 6,391.24	8	\$ 17,552.82
1922	44	6,372.25	14	5,294.16	10	6,247.79	7	8,156.96	13	28,102.98
1923	37	4,783.99	9	3,529.70	14	10,530.58	10	11,853.97	14	25,048.76
1924	47	5,450.16	6	2,333.43	17	12,161.31	7	8,376.54	8	16,518.93
1925	46	5,835.68	14	5,766.40	15	10,651.42	5	5,728.04	10	22,681.78
1926	31	4,604.54	8	3,315.37	8	5,779.69	10	11,475.54	5	10,484.75
1927	49	5,959.12	15	5,571.86	7	4,956.33	5	6,365.35	8	17,304.29
1928	25	3,322.65	9	3,529.50	3	2,480.28	3	3,515.69	5	9,833.56

Totals ₃₂₄ \$41,877.38 86 \$33,590.67 93 \$66,627.99 52 \$61,863.33 71 \$147,527.87

<u>FOREIGN TAX COLLECTED</u>										
1921	54	\$ 5,806.83	10	\$ 3,872.58	13	\$ 9,376.46	6	\$ 7,627.15	5	\$ 10,870.62
1922	66	6,174.01	16	6,400.39	9	6,848.90	10	12,265.06	9	19,658.96
1923	75	8,428.00	20	7,767.81	18	11,125.72	8	10,569.43	7	15,690.19
1924	58	6,657.52	19	7,100.11	21	13,669.63	7	8,288.79	6	12,588.69
1925	89	9,980.95	17	6,880.11	16	10,105.04	11	12,128.64	12	26,694.28
1926	88	10,290.91	16	6,366.14	17	10,761.93	4	4,824.49	7	15,369.00
1927	75	9,230.99	10	4,114.87	13	9,220.70	5	5,900.01	14	28,673.58
1928	44	6,613.65	10	4,117.03	7	5,189.15	4	4,572.58	4	8,490.22

Totals ₅₄₉ \$63,182.86 118 \$46,619.04 114 \$76,297.53 55 \$66,176.15 64 \$139,035.54

<u>TOTALS</u>										
LCL	324	\$ 41,877.38	86	\$33,590.67	93	\$ 66,627.99	52	\$ 61,863.33	71	\$147,527.87
FRN	549	63,182.86	118	46,619.04	114	76,297.53	55	66,176.15	64	139,035.54
Gr.										
TTL.	873	\$105,060.24	204	\$80,209.71	207	\$142,925.52	107	\$127,939.48	135	\$286,563.41

Table VIII.

Table showing total revenue collected under the Utah Inheritance Tax Law covering the period between January 1921 to June 30, 1928, inclusive, and segregated into groups as indicated, according to the amounts paid.

<u>LOCAL TAX COLLECTED</u>							
No.	3,000-10,000.	No.	SUB-TOTAL	No.	ABOVE	No.	GRAND TOTALS
11	\$ 62,278.73	99	\$109,842.42	2	\$ 90,849.68	101	\$ 200,692.10
7	29,588.64	95	83,762.98	6	106,208.29	101	189,971.27
8	56,652.58	92	112,399.58	4	123,221.60	96	235,621.18
7	35,295.09	92	80,135.46	4	94,051.89	96	174,187.35
6	29,402.80	96	80,066.12	6	159,237.43	102	239,303.55
5	29,521.41	67	65,181.30	2	23,809.61	69	88,990.91
10	56,213.11	94	96,370.06	12	209,119.73	106	305,489.79
3	18,659.59	48	41,341.27	0		48	41,341.27
57	\$317,611.95	683	\$669,099.10	36	\$806,498.23	719	\$1,475,597.42
<u>FOREIGN TAX COLLECTED</u>							
3	\$ 21,109.48	91	\$ 58,663.12	1	\$ 10,656.73	92	\$ 69,319.85
6	34,400.38	116	85,747.70	0		116	85,747.70
9	47,628.48	137	101,209.63	3	71,378.56	140	172,588.19
8	40,104.26	119	88,409.00	0		119	88,409.00
6	34,987.24	151	100,776.26	2	28,472.02	153	129,248.28
5	22,241.45	137	70,853.92	1	12,844.85	138	83,698.77
5	21,248.28	122	78,388.43	0		122	78,388.43
4	36,145.79	73	65,128.42	0		73	65,128.42
46	\$257,865.36	946	\$649,176.48	7	\$123,352.16	953	\$ 772,528.64
<u>TOTALS</u>							
57	\$317,611.95	683	\$ 669,099.19	36	\$806,498.23	719	\$1,475,597.42
46	257,865.36	946	649,176.48	7	123,352.16	953	772,528.64
103	\$575,477.31	1629	\$1,318,275.67	43	\$929,850.39	1672	\$2,248,126.06

Table XI.

Total revenue collectable under the proposed Inheritance Tax schedule based on the net estate of estates probated in Utah January 1921 to June 30, 1928, inclusive, and segregated into groups as indicated, according to the amounts paid.

		<u>LOCAL TAX POSSIBLE</u>								
YEAR	No.	EXEMPTIONS	No.	000-300.	No.	300-500.	No.	500-1,000.	No.	1,000-1,500.
1921	45	\$ 5,548.99	21	\$ 2,979.85	10	\$ 3,953.13	5	\$ 4,562.97	6	\$ 7,988.52
1922	44	6,372.25	21	2,637.13	3	1,087.76	9	6,304.52	6	7,358.57
1923	37	4,783.99	15	2,290.31	9	3,784.20	11	8,052.88	4	4,767.00
1924	47	5,450.16	15	2,747.66	8	3,045.14	8	5,473.03	5	6,260.71
1925	46	5,835.68	21	2,836.66	9	3,280.90	5	3,032.00	5	5,926.08
1926	31	4,604.54	13	2,181.55	3	1,205.46	10	6,080.38	4	4,960.86
1927	49	5,959.12	18	1,906.32	4	1,499.21	5	3,542.10	6	7,931.94
1928	25	3,322.65	10	1,024.04	2	926.95	5	3,857.12	2	2,474.92
Totals										
	324	\$41,877.38	134	\$18,603.52	48	\$18,782.75	58	\$40,905.00	38	\$47,668.60
		<u>FOREIGN TAX POSSIBLE</u>								
1921	54	\$ 5,806.83	15	\$ 2,042.21	8	\$ 2,863.89	6	\$ 4,201.71	3	\$ 3,391.65
1922	66	6,174.01	20	2,436.20	6	2,657.54	10	7,166.77	6	8,364.81
1923	75	8,428.00	35	5,104.08	5	1,811.90	6	4,591.54	4	5,419.21
1924	58	6,657.52	33	4,446.70	8	3,222.20	6	3,868.57	4	4,789.99
1925	89	9,980.95	31	4,933.50	2	921.30	13	8,159.10	4	5,258.99
1926	88	10,290.91	29	4,447.98	5	2,014.24	3	2,123.86	3	3,729.40
1927	75	9,230.99	17	2,975.47	6	2,041.84	5	3,169.99	10	12,534.33
1928	44	6,613.65	14	2,089.42	3	1,272.94	4	2,418.01	3	3,618.92
Totals										
	549	\$63,182.86	194	\$28,475.56	43	\$16,805.85	53	\$35,699.55	37	\$47,107.30
		<u>TOTALS</u>								
LCL	324	\$ 41,877.38	134	\$18,603.52	48	\$18,782.75	58	\$40,905.00	38	\$47,668.60
FRN	549	63,182.86	194	28,475.56	43	16,805.85	53	35,699.55	37	47,107.30
Gr.										
TL.	873	\$105,060.24	328	\$47,079.08	91	\$35,588.60	111	\$76,604.55	75	\$94,775.90

Table XI.

Total revenue collectable under the proposed Inheritance Tax schedule based on the net estate of the estates probated in Utah January 1921 to June 30, 1928, inclusive, and segregated into groups as indicated, according to the amounts paid.

<u>LOCAL TAX POSSIBLE</u>									
No.	1,500-3,000.	No.	3,000-10,000.	No.	SUB-TOTAL	No.	ABOVE	No.	GRAND TOTALS
5	\$ 10,810.67	7	\$ 46,244.38	99	\$ 82,088.51	2	\$ 136,216.09	101	\$ 218,304.60
8	16,015.55	4	15,917.87	95	55,693.65	6	124,964.17	101	180,657.82
9	19,348.14	7	40,632.34	92	83,658.84	4	164,922.50	96	248,581.36
5	10,751.09	4	22,344.59	92	56,072.38	4	117,806.39	96	173,878.77
8	16,407.32	3	17,352.85	97	54,671.49	5	204,632.99	102	259,304.48
2	4,708.12	4	22,520.27	67	46,261.18	2	24,429.49	69	70,690.67
5	10,871.97	7	40,592.75	94	72,303.41	12	249,470.76	106	321,774.17
2	4,084.12	2	13,577.14	48	29,266.94	0		48	29,266.94
44	\$ 92,996.98	38	\$219,182.19	684	\$480,016.42	35	\$1,022,442.39	719	\$1,502,458.81
<u>FOREIGN TAX POSSIBLE</u>									
2	\$ 3,754.84	3	\$ 19,162.66	91	\$ 41,223.79	1	\$ 10,548.07	92	\$ 51,771.86
2	3,622.62	6	29,000.38	116	59,422.33	0		116	59,422.33
4	7,665.25	8	37,385.10	137	70,405.08	3	95,643.95	140	166,049.03
5	10,690.93	5	26,112.16	119	59,788.07	0		119	59,788.07
7	12,797.69	5	27,614.55	151	69,666.08	2	30,700.82	153	100,366.90
6	12,761.94	3	12,175.28	137	47,543.61	1	13,402.93	138	60,946.54
6	11,215.77	3	12,076.99	122	53,245.38	0		122	53,245.38
3	7,219.20	1	3,712.69	72	26,944.83	1	29,692.22	73	56,637.05
35	\$ 69,728.24	34	\$167,239.81	945	\$428,239.17	8	\$ 179,987.99	953	\$ 608,227.16
<u>TOTALS</u>									
44	\$ 92,996.98	38	\$219,182.19	684	\$480,016.42	35	\$1,022,442.39	719	\$1,502,458.81
35	69,728.24	34	167,239.81	945	428,239.17	8	179,987.99	953	608,227.16
79	\$162,725.22	72	\$386,422.00	1629	\$908,255.59	43	\$1,202,430.38	1672	\$2,110,685.97

Table XII.

The following table contrasts the total tax collected under the present Utah Estate Tax with the amount possible to collect based on the same estates with rates levied on the proposed progressive schedule.

UTAH ESTATES

YEAR	TAX COLLECTED	POSSIBLE TAX	EXEMPTIONS	GAIN	LOSS
1921	\$ 195,143.11	\$ 218,304.60	\$ 5,548.99	\$17,612.50	
1922	183,599.02	180,657.82	6,372.25		\$ 9,313.45
1923	230,837.19	248,581.36	4,783.99	12,960.18	
1924	168,737.19	173,878.77	5,450.16		308.58
1925	233,467.87	259,304.48	5,835.68	20,000.93	
1926	84,386.37	70,690.67	4,604.54		18,300.24
1927	299,530.67	321,774.17	5,959.12	16,284.38	
1928	38,018.62	29,266.94	3,322.65		12,074.33
Totals	\$1,433,720.04	\$1,502,458.81	\$41,877.38	\$66,857.99	\$39,996.60

FOREIGN ESTATES

1921	\$ 63,513.02	\$ 51,771.86	\$ 5,806.83	\$	\$ 17,547.99
1922	79,573.69	59,422.33	6,174.01		26,325.37
1923	164,160.19	166,049.03	8,428.00		6,539.16
1924	81,751.48	59,788.07	6,657.52		28,620.93
1925	119,267.33	100,366.90	9,980.95		28,881.38
1926	73,407.86	60,946.54	10,290.91		22,752.23
1927	69,157.44	53,245.38	9,230.99		25,143.05
1928	58,514.77	56,637.05	6,613.65		8,491.37
Totals	\$ 709,345.78	\$ 608,227.16	\$63,182.86	\$	\$164,301.48

RECAPITULATION

Foreign	\$ 709,345.78	\$ 608,227.16	\$ 63,182.86	\$	\$164,301.48
Utah	1,433,720.04	1,502,458.81	41,877.38	66,857.99	39,996.60
Gr. Totl.	\$2,143,065.82	\$2,110,685.97	\$105,060.24	\$66,857.99	\$204,298.08
Total Loss					\$137,440.09

Under the proposed schedule 549 foreign cases, aggregating \$63,182.86, are made wholly exempt, while 324 Utah cases, aggregating \$41,877.38, were likewise exempt, making a total of 873 exemptions for a total of \$105,060.24. Total cases considered, 1672.

Table XIII.

Tax Schedule Recommended by National Committee
on Inheritance Taxation.¹

On the value of the net estate	Rate
Not in excess of \$50,000	1%
Over \$50,000 and not exceeding \$100,000	2%
Over \$100,000 and not exceeding \$200,000	3%
Over \$200,000 and not exceeding \$300,000	4%
Over \$300,000 and not exceeding \$500,000	5%
Over \$500,000 and not exceeding \$700,000	6%
Over \$700,000 and not exceeding \$1,000,000	7%
Over \$1,000,000 and not exceeding \$1,500,000	8%
Over \$1,500,000 and not exceeding \$5,000,000	10%
Over \$5,000,000	15%

1 Published in Report of the National Committee on Inheritance Taxation to the National Conference on Estate and Inheritance Taxation held at New Orleans, Louisiana, November 10, 1925, p. 60.

UTAH ESTATES 1921

NET ESTATE

AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED

AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER
PROPOSED SCHEDULE

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 492,775.40	\$ 23,838.77	\$ 28,794.27
113,800.00	4,890.00	3,990.00
28,848.00	642.40	265.44
29,079.40	653.97	272.38
30,847.40	742.37	325.42
115,504.00	4,975.20	4,075.20
143,800.00	6,390.00	5,490.00
32,686.00	824.30	380.58
103,467.60	4,373.38	3,473.38
33,783.00	889.15	413.49
24,251.33	427.54	127.53
22,214.66	366.44	66.43
41,246.60	1,262.33	699.86
22,869.33	386.08	86.07
34,129.40	906.47	423.88
57,376.00	2,068.80	1,345.04
38,244.40	1,112.22	579.77
44,568.40	1,428.42	832.73
28,338.60	616.93	250.15
21,594.33	347.83	47.82
81,524.60	3,276.23	2,376.23
26,545.60	527.28	196.36
20,966.66	329.00	28.98
31,796.00	789.80	353.88
27,102.00	555.10	213.00
24,511.66	435.35	135.34
39,175.40	1,158.77	617.01
33,444.40	874.22	403.33
27,761.40	588.07	232.84
27,574.20	578.71	227.22
65,522.80	2,476.14	1,670.91
20,720.00	321.60	21.60
56,528.80	2,026.44	1,311.15
35,682.40	984.12	477.29
25,547.00	477.35	166.41
56,000.00	2,000.00	1,290.00
197,572.80	9,078.64	8,654.36
27,746.20	587.31	232.88
156,020.80	6,901.04	6,161.24
32,287.00	814.35	368.61
53,681.40	1,884.07	1,197.25
60,186.60	2,209.33	1,457.46
44,590.00	1,429.50	833.60
79,214.60	3,160.73	2,260.73
21,759.66	352.79	52.78
71,320.20	2,766.01	1,902.80
86,000.00	3,500.00	2,600.00
23,798.33	443.85	113.94
26,032.00	501.60	180.96
165,724.80	7,486.24	6,743.48
1,356,218.20	67,010.91	107,421.82
180,945.40	8,247.27	7,656.72
32,253.20	812.67	367.59

UTAH ESTATES 1921, continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 58,440.60	\$ 2,122.03	\$ 1,387.62
34,635.40	931.77	439.06
22,074.00	362.22	62.22
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$ 195,143.11	\$ 218,304.60
Exemptions	<hr/>	
	5,548.99	
Total Tax Collected	\$ 200,692.10	<hr/>
		200,692.10
Total Gain		\$ 17,612.50

UTAH ESTATES 1922

\$ 108,361.20	\$ 4,618.06	\$ 3,718.06
21,401.33	342.04	42.04
43,862.80	1,393.14	804.51
26,618.00	530.90	198.54
26,325.40	516.27	189.76
278,650.20	13,132.51	13,805.51
114,048.20	4,902.41	4,002.41
239,742.60	11,187.13	11,184.55
29,000.00	470.00	270.00
26,045.60	502.28	181.36
20,877.66	326.33	26.32
65,915.60	2,495.78	1,686.62
26,965.20	548.26	208.95
20,893.66	326.81	26.80
20,735.33	322.06	22.05
268,464.00	12,623.20	13,092.48
84,213.60	3,310.68	2,510.68
24,455.40	433.77	133.66
40,481.20	1,224.06	669.24
21,100.40	330.12	30.12
30,734.40	736.72	322.03
66,843.60	2,542.18	1,723.74
48,941.80	1,647.09	1,007.67
60,688.80	2,434.14	1,477.55
38,507.60	1,125.38	590.30
63,225.80	2,361.29	1,579.03
21,950.60	358.52	58.51
807,500.40	39,575.02	54,475.03
37,181.40	1,059.07	537.25
95,097.60	3,954.88	3,054.88
37,851.40	1,092.57	564.05
344,976.60	16,448.83	18,448.36
89,102.80	3,655.14	2,755.14
280,832.00	13,241.60	13,958.24
57,573.60	2,078.68	1,352.94
73,159.00	2,857.95	1,976.36
24,436.33	433.09	133.09

UTAH ESTATES 1922, continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------------------

\$ 24,263.33	\$ 427.90	\$ 127.90
63,225.80	2,361.29	1,579.03
49,360.40	1,668.02	1,024.41
136,850.40	6,042.52	5,142.52
52,358.40	1,917.92	1,144.33
67,541.80	2,577.09	1,351.67
27,999.00	599.95	239.97
27,976.40	598.82	239.29
21,091.00	332.73	32.73
48,474.40	1,623.72	988.97
78,099.00	3,104.95	2,204.95
26,835.00	541.70	205.05
22,731.00	381.93	81.93
30,257.80	712.89	307.73
20,302.00	309.06	9.06
40,182.20	1,159.11	657.28
38,072.60	1,103.63	572.90
35,200.00	960.00	458.00
26,000.00	500.00	180.00
46,750.60	1,537.53	920.02
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$ 183,599.02	\$ 180,657.82

Exemptions

6,372.25

Total Tax Collected

\$ 189,971.27

189,971.27

Total Loss

\$ 9,313.45

UTAH ESTATES 1923

\$ 25,761.00	\$ 488.05	\$ 172.83
41,282.80	1,264.14	701.31
801,194.24	39,259.71	53,907.48
24,695.65	440.87	140.86
191,854.40	8,792.72	8,311.26
28,762.00	638.10	262.86
60,499.60	2,224.98	1,469.98
35,932.80	996.64	487.31
30,025.00	701.25	300.75
25,391.00	469.55	151.73
463,033.80	22,351.69	26,712.56
21,755.00	352.65	52.65
26,469.00	523.45	194.07
41,927.80	1,296.29	727.11
47,046.00	1,552.30	931.84
27,776.80	588.84	233.30
33,533.00	876.65	405.99
985,419.40	48,470.97	70,487.74
39,601.40	1,180.07	634.05
28,942.00	647.10	268.26

UTAH ESTATES 1923 continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 23,290.33	\$ 398.71	\$ 98.70
204,095.80	9,404.79	9,045.74
34,095.80	904.79	422.87
145,955.00	6,497.75	5,597.75
36,156.40	1,007.82	496.25
38,254.00	1,112.70	580.16
33,143.80	857.19	394.31
33,219.00	860.95	396.57
63,309.20	2,365.46	1,582.36
26,537.80	526.89	196.17
123,589.80	5,379.48	4,479.49
85,484.40	3,474.22	2,574.22
27,110.33	413.21	213.30
48,772.00	1,638.60	1,000.88
51,787.80	1,789.39	1,121.51
35,392.00	969.60	465.68
20,266.00	308.00	7.98
46,495.40	1,524.77	909.81
40,982.00	1,249.10	689.28
38,395.00	1,119.75	585.80
21,331.66	339.95	39.94
92,901.00	3,845.05	2,945.05
53,115.80	1,855.79	1,174.63
65,213.00	2,460.65	1,658.52
39,657.00	1,184.85	636.28
41,381.00	1,269.05	705.24
70,949.20	2,747.46	1,887.96
278,784.60	13,139.23	13,814.92
39,002.00	1,170.10	610.08
83,209.40	3,360.47	2,460.47
120,010.60	5,200.53	4,300.53
96,224.00	4,011.20	3,111.20
27,633.60	581.68	229.00
67,997.80	2,599.89	1,769.91
48,149.00	1,607.45	975.96
20,623.66	318.71	18.70
149,727.40	6,686.37	5,786.37
69,640.40	2,682.02	1,835.61
33,149.00	857.45	394.47
	\$ 230,837.19	\$ 248,581.36
Exemptions	4,783.99	
Total Tax Collected	\$ 235,621.18	235,621.18
Total Gain		\$ 12,960.18

UTAH ESTATES 1924

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 72,545.20	\$ 2,827.26	\$1,851.80
29,056.40	652.82	271.69
30,709.00	735.45	321.27
22,260.66	367.82	67.81
59,221.80	2,161.09	1,418.87
32,607.40	830.37	378.22
78,889.40	3,144.47	2,244.47
32,426.00	821.30	372.78
27,776.80	588.84	233.30
291,280.00	13,764.62	14,689.60
56,719.80	2,035.99	1,318.79
216,000.00	10,000.00	9,760.00
23,651.66	409.55	109.54
41,213.20	1,260.66	698.52
38,987.80	1,139.39	609.51
54,759.00	1,937.95	1,240.36
33,436.40	871.82	403.09
459,217.60	22,160.88	26,445.23
32,205.80	810.29	366.17
85,508.40	3,475.42	2,575.42
113,974.80	4,898.74	3,998.74
22,231.00	366.93	66.93
797,728.80	39,086.41	53,595.59
396,799.60	19,039.98	22,075.97
30,937.60	746.83	328.12
63,469.80	2,373.49	1,588.79
23,621.66	408.65	108.64
139,828.00	6,191.40	5,291.40
40,737.60	1,236.88	679.50
37,270.00	1,063.50	540.80
26,782.80	539.14	203.48
83,812.20	3,390.61	2,490.61
35,439.40	971.97	467.57
40,716.60	1,235.83	678.66
27,102.00	555.10	213.06
29,951.80	697.59	298.55
28,741.60	637.08	262.24
37,332.00	1,066.60	543.28
43,473.60	1,373.68	788.94
47,095.60	1,554.78	933.82
28,639.60	631.98	259.18
99,889.00	4,194.45	3,294.45
33,597.60	879.88	407.92
28,634.40	631.72	259.03
53,291.80	1,864.59	1,181.67
20,874.33	326.23	26.22
51,275.60	1,763.78	1,101.02
25,085.00	454.25	152.55
27,181.60	559.08	215.44
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$ 168,737.19	\$ 173,878.77
Exemptions	5,450.16	
Total Tax Collected	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$ 174,187.35	174,187.35
Total Loss		\$ 308.58

UTAH ESTATES 1925

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 26,606.00	\$ 530.30	\$ 198.18
40,949.00	1,247.45	687.56
23,420.00	402.60	102.60
62,474.40	2,303.72	1,548.97
54,168.40	1,908.42	1,216.73
54,172.80	1,908.64	1,216.91
26,216.60	510.83	186.49
816,000.00	40,000.00	55,240.00
31,725.60	786.28	351.76
30,806.40	740.32	324.19
24,633.66	439.01	139.00
21,875.00	355.25	56.25
21,586.00	347.58	47.58
23,915.66	417.47	117.46
489,844.40	23,692.22	28,589.10
73,001.00	2,850.05	1,970.04
83,081.60	3,354.08	2,454.08
30,845.60	742.28	325.36
211,795.00	9,789.75	9,507.70
65,032.40	2,451.62	1,651.29
25,143.60	457.18	154.30
23,285.00	398.55	98.55
32,078.60	803.93	362.35
25,502.60	475.13	165.07
36,385.00	1,019.25	505.40
75,410.00	2,970.50	2,070.50
71,215.60	2,760.78	1,898.62
26,308.00	515.40	189.24
80,774.00	3,238.70	2,338.70
20,219.66	306.59	6.58
29,583.00	679.15	287.49
49,573.00	1,678.65	1,032.92
23,317.00	399.51	99.51
239,920.00	11,196.00	11,195.20
26,702.60	535.13	201.07
876,208.00	43,010.40	60,658.72
33,457.80	872.89	403.73
55,539.00	1,976.95	1,271.56
125,200.20	5,460.01	4,560.01
40,828.20	1,241.41	683.12
33,433.80	871.69	403.01
30,233.80	711.69	307.01
53,449.00	1,872.45	1,187.96
26,000.00	500.00	180.00
38,560.00	1,128.00	592.40
537,564.60	26,178.23	32,305.16
32,629.40	831.47	378.88
23,650.00	409.50	109.50

UTAH ESTATES 1925, continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 37,838.60	\$ 1,091.93	\$ 563.55
83,502.40	3,375.12	2,475.12
34,152.80	907.64	424.58
22,961.00	388.83	88.83
99,702.80	4,185.14	3,285.14
319,211.60	15,160.58	16,644.81
28,248.40	612.42	247.45
25,384.00	469.20	161.52
	\$ 233,467.87	\$ 259,304.48
Exemptions	5,835.68	
Total Tax Collected	\$ 239,303.55	239,303.55
Total Gain		\$ 20,000.93

UTAH ESTATES 1926

\$ 181,520.20	\$ 8,276.01	\$ 7,691.21
116,264.20	5,013.21	4,113.21
34,803.40	940.17	444.10
44,423.40	1,421.17	826.93
40,076.60	1,203.83	653.06
23,296.00	398.88	98.88
60,681.60	2,234.08	1,477.26
283,796.60	13,389.83	14,165.76
37,420.40	1,071.02	546.81
29,173.60	658.68	275.20
38,254.60	1,112.73	580.18
29,800.40	690.02	294.01
56,017.00	2,000.85	1,290.68
36,478.40	1,023.92	509.13
25,994.80	499.74	179.84
23,008.66	390.26	90.25
37,150.80	1,057.54	536.03
28,149.00	607.45	244.47
151,492.20	6,774.64	5,889.53
31,234.20	761.71	337.02
36,675.20	1,033.76	517.00
224,395.60	10,419.78	10,263.73
45,743.20	1,487.16	879.72
52,250.40	1,812.56	1,140.01
70,672.40	2,733.62	1,876.89
27,631.00	581.55	228.93
50,072.80	1,703.64	1,052.91
24,910.00	447.30	147.30
36,679.00	1,033.95	517.16
90,624.60	3,731.23	2,831.23
36,609.20	1,030.46	514.36
23,597.33	407.92	107.91
29,656.80	682.84	289.70

UTAH ESTATES 1926, continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 25,811.00	\$ 490.55	\$ 174.33
20,255.00	307.65	7.65
33,145.40	857.27	394.36
22,435.66	373.07	73.06
130,526.40	5,726.32	4,826.32
	<u>\$ 84,386.37</u>	<u>\$ 70,690.67</u>
Exemptions	<u>4,604.54</u>	
Total Tax Collected	\$ 88,990.91	<u>88,990.81</u>
Total Loss		\$ 18,300.24

UTAH ESTATES 1927

\$ 58,935.40	\$ 2,146.77	\$ 1,407.41
38,637.00	1,131.85	595.48
21,107.33	333.22	33.21
44,555.20	1,427.96	832.20
558,845.60	27,142.28	34,007.64
22,681.66	380.45	80.44
22,385.66	371.57	71.56
53,429.80	1,871.49	1,187.19
34,821.40	941.07	444.64
252,882.60	11,844.13	12,001.78
24,871.00	446.13	146.13
26,831.60	541.58	204.94
34,561.80	928.09	436.85
143,696.60	6,384.83	5,484.83
23,125.66	393.77	93.76
22,155.00	364.65	64.65
79,409.00	3,170.45	2,270.45
145,907.60	6,495.38	5,595.38
281,656.40	13,282.82	14,015.94
126,272.80	5,513.64	4,613.64
224,715.00	10,435.75	10,282.90
280,900.40	13,245.02	13,963.02
101,317.00	4,265.85	3,365.85
91,160.00	3,758.00	2,858.00
43,698.40	1,384.92	797.93
29,618.33	388.55	88.54
134,261.00	5,913.05	5,013.05
80,238.20	3,211.91	2,311.91
30,581.00	729.05	317.43
22,462.23	373.87	73.86
22,401.65	372.05	72.04
21,520.00	345.60	45.60
20,328.00	309.84	9.84
22,016.00	360.48	60.48

UTAH ESTATES 1927, continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 61,615.00	\$ 2,280.57	\$ 1,514.60
166,000.00	7,500.00	6,760.00
23,335.60	400.07	100.06
26,816.60	540.83	204.49
27,504.40	575.22	225.13
43,292.40	1,364.62	781.69
20,601.60	318.05	18.04
216,000.00	10,000.00	9,760.00
51,764.20	1,788.21	1,120.56
234,286.40	10,914.32	10,857.18
239,848.40	11,192.42	11,190.90
58,409.60	2,120.48	1,386.38
259,803.20	12,190.46	12,486.22
57,838.00	2,091.90	1,363.52
23,785.30	413.56	113.55
37,120.00	1,056.00	534.80
71,675.40	2,783.77	1,917.01
325,305.20	15,465.26	17,071.36
1,102,121.20	54,306.06	82,012.13
60,422.00	2,221.10	1,466.88
256,000.00	12,000.00	12,220.00
358,024.20	17,101.21	19,361.69
30,009.80	700.49	300.29
	<u>\$ 299,530.67</u>	<u>\$ 321,774.17</u>

Exemptions

5,959.12

Total Tax Collected

\$ 305,489.79

305,489.79

Net Gain

\$ 16,284.38

UTAH ESTATES 1928

\$ 20,150.00	\$ 304.50	\$ 4.50
27,034.00	551.70	211.02
22,877.00	385.31	86.31
183,437.40	8,871.87	7,806.22
22,221.00	366.63	66.63
70,433.00	2,721.65	1,867.32
23,733.00	411.99	111.99
40,216.60	1,210.86	658.66
41,416.60	1,270.83	706.66
23,292.66	398.78	98.77
25,873.00	493.65	176.19
53,134.00	1,856.70	1,175.36
20,610.00	318.30	18.30
149,418.40	6,670.92	5,770.92
35,981.00	999.05	489.24
34,590.60	929.53	437.71
48,264.00	1,613.20	980.56
23,611.00	408.33	108.33
24,733.66	442.01	142.00
48,601.00	1,630.05	994.04

UTAH ESTATES 1928, continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 36,680.00	\$ 1,034.00	\$ 517.20
78,336.00	3,116.80	2,216.80
56,239.20	2,011.96	1,299.56
	<u>\$ 38,018.62</u>	<u>\$ 29,266.94</u>
Exemptions	<u>3,322.65</u>	
Total Tax Collected	\$ 41,341.27	<u>41,341.27</u>
Total Loss		\$ 12,074.33

SUMMARY

YEAR	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
1921	\$ 200,692.10	\$ 218,304.60
1922	189,971.27	180,657.82
1923	235,621.18	248,581.36
1924	174,187.35	173,878.77
1925	239,303.55	259,304.48
1926	88,990.91	70,690.67
1927	305,489.79	321,774.17
1928	<u>41,341.27</u>	<u>29,266.94</u>
Totals	\$ 1,475,597.42	\$ 1,502,458.81
Total Gain		\$ 26,861.39

FOREIGN ESTATES 1921

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 51,755.60	\$ 1,787.78	\$ 1,120.22
50,393.80	1,719.69	1,065.75
26,297.80	514.89	188.93
24,910.00	447.30	147.30
31,621.00	781.05	348.63
29,853.60	692.68	295.60
23,177.00	395.31	95.31
28,108.60	605.43	243.25
162,030.60	7,301.53	6,521.83
30,802.00	740.10	324.06
94,306.40	3,918.02	3,015.32
36,587.00	1,029.35	513.48
28,925.00	646.25	267.75
22,613.30	384.46	78.39
31,308.80	765.44	339.26
21,710.60	351.32	51.31
26,007.60	500.08	180.22
23,578.60	407.36	107.35
43,163.80	1,358.19	776.55
20,125.00	303.75	3.75
30,271.60	713.56	308.14
43,242.60	1,362.13	779.70
31,411.20	770.56	342.33
24,598.00	437.94	137.94
45,986.00	1,499.30	889.44
37,960.60	1,098.03	568.42
53,892.00	1,894.60	1,205.68
213,758.60	9,889.93	9,625.51
70,536.00	2,726.80	1,871.44
70,835.00	2,741.75	1,883.40
21,507.60	345.23	45.22
33,950.00	947.50	418.50
35,362.00	968.10	464.48
30,616.40	730.82	318.49
229,134.60	10,656.73	10,548.07
40,603.00	1,280.15	674.12
22,872.30	386.17	86.16
23,791.30	413.74	113.73
	<hr/> \$63,513.02	<hr/> \$51,771.86
Exemptions	<hr/> 5,086.83	
Total Tax Collected	\$68,599.85	<hr/> 68,599.85
Total Loss		\$17,547.99

- 73 -
FOREIGN ESTATES 1922

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 141,568.40	\$ 6,278.42	\$ 5,378.42
35,773.40	988.67	480.93
47,492.60	1,574.63	949.70
94,475.40	3,923.77	3,023.77
149,744.80	6,687.24	5,787.24
24,622.00	438.66	138.66
43,029.40	1,351.47	771.17
135,278.20	5,963.91	5,063.91
67,329.20	2,566.46	1,743.16
145,941.80	6,497.09	5,597.09
25,904.80	495.24	177.14
28,408.00	620.40	252.24
20,719.33	321.58	21.57
26,216.40	510.82	186.49
36,628.40	1,031.42	515.13
23,214.00	396.42	96.42
22,715.33	381.46	81.45
20,589.00	317.67	17.67
24,995.00	449.85	149.85
56,895.40	2,044.77	1,325.81
23,985.00	419.55	119.55
23,964.33	418.93	118.92
58,191.60	2,109.58	1,377.66
23,908.66	417.26	117.26
34,963.60	948.18	448.90
22,307.33	369.22	69.21
36,470.80	1,023.54	508.83
21,484.33	344.53	44.52
41,037.40	1,251.87	691.49
70,736.60	2,736.83	1,879.46
116,999.00	5,049.95	4,149.95
34,757.60	937.88	442.72
20,426.00	312.78	12.78
22,285.00	368.55	68.55
25,172.80	458.64	155.18
60,529.40	2,226.47	1,471.17
36,098.60	1,004.93	493.94
27,530.60	576.53	225.91
60,465.80	2,223.29	1,468.63
38,422.60	1,121.13	586.90
33,630.00	881.50	408.90
55,353.80	1,967.69	1,264.15
45,740.00	1,487.00	879.60
60,184.80	2,209.24	1,457.39
32,738.40	836.92	382.15
38,493.60	1,124.68	589.74
45,853.00	1,492.65	883.12
43,527.40	1,376.37	791.09
26,960.00	548.80	208.80
25,801.00	490.05	174.03
	\$ 79,573.69	\$ 59,422.33
Exemptions	6,174.01	
Total Tax Collected	\$ 85,747.70	85,747.70
Total Loss		\$ 26,325.37

FOREIGN ESTATES 1923

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 34,304.00	\$ 915.20	\$ 429.12
22,227.66	366.83	66.82
26,685.20	534.26	200.55
25,495.20	474.76	164.85
20,756.33	322.69	22.68
24,136.00	424.08	124.08
22,154.66	364.64	64.63
31,202.80	1,260.14	336.08
25,376.40	468.82	161.29
26,142.80	507.14	184.28
22,254.00	367.62	67.62
31,096.60	1,254.83	332.89
23,456.66	403.70	103.69
44,170.60	1,408.53	816.82
26,662.20	533.11	199.86
26,227.60	511.38	186.82
141,976.40	6,298.82	5,398.82
22,233.33	367.10	66.99
40,415.60	1,220.78	666.62
26,185.80	509.29	185.57
57,575.40	2,078.77	1,353.01
22,219.66	366.59	66.58
20,972.66	329.18	29.17
23,174.33	395.23	95.22
20,520.00	315.60	15.60
56,308.00	2,015.40	1,302.32
27,940.80	597.04	238.22
28,513.00	625.65	255.39
880,766.60	40,238.33	61,068.94
23,353.00	410.59	100.59
94,179.00	3,908.95	3,008.95
28,206.00	610.30	246.18
204,520.00	9,426.05	9,071.20
32,060.40	803.02	361.81
236,130.20	11,006.51	10,967.81
27,385.80	569.29	221.57
20,017.33	300.52	.51
96,859.40	4,042.97	3,142.97
124,036.20	5,401.81	4,501.80
64,297.80	2,414.89	1,621.91
31,733.60	786.68	352.00
57,155.20	2,057.76	1,336.20
29,550.00	677.50	286.50
27,538.20	566.92	226.14
42,817.80	1,340.89	762.71
20,275.00	308.25	8.25
99,364.80	4,168.24	3,268.22
59,442.20	2,172.11	1,427.68
418,674.40	20,133.72	23,607.20
151,384.00	6,769.20	5,883.04

FOREIGN ESTATES 1923, continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 40,076.20	\$ 1,203.81	\$ 653.04
25,569.60	478.48	167.08
28,434.00	621.70	253.02
96,202.00	4,010.10	3,110.10
24,974.00	449.22	149.22
28,902.40	649.12	267.07
44,918.60	1,445.93	846.74
67,664.40	2,583.22	1,756.57
88,046.80	3,602.34	2,702.34
23,660.00	410.40	109.80
24,783.60	443.51	143.50
44,890.40	1,434.52	845.61
63,360.80	2,368.04	1,584.43
27,415.20	570.96	222.45
26,743.20	537.16	202.29
	<u>\$ 164,160.19</u>	<u>\$ 166,049.03</u>
Exemptions	<u>8,428.00</u>	
Total Tax Collected	\$ 172,588.19	<u>172,588.19</u>
Total Loss		\$ 6,539.16

FOREIGN ESTATES 1924

\$ 58,288.80	\$ 2,114.44	\$ 1,381.55
32,035.80	801.79	361.07
66,303.20	2,515.16	1,702.12
78,356.60	3,117.83	2,217.83
26,404.00	520.20	192.12
128,630.60	5,631.53	4,731.53
27,539.40	576.97	226.18
35,075.40	953.77	453.01
126,913.60	5,545.68	4,645.68
26,564.40	528.22	196.93
34,502.60	925.13	435.07
38,561.00	1,128.05	592.44
22,337.33	370.12	70.11
27,268.80	563.44	218.06
26,477.00	523.85	194.31
21,342.66	340.28	40.27
28,139.60	606.98	244.17
43,295.60	1,364.78	781.82
20,801.66	324.05	24.04
38,331.00	1,116.55	583.24
31,643.00	782.15	349.29
26,983.00	539.15	209.49
25,557.00	477.85	166.71

FOREIGN ESTATES 1924, continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 28,536.60	\$ 626.83	\$ 256.08
27,902.60	595.13	237.07
21,648.00	349.44	49.44
23,529.00	405.87	105.87
25,041.80	452.09	151.25
196,990.60	9,049.53	8,619.43
51,964.40	1,798.22	1,128.57
100,708.20	4,235.41	3,335.41
27,156.00	557.80	214.68
40,309.80	1,215.49	662.39
78,703.60	3,135.18	2,235.18
22,729.33	381.88	81.87
38,239.60	1,111.98	579.58
26,292.00	514.60	188.76
129,602.20	5,680.11	4,780.11
66,920.40	2,536.02	1,726.81
20,905.00	327.15	27.15
27,292.20	564.61	218.76
20,893.60	326.81	26.80
90,179.80	3,708.99	2,808.99
48,966.40	1,648.32	1,008.65
21,882.00	356.46	56.46
41,886.60	1,294.33	725.46
23,415.66	402.47	102.46
24,420.66	432.62	132.61
37,152.20	1,057.61	536.08
20,438.66	313.16	13.15
27,006.20	550.31	210.18
22,432.66	372.98	72.97
55,530.60	1,976.53	1,271.22
30,171.00	708.55	305.13
21,590.00	347.70	47.70
30,943.00	747.15	328.29
33,263.40	863.17	397.90
20,741.00	322.23	22.23
28,396.60	619.83	251.89
24,290.33	428.71	128.70
22,274.66	368.24	68.23
	\$ 81,751.48	\$ 59,788.07
Exemptions	6,657.52	
	\$ 88,409.00	88,409.00
Total Loss		\$ 28,620.93
<u>FOREIGN ESTATES 1925</u>		
\$ 38,283.60	\$ 1,114.18	\$ 581.34
34,752.40	937.62	442.57
28,680.60	634.03	260.41

FOREIGN ESTATES 1925, continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 23,147.66	\$ 394.43	\$ 94.42
26,400.40	520.02	192.01
25,565.40	478.27	166.96
29,117.20	655.86	273.51
41,306.20	1,265.31	702.24
57,756.00	2,087.80	1,360.24
124,423.20	5,421.16	4,521.16
68,994.00	2,649.70	1,809.76
111,568.80	4,778.44	3,878.44
54,723.60	1,936.18	1,238.94
250,168.80	11,708.44	11,811.81
37,055.40	1,502.77	532.21
41,790.40	1,289.52	721.61
22,713.33	381.40	81.39
80,550.40	3,227.52	2,327.52
22,684.66	380.54	80.53
24,278.00	428.34	128.34
26,999.40	549.97	209.98
37,922.60	1,096.13	566.90
27,161.60	558.08	214.84
25,783.00	489.15	173.49
38,710.00	1,135.50	598.40
37,175.80	1,058.79	537.03
67,803.60	2,590.18	1,762.15
25,537.20	476.86	166.11
26,108.00	505.40	183.24
36,432.80	1,021.64	507.31
64,774.00	2,438.70	1,640.96
26,666.40	533.32	199.99
35,718.40	985.92	478.73
62,143.00	2,307.15	1,535.72
48,410.60	1,620.53	986.42
20,999.33	329.98	29.97
36,851.20	1,042.56	524.04
45,745.60	1,537.28	879.82
159,067.60	7,153.38	6,344.05
29,091.80	654.59	272.75
21,366.66	341.00	40.98
351,271.60	16,763.58	18,889.01
58,515.40	2,125.77	1,390.61
24,991.00	449.73	149.73
74,292.40	2,914.62	2,021.69
28,332.00	616.60	249.96
36,636.40	1,031.82	515.45
176,416.40	8,020.82	7,384.98
20,373.00	311.19	11.19
27,336.00	566.80	220.08
21,705.66	351.17	51.16
26,042.20	502.11	181.26
20,698.00	320.94	20.94

FOREIGN ESTATES 1925, continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 25,670.00	\$ 483.50	\$ 170.10
29,342.60	667.13	280.27
25,897.60	493.98	176.92
66,247.40	2,512.37	1,699.89
26,861.00	543.05	205.83
36,408.40	1,020.42	506.33
55,480.00	1,974.00	1,269.20
25,360.00	468.00	160.80
143,718.40	6,385.92	5,485.92
29,490.80	674.54	284.72
20,054.33	301.63	1.62
	<u>\$ 119,267.33</u>	<u>\$ 100,366.90</u>
Exemptions	<u>9,980.95</u>	
Total Tax Collected	\$ 129,248.28	<u>129,248.28</u>
Total Loss		\$ 28,881.38

FOREIGN ESTATES 1926

\$ 43,460.80	\$ 1,373.04	\$ 788.43
64,246.80	2,412.34	1,619.87
25,070.20	453.51	152.10
114,018.40	4,900.92	4,000.92
26,032.80	501.64	180.98
27,176.00	558.80	215.28
25,076.00	453.80	152.28
26,593.40	529.67	197.80
32,234.00	811.70	367.02
20,567.33	317.02	17.01
30,241.60	712.08	307.24
27,496.00	574.80	224.58
20,972.66	329.18	29.17
24,687.33	440.62	140.61
23,099.66	392.99	92.98
96,991.80	4,049.59	3,149.59
34,758.00	937.90	442.74
26,299.80	514.99	188.99
22,064.66	361.94	61.93
66,691.40	2,534.57	1,717.65
27,108.20	555.41	213.24
28,564.60	628.23	256.93
134,495.40	5,924.77	5,024.77
20,610.33	318.31	18.30
21,963.00	358.89	58.89
52,564.80	1,828.24	1,152.59
24,939.00	448.17	148.17
70,230.40	2,711.52	1,859.21
43,491.40	1,374.57	789.65

FOREIGN ESTATES 1926, continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 27,269.20	\$ 563.46	\$ 218.07
21,537.66	346.13	46.12
73,726.00	2,886.30	1,999.04
27,711.00	585.55	231.33
272,899.00	12,844.85	13,402.93
56,094.20	2,004.71	1,293.76
25,082.80	454.14	152.48
24,642.66	439.28	139.27
25,445.40	472.12	163.36
24,276.33	428.29	128.28
28,632.40	636.62	258.97
55,826.40	1,991.32	1,283.05
26,310.80	515.54	189.32
28,467.00	623.35	254.01
28,859.60	642.98	265.78
36,143.00	1,007.15	495.72
92,216.60	3,810.83	2,910.83
37,394.60	1,069.73	545.78
21,725.00	351.75	51.75
33,384.20	869.21	401.52
87,106.80	3,555.34	2,655.34
	<u>\$ 73,407.86</u>	<u>\$ 60,946.54</u>
Exemptions	<u>10,290.91</u>	
Total Tax Collected	\$ 83,698.77	<u>83,698.77</u>
Total Loss		\$ 22,752.23

FOREIGN ESTATES 1927

\$ 20,548.00	\$ 316.44	\$ 16.44
59,007.20	2,150.36	1,410.28
60,315.40	2,215.77	1,462.61
22,311.66	369.35	69.35
29,472.80	673.64	284.18
38,539.80	1,126.99	591.59
30,885.00	744.25	326.55
80,521.40	3,226.07	2,326.07
29,223.20	661.16	276.69
24,344.33	430.33	130.32
20,611.33	318.34	18.33
52,499.00	1,824.95	1,149.96
29,349.60	667.48	280.48
30,739.00	736.95	322.17
45,303.20	1,465.16	862.12
24,714.33	441.43	141.42
68,017.80	2,100.89	1,770.71
111,718.00	4,785.90	3,885.90

FOREIGN ESTATES 1927, continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 80,904.40	\$ 3,245.22	\$ 2,345.22
30,983.20	749.16	329.49
31,686.20	784.31	350.58
22,609.66	378.29	78.27
65,931.60	2,496.58	1,687.26
32,517.60	825.88	375.52
31,251.20	762.56	337.53
51,111.20	1,755.56	1,094.44
29,675.20	683.76	290.25
25,399.20	469.96	161.97
29,795.00	689.75	293.85
100,286.20	4,214.31	3,314.31
58,045.60	2,102.28	1,371.82
61,806.40	2,290.32	1,522.25
29,121.20	656.06	273.63
54,112.80	1,905.64	1,214.51
25,725.00	486.25	171.75
39,260.80	1,163.04	620.43
54,906.80	1,845.34	1,246.27
55,609.80	1,980.49	1,274.39
27,714.80	585.74	231.44
23,351.00	443.53	100.53
62,856.60	2,342.83	1,564.26
49,626.40	1,681.32	1,035.05
38,308.40	1,115.42	582.33
36,588.00	1,029.40	513.52
25,219.00	460.95	156.57
55,625.00	1,981.25	1,275.00
131,535.60	5,776.78	4,876.78
	\$ 69,157.44	\$ 53,245.38

Exemptions

9,230.99

Total Tax Collected

\$ 78,388.43

78,388.43

Total Loss

\$ 25,143.05

FOREIGN ESTATES 1928

\$ 25,672.80	\$ 483.64	\$ 170.18
37,114.00	1,055.76	534.56
504,902.80	24,455.14	29,692.22
79,569.80	3,178.49	2,278.49
55,450.80	1,972.54	1,268.03
35,804.80	990.24	482.19
39,946.00	1,197.30	647.84
22,207.33	366.22	66.21
72,281.00	2,804.05	1,941.24

FOREIGN ESTATES 1928, continued

NET ESTATE	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
\$ 51,540.20	\$ 1,777.01	\$ 1,111.60
22,942.33	388.27	88.26
25,404.20	470.21	162.12
108,253.80	4,612.69	3,712.69
29,734.20	686.71	292.02
23,056.66	391.70	91.69
34,147.60	907.38	424.42
20,607.33	318.22	18.21
28,611.20	630.56	258.33
93,989.40	3,899.47	2,999.47
40,958.60	1,247.93	688.34
27,926.00	596.30	237.78
25,723.00	486.25	171.69
37,431.80	1,071.59	547.27
24,480.33	445.21	145.20
54,732.40	1,936.62	1,239.29
20,673.66	320.21	20.20
24,903.33	447.10	147.09
32,211.20	810.56	366.33
27,348.00	567.40	220.44
	<hr/>	<hr/>
	\$ 58,514.77	\$ 56,637.05
Exemptions	6,613.65	
Total Tax Collected	\$ 65,128.42	<hr/> 65,128.42
Total Loss		\$ 8,491.37

SUMMARY

YEAR	AMOUNT OF TAX COLLECTED	AMOUNT POSSIBLE UNDER PROPOSED SCHEDULE
1921	\$ 68,599.85	\$ 51,771.86
1922	85,747.70	59,422.33
1923	172,588.19	166,049.03
1924	88,409.00	59,788.07
1925	129,248.28	100,366.90
1926	83,698.77	60,946.54
1927	78,388.43	53,245.38
1928	65,128.42	56,637.05
Totals	\$ 772,528.64	\$ 608,227.16
Total Loss		\$ 164,301.48

Bibliography

Bastable-Public Finance, 1903.

Bullock-Selected Readings in Public Finance, 1924.

Carver-Principles of National Economy, 1921.

Ely-Outlines of Economics, 1926.

Kuhn-Inheritance and Income Taxes in Relation to Investments, 1927.

Lutz-Public Finance, 1924.

Pinkerton and Millsaps-Inheritance and Estate Taxes, 1926.

Plehn-Introduction to Public Finance, 1926.

Seligman-Essays in Taxation, 1911 and 1921.

Taussig-Principles of Economics, 1924.

Utah State Treasurer-Biennial Reports for January 1921 to June 1928.

Report of the National Committee on Inheritance Taxation, 1925.