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## PREFACE.

The greater part of this work was completed before the war began. In so far as it is a contribution to economic history, it might well have awaited a more auspicious time for publication; but there is sufficient justification for its appearance now in the fact that the war itself is raising, and will continue to raise, questions relating to national income, property, and wealth, as well as to the distribution of incomes, in which the official statistics play a more or less important part. Any assistance which this book may afford to those who wish to use and interpret these statistics in economic, statistical, or political investigations is accardingly offered without further delay, although leisure has been wanting for elaboration of some of the applications in Part II. on the lines originally planned. The war marks, as definitely as the close of the Napoleonic era, the completion of one economic epoch and the beginning of another, so that a summary of the official record of the past century can hardly be regarded as inopportune at this turning point in our national history.

I should not like to miss the opportunity of expressing to Dr. Bowley my appreciation of his kindly interest in this study. My obligations are due to

Messrs. S. Minnis and G. T. Nicholls for criticisms on particular points, and especially to Mr. J. W. Mitchell for his patience and helpful suggestion in many discussions, while I owe much to many old friends in various parts of the kingdom, my colleagues in the Inland Revenue Department, who have given me freely of their experience where a collective opinion has been desirable. Mr. E. C. L. White has rendered invaluable assistance with the indexes.

I shall be grateful to any reader who draws my attention to any inaccuracies which may be found in the text, the references, or the tables.

Several changes introduced in the Budget of September, 1915, while this book was in the press, have been briefly referred to in footnotes.

> J. C. S.

Seplember, 1915,
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## British Incomes and Property.

## INTRODUCTION.

The statistics of the income tax, together with those of the inhabited house duty (which form in fact merely a subclassification of one section of the income tax), may fairly be numbered amongst the three or four great branches of national official statistics, and, from some points of view, they may be said to rival in importance statistics of population, of births, marriages and deaths, and of overseas trade. Their use is both widespread and essential, and they form the only criterion we possess by which to judge certain features of progress, and by which to examine some vexed modern problems in economic sociology. Unfortunately they differ in one important respect from all other great branches of statistics. Census and general registration details, and particulars of foreign trade, can be schemed, and broadly speaking are actually designed, to serve purely statistical ends ; where the statistical framework shows signs of weakness it can be specially strengthened. But the statistics which form the subject of this work are the byproduct of a system of taxation. That system is designed, maintained, and modified an legal and administrative lines with a view to its efficiency as an engine of taxation. First and last is the object of raising revenue with a maximum of financial result and a minimum of inconvenience, evasion, and expense. Nowhere does it study to ensure statistical convenience or completeness. Assessments made in such a
way as to give the best results for all concerned from the point of view of taxation may be in such a form as to give the worst facilities for statistical use. It will of course be urged that the income tax system is cumbrous, archaic, and involved, and that its general convenience and efficiency would be greatly improved if it were revised and simplified. Even if this be admitted to the full, it does not in the least follow that the revised system would serve the statistician any better, if as well. The broad probability must always remain that maximum advantage for taxation will not coincide with maximum advantage for statistical use. Indeed, a scheme designed to furnish the details required by some statisticians would be a poor revenue-getter, and perhaps its facile " facts" would be further from the truth than the present official tables. The Prussian system yields some beautiful tables, but it would need a greater recommendation than that before the British public would tolerate it or our officials precipitately adopt it.

For many years the life of the income tax hung upon a slender thread. The most fundamental idea of the tax was that it lasted for a year and no longer. It refused to take considerations of justice upon a long view, and was always about to be "abolished." It was administered as a temporary extra task by a staff whose main business lay elsewhere, and who gave it the minimum attention that it appeared to deserve. Who could be enthusiastic about a stopgap, a temporary visitant? Who could advise laying down an expensive national "plant" for transitory purposes? Even long after the time when the continuance of the tax should-as it appears to us after the event-have shown clearly that the "temporary " idea was out of date, the expenditure upon the staff and its equipment was niggardly and far below the responsibility of the task involved. Indeed, only quite recently, and after seventy years, has the clerical staff been " recognised," established, and dealt with upon an official basis. The large element of local control and administration, although it was probably vital to the life of the system, for twenty years effectively hindered any serious grip of the whole task by the central
authority. When all the facts are considered, and especially when some of the complex parliamentary statistical returns of the earlier days are examined, the marvel is, not that the statistics were so bad and so inadequate, but that they were so good and so detailed. One has only to be reminded, by some of the older and retired officials, of the days when, in a district of great area and importance, it needed all the efforts of the overworked and harassed surveyor of taxes to prevent money " flowing down the drain," in order to set in its proper light the annual task of preparing a statistical return which would occupy his time for four or five weeks, or, if that task were confided to the clerk (with a weekly wage of fifteen or twenty shillings), of the equally protracted duty of discovering his errors and adjusting the totals judiciously in the end.

In such circumstances the statistical aspects of the official's work could never be regarded as important. Revenue was his objective, and he took the line of least resistance. Where no revenue was involved it may be regarded as axiomatic that statistical completeness was weak. When there came a change in law, a new exemption limit, or a new allowance, the break was frankly and openly made-there was no attempt at statistical sequence. Why should official posterity be burdened with such an encumbrance? Besides, their duty was to record what was actually there in exact figures, and not what might have been in other circumstances.

So for sixty years the Commissioners of Inland Revenue have presented to the Lords of the Treasury tabular statements of various "assessments," conditioned entirely by the statutory basis of those "assessments." They did not translate that information into terms of ordinary life, into incomes, persons, and so on. From time to time they gave explanations and warnings, but if any investigator wanted "definitions " and guidance there were always the law-books to which he could resort. It could hardly have been otherwise, for, until recent ycars, the system was so entirely an objective one that there was not the slightest internal evidence upon such vital questions as the number of taxpayers or the distribution of income. Gaps were indeed pointed
out, but it was left for the ingenious and wary to bridge them, and radical changes in law greatly impaired the comparability of the figures over a series of years, and made it difficult to employ them in ordinary problems.

It is small wonder that the statistician, turning from other classes of figures designed for his use to the products of an income tax department whose main function, as it seems to him, should be that of turning out information about " incomes," is filled with impatient disgust. Dr. Bowley, in an address to the Economic Section of the British Association, has expressed the general defects of official statistics in these terms:-


#### Abstract

" It has till recently been the custom of departments publishing statistical returns to issue them without explanation of the particular conventions adopted, and then to complain that the ignorant public misquote them, till there was a danger that statistics should be issued only by officials for officials, and even by an official for himself alone, while the use of them (necessarily erroneous) by the general public was regarded as objectionable trespass in a private preserve. The growth of popular interest, and of a certain blind and misguided confidence in statistical statements. resulted in the printing of cautions that the statistics did not mean what they appeared to mean; and then boards were erected to the effect that this table was dangerous to statisticians, and newspaper writers should drive with caution: bat it did not for long occur to those responsible that it was their business to put the public roads in good order for the convenience of travellers."


There is no doubt that the Inland Revenue reports would answer to this description very closely, in the opinion of this eminent authority. Indeed, in another place he describes. them as the last refuge of "obscurantism," while in writing generally upon the improvement of official statistics he comes to close grips with the difficulties of the subject :-

[^0]their true value, what is a residential shop? . . . In each of these and in innumerable other cases special knowledge is needed before the exact working definition is known" (Stat. Journal, September, 1908).

This lends force to his plea for a central statistical department which could supervise the existing figures, as well as undertake or direct excursions in pure statistics. But even here he clearly underrates the inherent difficulties owing to the vast legal complications of the subject, and to the fact that the administration of the tax must always have a revenue orientation:-
" . . . If the method of samples were employed with compulsory powers, we could (for example in statements of income, for which statutory powers already exist) by a rapid and abridged investigation get a great deal of unbiassed information. . . . There is very great delay in publications of many of our statistics. We receive our external trade statistics with wonderful promptitude ; it is only a matter of organisation to hasten all the serial publications. As regards occasional reports, the delay is due to methods derived from the Circumlocution Department. With an untrained staff at the bottom hastily brought together and as hastily disbanded, with understaffing at the head, and a hierarchy of officials who must initial every minute and delay every report till it has received their several imprimaturs, there is no wonder that official statistics often do not appear till after their possible utility is passed. This, with many other defects, will disappear when we have a central permanent statistical department. - . . A specially important consideration in the immediate future will be the comparability of the statistics published by the Inland Revenue Commissioners with previous years. It appears that during the past year a great deal of income has been discovered and taxed which had hitherto eluded the collector. Also there has been, I believe, some change in the methods of averaging the receipts of the pest years in favour of paying on the most recent yoar; certainly the forms issued have altered considerably, and the unit requires new and very careful definition. If the figures either for gross or net income are published, they will give rise to yet more serious errors as to the growth of income than that with which I dealt just now, and it is of national importance that this should be put right. Further, an immense amount of information is accumulating with the recent differentiation of the tax. and if it is skilfully handled, it should throw light on many of the
questions which the Income Tax Committee left doubtful. There is a great opportunity for the statisticians of Somerset House, which Mr. Mallet's recent paper leads us to hope will be taken, to give us a sound and very interesting analysis of a great part of the national income. Incidentally, it may be hoped that the 'gross revenue' statistics may be amended, or disappear from the Statistical Abstract."

In writing upon the same subject another distinguished statistician, Sir J. Athelstane Baines, refers to the income tax statistics, and remarks that the interesting evidence given before the Select Committee of 1906 " showed how much has to be based upon approximation from data more or less remote, as soon as one comes to grips with important questions. . . . As a rule, however, the dead weight of returns poured into an office such as this keeps the whole staff at work upon current duties. Nevertheless, it may be assumed from the amount of detail collected that much good work could be done in the way of correlation of the different revenue returns if any one of the officials had the time and the taste for it. . . . ${ }^{1}$ Sir L. G. Chiozza Money commented upon Dr. Bowley's paper, quoted above, in terms somewhat more favourable to the reports. He agreed with " all that had been said with regard to the unfortunate habit of publishing statistics without sufficient explanation. For instance, the Statistical Abstract contained scarcely a page which would not deceive a man who came to it without careful study. That was the cause of the misquotations in the newspapers." . . . In many official publications of the last two years more and more explanatory matter had been published. The Report of the Inland Revenue Commis. sioners did condescend to explain a great deal of the information given; and he noticed that that useful habit was finding its way to other departments, so that they might hope in a few years even the Statistical Abstract might condescend to explain its very valuable contents.

It is not my intention in any way to take up this matter, either in defence or in further attacks, but the opinion may

[^1]at any rate be expressed that many of the criticisms urged against the income tax statistics show a real failure to appreciate the genuine difficulties of the subject and its intractability for ordinary treatment. Some of those criticisms also show a failure to appreciate the degree of ingenuity that has been required to work upon the raw material and present the tables in the form that has been adopted since the year 1900. Any one who imagines that a taxed " income" isor can be under the most ideal system-a simple objective fact like a death, or a bale of goods, or a cheque, or a railway mile, is recommended to a stout volume like Dowell's " Income Tax Laws," or is asked to devise, with the aid of Seligman's " Income Tax," a scheme of taxation which shall fit all the complexity of modern life like a glove, pay over taxes without irritation, hesitation or evasion, and yield statistics that a babe can handle.

Now the classification of assessments under Sch. D is a case in point. It is true its practical value is limited, and it whets the appetite for the unattainable, but it was furnished under Pitt's tax and has been rendered continuously since the forties, for it represents the best that could be given by way of analysis in those days, and in its improved form it gives what can be known about such assessments now. Practical experience has, however, shown the necessity for careful definition and explanation in order that it shall not be held to convey more than it really does, and a hypothetical example is therefore furnished annually. Dr. Bowley is sarcastic at the expense of " an imaginary solicitor, who also owns houses and shares in Government, municipal, and foreign stock and in a public company, who occupies lands is a land agent and borough auditor, and employs his leisure moments with success as an author. . . . It is time that this talented gentleman disappeared, and that the report was devoted to showing what is the case, rather than to proving that the tables printed are only booby traps." ${ }^{1}$ The true difficulty and difference of view lie in the assumption of an identity in the two tasks-the analysis of the

[^2]existing material and the special preparation of material for statistical ends-both as to the work and expense involved, and also as to the recognised functions of the department.

The main practical aims of this work are threefold :-
First, it is proposed to describe the subject-matter and to formulate definitions of all the "conventions" of the tax in such a way that their bearing upon statistical and economic investigation shall be clear, and the relations between the figures and the facts be revealed so far as that may be possible. To this end the present form of the statistical returns is examined in detail.

Secondly, an attempt has been made to obtain historic continuity in the figures, and to furnish tables, based upon the official returns, which shall bridge the gaps or "breaks" caused by changes in the legal and administrative basis of assessment, so that a real comparability may exist between years widely separated. Sir Athelstane Baines has remarked: " After proceeding a certain distance on an excellent road, the explorer finds himself brought up by an impassable chasm, or perplexed by the dispersal of the track into a number of blind alleys, putting an end to all progress." It is this continual bar to useful comparison that I have endeavoured to overcome by a presentation of the tables upon main uniform lines throughout, and particularly in showing, by close approximation, how the original tables must be modified to give what would have been the figures if recent statutory conditions (as to exemption limits, repairs, allowances, etc.) had obtained throughout. It has been impossible, for example, to get a continuous view of anyset of statistics from 1842 without reference to at least six separate volumes (and often many more), and this involves all the perils of transition. Even so careful a worker as Giffen is occasionally trapped. In a comparison of real property values made for the years 1814, 1853, 1868, 1884, and 1901 he gives figures which are really not comparable at all: for the first two dates he quotes England and Wales only, the second is really applicable to 1843, the first includes quarries, mines and ironworks, the second adding also profits
of railways and gas works, while the last three exclude all these items and refer to the United Kingdom. ${ }^{1}$
It will readily be understood that, apart from general comments, no attempt has been made to allow in these tables for the improved efficiency of the tax administration. But the opportunity has been taken-indeed, it was essential to the successful performance of the task-to bring together from widely scattered sources all the available information, to sift it, and to preserve all that is likely to be of value.
In the third place, the book illustrates freely the practical difficulties connected with the use of these statistics for econonic investigation. The inquirer will find, in connection with any given subject, if the statistics have been applied to it at all, a sufficiently complete reference or bibliography of that application, with the warnings and limitations peculiar to it. The intention has not been to extend the scope of the work unduly by giving a complete examination of all such investigations, but to say sufficient in each case to guide past the chief pitfalls and to provide some definite ideas as to the work already done upon the subject.
It is not a part of the purpose of this book to carry on these economic investigations to a final conclusion in each case. That would in most instances involve the use of auxiliary statistics, or an incursion into other spheres, and some of those inquiries would require a volume specially devoted to each. It has been the aim to provide new or improved tools for use rather than to use them when made: to prepare a road rather than to transport merchandise; to build the vessel for others rather than to take voyages in herBut in several directions, not involving the use of outside material, constructive work has been done beyond the strict limits of the book where it has arisen directly from the appointed task. This necessary restraint has been exercised even at the risk of such a criticism as that made by Mr. Ernest Barker: " He seems to do a great deal of packing in preparation for a journey on which he never starts." "

[^3]The official figures used throughout this book are derived from the following sources:-
(a) Reports of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, I to 57, 1355-6 to 1912-13 (these are referred to throughout briefly, e.g., " 18th Report"). They form the main source, as the annual statistical returns rendered by the surveyors of taxes are summarised therein. The 1st, 13th, 28th, and 45th Reports are especially valuable, both for their summary tables, and also their descriptive matter. In many of the earlier ones the information given is somewhat meagre, but important clues are sometimes to be found in them. Great changes were introduced in the content and presentation of the statistics in 1874-5 and 1900-I and a unification of the various periods has been one of the chief tasks of this work.
(b) Returns rendered to Parliament, 1801 to 1915 (referred to in the form " H. C. 57 of 1863 " or " H. L. 6 I of 1864 "). These returns are very numerous. Some of them form a series (e.g., classification of Sch. D and E assessments), and others were of ephemeral interest only or were embodied in subsequent reports. But in many cases the details given are important and unique.
(c) The Reports of Royal Commissions, Select and Departmental Committecs, together with the evidence. The appendices frequently contain specially prepared official returns, and the evidence brings ont the character and limitations of official statistics, with valuable and official expressions of opinion on difficult points.
(d) Tables supplied officially to eminent investigators: Levi, Giffen, Goschen, etc.
(c) Answers to Questions in Parliament, Budget Speeches, etc. (the reference to Hansard is given where necessary). Where the information furnished is likely to be useful in future it has been incorporated.

Although a practical acquaintance with the official statistics of income tax and inhabited house duty, with the general procedure of their compilation and with the assessments themselves, has materially assisted in the interpretation and manipulation of the figures, this work is in no sense an official one. No statistics are given which had not already
been published and which are not equally available for all investigators in the documents above mentoined. But for the use that is now made of them I am entirely responsible. Sufficient evidence for the general definitions and practical statements given may be found in Dowell's "Income Tax Laws " and Dowell's "House Duty Acts," in the Commissioners' Reports, in the published Tax Cases, in the evidence before the Income Tax Committees of 1905 and 1906, and in such reference books on practice as Senior's "Income Tax Practice," published in the sixties, and Murray and Carter's well-known work for recent years. Nevertheless, a careful compilation from these sources would hardly have assumed the form which practical knowledge and a study specially directed to statistical ends have given to the present work, for legal lore and technical reference have been severely subordinated to the main purpose. They have been drawn upon freely, but only so far as they are likely to have a bearing upon interpretation and use for statistical and economic investigations. For such purposes the treatment has been as complete as seems to be necessary, but for all other purposes it is manifoslly inadequate. The work pretends to no authority, therefore, in general income tax matters from the standpoint of law, accountancy, equity, political theory, or ordinary practice.

For some of the difficult research affecting the earlier years I have, before arriving at my conclusions, examined all the original blank forms of assessment, together with blank forms of the statistical returns which formed the basis of the official reports, and on matters of practice I have consulted retired officials whose memory extends, with varying degrees of reliability, to the early sixties. In some matters in which no official data has been obtained or published I have relied upon my own experience and observation (as a sample investigation), or I have obtained expressions of opinion from a number of official friends whose varied experience furnishes the best possible substitute for actual sample tests on a comprehensive scale.

The illustrative quotations are not exhaustive in any sense -many that have come under my notice have been omitted
to avoid tedious repetition-but they are drawn from a wide range of economic and statistical literature. They are not given in any captious or critical spirit. It is true that, in some instances, gross carelessness has been exhibited, by the authors cited, in their use of official returns; and there are one or two writers who are culpably negligent in their writings generally. But for the most part the errors are excusable or natural, and could only have been avoided by a close study of the statistical material. They are cited in detail to justify the treatment of the subject in the text, which otherwise might appear to elaborate unnecessarily or to labour the obvious. It is often valuable, moreover, to observe the precise form in which an erroneous interpretation has been made. Collectively, these references furnish perhaps the best and most obvious justification for the present work. They show that the whole subject is a difficult one and that some guidance in its technicalities is not unnecessary; and, further, they prove the importance of this class of statistics and the wide and various uses to which the details are brought.

The new and entirely original tables compiled from the official data, corrected and adjusted to exhibit consistent sequences, are intended to show as faithfully as possible the true trend of objective facts, uncomplicated by interior changes either in law or administrative practice. The official figures are very unsuited for comparisons over long periods, and these tables are now offered as superior for such purposes and as superseding to that extent the use of official reports in their " raw " state. It is hoped, therefore, that they may be regarded as a real, if humble, contribution to the economic and social history of the United Kingdom in the last hundred years.
Mathematical methods of interpolation have occasionally been used, but in most instances (particularly in the distribution of known totals over a classification) they do not give results so consistent and accurate as a "free-hand" method which follows, on a technical instinct, the trend of each series of figures, and duly observes the numerous checks and limits afforded by other branches of the statistics.

Examples of this may be found in the effect of re-assessment years upon gross assessments on property and the converse effect upon deductions therefrom ; or in the relation between Sch. A on Lands and Sch. B, or Sch. A on Houses, etc., and the House Duty figures. A margin of possible error is given, where necessary, adequate for all purposes-in many cases where an estimate has been given for one factor over a certain period, and comparisons are made within that period, it is unnecessary to take the whole range of error given; it may be read for both years as plus, or for both as minus, because any error will be constant in direction for that period. Only the final results have been brought into the main tables, for the complicated details in the adjustments would be confusing in ordinary reference. In the main tables the ordinary official figures have been given together with the revised figures, where necessary, to facilitate reference and identification.
I have not attempted to make this book "readable " in the ordinary sense, but to provide a work useful for reference, and valuable in conjunction with the current official reports, or largely in substitution for the older official tables. I have accordingly been content to summarise many points briefly, where an indication of their character will be sufficient to inform the investigator, or to warn the unwary. Generally speaking, where such matters have been fully dealt with elsewhere, I have been most brief, but where the considerations are being urged for the first time I have felt it necessary to elaborate them more fully. The adoption of such a principle has alone prevented the book assuming excessive proportions. Reference has been made to all matter coming to my notice which is likely to be of real use in pursuing investigations based upon these data. The results of actual observations lasting for some years or covering a great number of cases have generally been conveyed in a few lines, while "workings" for the tables, the methods employed. the adjustment required, and the evidence relied upon are given briefly in the Appendices.

[^4]individual piece of knowledge by its significance for the search after truth. . . . Science is not a mere juxtaposition of individual opinions, but the worker who puts forth effort at any particular spot is conscious that his effort is girt about and sustained by an effort of the whole to which he willingly yields his contribution. . . . Truth won at any particular point is valid and binding throughout."Rudolf Eucken.
" And as in Arithmetique, unpractised men must, and Professors themselves may often erre, and cast up false; so also in any other subject of Reasoning, the ablest, most attentive, and most practised men, may deceive themselves, and inferre false Conclusions. . . . For there can be no certainty of the last Conclusion, without a certainty of all those Affirmations and Negations, on which it was grounded and inferred. . . . In Reasoning of all other things, he that takes up conclusions on the trust of Authors, and doth not fetch them from the first Items in wery Reckoning, (which are the significations of names settled by definitions), loses his labour; and does not know any thing ; but oriely belicueth."-Hobbes' "Leviathan."

## PART I.

# ANALYSIS AND DESCRIPTION OF OFFICIAL STATISTICS AND THEIR USES. 

## CHAPTER I.

Schedule A. Real Property. INCOME FROM OWNERSHIP OF LIAND, HOUSES, ETG.
Incous tax, Sch. A, commonly known as the "Property Tax," is that section which deals with profits from the ownership of lands, houses, etc., and every description of property in the nature of realty. The assessments are re-made periodically, the poor law parish being the unit of grouping for property, and the poor rate order and form are adopted as a basis by the Imperial authorities. ${ }^{1}$ All properties are reviewed (with a few exceptions mentioned hereafter), whether those interested in them are liable to income tax or not, so that the statistics are very complete.

## GROSS INCOME UNDER SCHEDULE A.

" Grosa Income " stands for "gross assessments " which are made upon the "annual value " determined according to statutory rules. "Gross income" is not, therefore.

[^5]
## BRITISH INCOMES AND PROPERTY.

necessarily the same as the gross actual income received or enjoyed, nor is the "income on which tax was received" the same as the actual net income received and enjoyed. The various rents paid, or beneficial occupations enjoyed, in connection with the ownership of lands, houses, etc., have to be brought to a common denominator of " annual value." Thus the rents of five premises of identical " annual value" may be all different-the first being let at a low rent on a long lease, ${ }^{1}$ the second let by the year, the third at a high rent by the week, the fourth at a higher rent, owner paying tenapt's rates, and the fifth may be let at a conventional or nominal rent, the tenant having a beneficial occupation, or being himself responsible for creating part of the " annual value." The use of a common denominator is very valuable from a statistical point of view, since it secures uniformity as regards both time and space, and makes comparisons perfectly valid between distant places or periods, as well as between different classes of property. But it has the slight disadvantage that it is a legal conception which, over part of the field at any rate, does not correspond to popular conceptions of " rent."
Defintions of "Annual Value."-The legal definitions of " annual value " are not quite identical throughout the United Kingdom.

## Comparability of Different Areas.

Metropolis: Annual Value.-" Gross value" means the annual rent which a tenant might reasonably be expected, taking one year with another, to pay for a hereditament, if the tenant undertook to pay all usual tenant's rates and taxes, and the tithe commutation rentcharge, if any, and if the landlord undertook to bear the cost of the repairs and insurance, and the other expenses, if any, necessary to maintain the hereditament in a state to command that rent. ${ }^{2}$

[^6]This definition is for rating purposes, but as the gross value is binding for income tax (Sch. A) and House Duty as the annual value, it is material to examine the conditions under which it is arrived at. Periodical conferences of London rating authorities pass resolutions which make for uniform practice, and the following cases taken from them illustrate general principles :-
(a) Weekly and monthly tenancies. A scale is provided in which the gross value is always below the full net rent for the year after deducting rates-e.g., ros. per week, owner paying rates at $6 s$. in $f$, or in actual amount $f 4$ Ios. per annum, is not $£ 2 I$ ros. gross, but $£ 19 ;^{2}$ and similarly $20 s$. per week is not $£ 52-£ 9=£ 43$, but $£ 37$. $^{\text {a }}$
(b) For quarterly and yearly tenancies and ordinary three years" agreements the actual rent is taken as the "gross value." ${ }^{3}$
(c) For agreements longer than three years, tenant doing inside repairs, 5 per cent. is added to the rent to arrive at gross value. ${ }^{\text {a }}$
(d) In the case of a repairing lease, 10 per cent. is added. ${ }^{3}$

[^7]hereditaments or heritages charged under Schedule A shall be understood to be the rent by the year at which the same are let at rackrent . . . fixed by agreement within . . . seven years," or " if not let at rackrent, then at the rackrent at which the same are worth to be let by the year." ${ }^{2}$
(Other items of Sch. A, non-commuted tithes, manorial rights, etc., are assesscd under special rules ; see pp. 44, 48).

The official definition of "rack rent" is well known, and is practically identical in its terms with that given for the metropolis above. But whereas the gross value for the poor rate is binding for Sch. A in the metropolis, outside the metropolis the assessments are quite independent of the values for local purposes. The conditions governing assessments may, however, be taken to be broadly sinilar to those quoted above from the Metropolitan Valuation Conference resolutions.

Scotland: Annual Value.-For rating purposes one uniform valuation exists, upon which all public assessments are based, and it is revised annually. ${ }^{2}$ The county and burgh authorities appoint assessors for the purpose. Very frequently, with Treasury approval, ${ }^{3}$ they appoint the Government surveyor of taxes as assessor, and it is provided by law that the values in the valuation roll are conclusive also for income tax (Sch. A, B) and House Duty ${ }^{4}$ except where the surveyor is not assessor. ${ }^{4}$ In 23 out of 33 counties and 46 out of 85 burghs the surveyors act as assessors,' so that it is clear that over a considerable part of Scotland rating law governs or influences the income tax assessments." In
${ }^{2} 5$ \& Vict. c. 35, s. 60.
177 \& 18 Vict. c. 91.
$35^{2}$ \& 53 Vict. c. 50, s. 83.

- 20 \& 21 Vict. c. 58 , s. 3 .
${ }^{5}$ D. C. on Imperial and Local Taxation, 1912, Q. 11.475. Owing to the fact that Edinburgh and Glasgow are not included, the amount of the valuation made by the surveyors is slightly lems than half the
 30 connties and 42 burghs (Armour's "Valuation of Property for Rating in Scotland," p. 23).
- Vide evidence before S. C. on Valuation of Lands and Aspespments (Scotiand) Bill, by W. Mnnro, valuation asmesaor and surveyor of taxes, Qs. 1,456, etc. Also A. Nisbet before S. C. On Rating of Machinery Bill, 1887, and F. S. Allan before S. C. on Valaation of Lands and Heritages, Scotiond, 18650
the remaining part, the ordinary Income Tax Acts apply, as in England and Wales. The " yearly value" as defined by the Valuation Act is " the rent at which, one year with another, such lands and heritages might in their actual state be reasonably expected to let from year to year . . . and where such lands and heritages are boná fide let for a yearly rent conditioned as the fair annual value thereof, without grassum or consideration other than the rent, such rent shall be taken. . . . Provided always, that if such lands and heritages be let upon a lease the stipulated duration of which is more than twenty-one years from the date of entry . . . the rent payable . . . shall not necessarily be assessed as the yearly rent or value . . ." 1

For rating purposes this ectually substituted the gross rout for the met rent (after average repairs and other expenses and public charges had been deducted) as contained in the Poor Law (Scotland) Act of 1845. For many years no improvements, even if permanent, could be entered in the valuation roll if they were voluntarily made by a tenant holding under a bond fide lease of less than twenty-one years' duration and without "grassum" or consideration other than the rent 2 -this was remedied by statute in 1895 , when the whole property as improved could be dealt with, and included in the Income Tax Asssessments.

## Eficot of Raten on Annual Value.

Soolland.-A point of greater importance in comparing "gross value " in Scotland with "gross value " elsewhere is the effect of the difference in rating law and practice as to payment of rates by owners. The Income Tax Act, 1842, naturally made provision that where owners had agreed to pay rates, taxes, and other charges which by law were a charge on tenants, such payments should be deducted from the gross rent in order to arrive at the "gross assessment." The Scottish law provides for a part of the rates to be paid by the owner, and the new or "yearly value "for

[^8]rating purposes is taken to be the yearly rent, and is binding (for the greater part of Scotland) upon the income tax, Sch. A, so that the gross tax assessments in Scotland exceed those in England, in identical circumstances, by the amount of the rates borne by the owner. In 1856 an Act was passed " to grant relief in assessing the Income Tax on lands in Scotland in respect of certain Public Burdens charged thereon," being the public rates, etc., which in England are by law a charge on occupiers. The allowance is made as a deduction in the assessment, and not in arriving at the gross value, so that Scottish values exceed corresponding English ones, although net assessments may be quite comparable. There are, however, several small anomalies arising out of this difference that may most clearly be seen from an example:

A house is let in England at $£ 36$ per annum, the tenant paying $£ \mathrm{x} 2$ rates. A similar house is let in Scotland at $£ 42$ per annum, the owner paying $£ 6$ rates and the tenant paying $\ddagger 6$ also. (It will be observed that the owners' net incomes are the same, and repairs will be taken to be actually the same in the two cases.)

|  |  | Dedo | tioss. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grom | $\begin{gathered} \substack{\text { Repains } \\ \left(\begin{array}{l} \text { fthth). } \end{array}\right.} \end{gathered}$ | Pablic Burdena | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{\text {Not }}$ | Houre Duty. |
| England | ${ }_{36}^{t}$ | $\frac{1}{6}$ | $\underline{t}$ | ${ }_{30}$ | $\frac{t}{36}$ |
| Scotland | 42 | 7 | 6 | 29 | 42 |

The effect upon the statistics when used for many purposes is sufficiently important to warrant close examination. The actual amount of "public burdens" allowed is not now shown separately. It is included in "other deductions" at the foot of the main table, Sch. A. For 19ro-II, "other deductions" amount to $£ 2,154,884$ for England and Wales from a total gross assessment of $£ 233,906,688$, whereas for Scotland they amount to $£ 2,713,025$ out of a total gross of $£^{26,944,346 \text {. }}$. The disproportion is mainly accounted for by this item of "pablic burdens." In the last year for which separate details were given ( $\mathbf{1 8 9 9 - 1 9 0 0 \text { ) they amounted to }}$ £ $1,352,265$, out of abont $£ 1,393,000$ total "other deductions" ${ }^{2}$;
${ }^{1}$ 55th Report, P. 105.
44th Report, p. 118.
the gross assessment for Scotland amounted to $£ 22,949,89 x$, and so exceeded the gross assessment, according to the English method, by 6 per cent. (For further details of the deductions see p. 60, Effect on House Duty, p. 133, and Repairs, p. 6r.)

The effect of this pecularity is much more important in a comparison of places than in one of periods.

Speaking generally, when correction has been made for this item, there is no substantial difference in the method of arriving at the "gross assessment " over the whole of Great Britain, although there are some slight differences in local customs as to the repairs that owners of dwelling-houses undertake and as to fixtures customarily let with houses.

Ireland.-Here the position is very different. The gross assessments are bound by Griffith's valuation, now fifty years old, and bear no regular or necessary relation to the facts of any given case. But at the time of the valuation, after elaborate instructions to the valuers they were told that the value was " to be the rent which a liberal landlord would obtain from a solvent tenant for a term of years, rates, taxes, etc., being paid by the tenant."1 This, however, applied to buildings only; and land was valued on an entirely different basis. The whole question of Irish assessment is full of difficulties from a statistical point of view, and will be separately dealt with in Chapter IV.

The movement of values of land in Ireland is sometimes comparod with the increases in England, when of course no comparison is possible. Eg., Royal Agric. Soc. Trans, 1878, the " small rise in Ireland " 1857 to 1875 is compared with 21 per cent. and 26 per cent. elsewhere.

## The Relation between the Legal Value as defined and the True Value (Great Britans).

Assuming that assessments are accurately made according to definitions, and are always up to date, how closely does the statutory gross value, as defined, approach the real value as popularly underatood? It was remarked above that over

[^9]part of the field the legal conception and the popular conception are not identical; but fortunately they are alike over a sufficiently wide range for the idea of the properties of the whole country let uniformly at rack rent by the year, tenant paying rates and owner doing repairs, to be fairly easily received and apprehended. Dr. Bowley asks, ' $:$ What is the relation between assessed value of houses and their true value?" ${ }^{2}$ Does he mean by this a true value in a hypothetical common denominator or measure, enabling unlike expressions to be aggregated ? or true value in the sense of current expressions ( 8 s .6 d . per week, $£ 70$ per annum on seven, fourteen, or twenty-one years' lease, $£ 30$ per annum three years' agreement, and so on) ? If the latter is intended, then the answer must be given piecemeal, ${ }^{2}$ and no one conspectus of the aggregate is possible, because these terms cannot be aggregated. If an answer as to the aggregate is required, then that annual value, which is a hypothetical expression for many of the cases, mrst perforce be taken.

This is in some instances to postulate a demand curve running practically parallel to the demand curve of ordinary terms-the mere translation of a " weekly rent " into a rent ex rates, and the translation of that result into a yearly rent, after allowing a contingency margin. But when we come to another class of properties which are nowhere let on the terms required by the definition, we postulate an imaginary demand curve for those terms. Thus the attempt to get the annual value of a large isolated country mansion or residence such as Chatsworth or Arundel Castle, or of a town hall, strictly according to the definition, leads us dangerously near the ridiculous, and it is a moot point whether the value, year by year, on such terms is not zero. As a fact, we really modify our definition, and almost forsake the hypothetical demand curve, falling back in practice upon the supply curve, i.e., the reasonable rate of interest on the building outlay which would be necessary to call forth that outlay. ${ }^{3}$

[^10]Two cases where the value as defined differs from the " rent " as commonly used may be mentioned as additional to those referred to on p. r6. The first is the labourer's, or eatate, cottage, in rural districts, let at a nominal or conventional "rent," but assessed on its rack rental value.

The second is the public-house tied to a brewer, where the tenant pays a rent less than the rent which would be required from a free tenant, and makes up the balance in the less advantageous terms upon which he is entitled to purchase his beer, etc. This difference is not really what is ordinarily known as " beneficial occupation," because a full rent is really paid, but in a different form. Similarly the rent paid by the brewer to the superior landlord may exceed the rack rental value of the definition, the excess being an expense of the brewer's investment in obtaining a market, and having no relation to the rent a tenant would afford to pay. Where brewers are competing for tied houses belonging to private owners, it is a nice point whether the rack rental value should be decided as in a brewer's market, or in a market for tenants (who will be the actual occupiers).

It is generally and rightly considered that the weakest part of rating and assessment is the treatment of " owneroccupied " property. ${ }^{1}$ Failing the test of practical letting, value must be a matter of judgment which will be nearer the truth according to the extent to which valid comparison is possible. Probably the statistical importance of the deviation from "rental " truth is insignificant, although expert valuers are perhaps inclined to emphasise it. It is true that for neither local nor imperial purposes is the machinery of valuation strong enough, or rather fine enough, to do the work with exactness. But approximation to a general rental standard is certainly sufficient for ordinary purposes, although it fails to satisfy some experts. Mr. H. T. Eve, in evidence before the D. C. on Imperial and Local Taxation,

[^11]recently declared that in rafing the property in unions he found the rent was too high or too low as a representation of real value in 50 per cent. of the cases ! When asked whether he was not " too much of an artist," he said that " many rents are fixed by many minds at many times," but in valuation " one rent is fixed by one mind at one time." Commenting upon the value of the services of the surveyor of taxes in Scotland for rating valuation, he remarked that in Scotland he must assess on the basis of rent by law, and however useful the surveyor might be there he would fail in England, under the Rating Act of $\mathbf{1 8 3 6}$, to find what property is worth to be let from year to year-the real distinction.

## Woodlands and Timber.

"It may be urged that timber goes with the land, and is included in the valuation of the land, but this is not so according to the method of income tax returns. The real income from woods and plantations is not included in Sch. A, but only an assumed agricultural or prainie value . . . 100 million $\hat{\ell}$ for woods and forests."-Gifren, "The Growth of Capital," 1889 , p. 18.

Income from the sale of timber is regarded as covered by the Sch. A assessments on the land on which the timber grows. The assessments usually correspond with poor rate valuation, and the peculiarities of rating law in this respect are fully set out in standard works on rating, but they may be briefly mentioned here. The governing Act of 1874 gives three classes: ( $\mathbf{x}$ ) Land used only as a plantation or a wood, where the value is to be taken as though divested of timber and in a natural, unimproved, or "prairie" state; (2) land used exclusively for growth of saleable undenvood-to be valued in full, as if let for that purpose ; (3) land used for both the foregoing purposes-to be valued on either method according to the discretion of the assessment committee.

On a representation from the British Timber Conference the Local Government Board circularised the assessment committees recently, calling attention to these provisions. Appeals against valuations of woodlands have been very
numerous in late years, and they now stand mostly in relation to class ( $x$ ), on an artificial "prairie " value, and it is doubtful whether, in strictness, this should be a governing consideration for the Sch. A value. It should be understood, of course, that the shooting is separately valued, and added to the value of the woodlands.

There is far more point in Giffen's argument now than when he wrote, because at that date the ratings of woodlands were much higher and nearer to the true full annual value for all purposes. ${ }^{1}$

The next question, and the more important one, is : How closoly do the assossmonts as mado in practice approach the true values as porfoctly assossod in theory ?

## Comparison with the Poor Rate.

It is generally acknowledged that the income tax, Sch. A, assessments are the best approach to the true values that we possess.' In the metropolis, in Ireland, and most parts of Scotland it has no advantage over the poor rate because it is made upon the same figures. But in England and Wales, apart from the metropolis, it is always considered to be superior. A great feature of the early Reports was a comparison of the Sch. A totals with the corresponding totals of the poor rate, the figures being adjusted so as to relate to exactly the same properties. This was often given in great detail by counties, showing clearly in which counties the poor rate was most below the rack rental. This is not to say that in such counties the poor rate was the worst,-we should apply such an adjective to the relative correctness of the parts: and it is often found that a low-rated parish has its ratings in excellent proportion to each other, where a parish in which the aggregate is practically correct abounds in anomalies, ratings erroneous both in excess and deficiency. The local authorities have statutory right of obtaining information upon the Sch. A assessments, and of late years have availed themselves so freely of it that a much closer

[^12]approximation now exists between the totals of the two valuations. ${ }^{1}$

The influence of the poor rate valuations and the Sch. A assessments upon each other, reciprocally, has often been misunderstood. It is true that the poor rates are used as a basis for the Sch. A assessment, so far as the skeleton plan is concerned, but the amount of the assessments can be quite independent of the ratings. There was provision for the Sch. A assessments being based upon a " scale" of poor rate values in each parish, but this never meant anything else than taking a number of sample properties whose aggregate rack rentals were known, finding the aggregate rateable values of the same properties, and using the comparative totals as a ratio for use where rack rentals were not independently known or obtainable. ${ }^{2}$ It was theoretically impossible, after the Parochial Assessments Act, 1836, to carry out the provision as to scales, but as the ratings did not hasten to amend themselves under that Act there was no difficulty in practice. ${ }^{8}$

A specimen of the adjustment and comparison made in the early Reports is given below (Metropolis, Ireland and Scotland are omitted as the differences are negligible and due to infrequent exceptions to the general agreement):-

## Year 1875-6 (Rest of Englard).

## Poor Rate Assessmont.

| Total gross estimated rental |  | $\underset{\mathrm{II} 2,664,631}{f}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total rateable value . . . . 95,961,497 |  |  |
| Value of property rated, but not |  | 27 |
| assessed under Sch. A ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | frateable | 10,765,712 |
| Value of property rated and |  | 99,218,361 |

${ }^{1}$ In many cases this means merely that the poor rate defects plus and minus balance each other. For a detailed description of the present condition of rural rating, vide Economic Journal, March, 191I, already cited: for the growing use of the Sch. A for the county rate basis, vide D. C. on Imperial and Local Taxation, Qs. 10,5 $\times 2-5$, 10,522.
${ }_{5}^{2}$ \& 6 Vict. c. 35, 3. 64, taken from 46 Geo. 3, c. 65 .
3 For the general practice as to using the poor rate as a guide, see evidence by T. Sargent, S. C. on Poor Rate Aspemments, 1868, Qs. 6,316, 6,381-2, etc. Also R. C. on Agriculture, Q 45,570.

- Such as quarries, mines, railways, etc.


## Sch. A Assonsment.



Thus the property rated at $£ 99,218,36 x$ was assessed, Sch. A, at $f$ rog,096,483, or practically ro per cent. more.

In 1876-7 a comparison was given by counties. Anglesea (26.57), Lincoln (25.08), Bedford (20.97), Carnarvon (19.03) were the worst cases, and Northumberland (2.65), Cornwall $(5 \cdot 16)$, Salop ( $5 \cdot 13$ ), and Wilts ( 6 ) were the best.

In the Table AI the information in the different reports is collected to show the progressive improvement in the poor rate.

Leone Levi, pleading for a common unit of valuation, illustrates the necessity by quoting Sch. A against gross estimated rental and rateable value in $\mathbf{5 8 7}$, and also in 1885-2, but without making any allowance or adjustment for property yated but not assessed, so that the comparison is valueless and the difference proves nothing-it would exist even though the rates and income tax values were identical (S. J., 1884).

Goschen gives a table showing rateable value and its proportion to the Sch. A values : $18 \times 5$ (estimated), 75 per cent. ; $184 \mathrm{r}, 72.89$ per cent.: 1847, 75 per cent.: 1856, $70-25$ per cent. : 1868, 70 per cent. The former increased 169 per cent. and the latter 150 per cent. in the interval (Report on Local Taxation, p. 17).
"According to the local taxation returns, the rateable value of farms and farmhouses in England and Wales amounted in 1907 to $\{30,900,000 \ldots$ if we add for repairs and also add the figures for Scotland, we obtain $£ 38,500,000$ as the estimated gross rental of the farms of Great Britain. . . Sch. A amounted to £ $42,300,000$. Empty property and deductions on appeal would slightly reduce this figure, but if we take it at $£ 45,500,000$, it only leaves $\{3,000,000$ in excess of the former figure as the annual value of residential estates, sporting lands, etc. This is almost certainly

[^13]far too low, but there is little doubt that there is considerable undervaluation of such properties, especially when they are inhabited by the owners themselves" ("Rent, Wages and Profits of British Agriculture," Economist, 1913, p. 1175).

The first figure appears to be obtained by adding to the " agricultural lands" for $1907 £ 23,654,000$, the value of " other lands, including farm buildings, etc.," $£ 7,278,000$ from House of Lords paper 150 of 1900 (the analysis has not been available since). But the actual gross estimated rental for these two classes was available $(\{34,675,567)$ in the same return for 1899, the Sch. A being $£ 37,110,000$. These cover practically the same ground, the difference being due to valuation, and not to the omission of park lands, sporting, etc., as suggested. The point intended to be made as to a difference in classification is not sound.
Q. " Why is it that the assessment of land for income tax purposes is so very much higher than for local purposes-the difference being about 7 per cent.? "-A. "Gross estimated rental is a column in the rate book which is regarded very differently by different overseers. . . . I find in many cases they deduct the tithe rentcharge before arriving at the gross estimated rental, which of course is wrong. The gross estimated rental should afford the means of comparison between two pieces of land of equal value, one of which may be subject to tithe rentcharge, the other of which may be free." . . . Q. "The tithe mistake, if it were general, would account for $\{3,000,000$ of this ?"-A. "Yes, but I do not suppose it is universal . . . it is very common, I fancy. . . . There is a difference of nearly $£ 3,000,000$ in comparing the income tax assessment with the gross estimated rental-it might be practically covered by tithe " (Evidence of Mr. W.C. Little before R. C. on Agricalture, Qs. 63,91x-63,921).

There is great confusion of thought here, and in so far as the statement of fact is correct it operates in an opposite direction to the explanation intended. Is the tithe separately rated? If it is, and the ratings on the farms are met, after tithe is deducted, the principle is the same as that under Sch. A. If the tithe is rated, and the farms are rated gross, the total must exceed Sch A. If the tithe is not rated and farms are rated gross, the totals should agree. The only case in which the explanation is valid is where lands are rated net, and the tithe is not rated-a very rare occurrence, no single instance of which has ever come under my notice.

Table AI.-Comparison between Value in Ineome Tax Ansossmonta (Sch, A) and Value in Local Assossmenta ( 6000 omitted).

| Yar. | Local Rate AssossEnents, Grows | Schat |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1874-5 | 97,8r3 | 107,690 | 10.1 |
| ${ }^{1875-6}$ | 978218 103,848 | 109,096 IT5,609 | II•3 |
| 1877-8 | 106,03r | I17,392 |  |
| 1878-9 | 107,399 | 118,966 |  |
| 1879-80* | III,042 | 123,107 | 109 |
| 1880-1 | 113,065 | 124.454 |  |
| ${ }_{\text {I }}^{\text {I }}$ | 114,040 | 125,201 125,399 | 9.2 |
| $1883-4$ | II6,584 | 126,390 | 9.2 |
| 1884-5. | 118,025 | 127,047 |  |
| ${ }^{1885-6 *}$ | 118.360 | 127,662 | $7 \cdot 8$ |
| ${ }_{1887}^{1880}$ | 119.860 120.882 | 128,090 127,988 |  |
| 1888-9** | 118,874 | 127.469 | 72 |
| 1889-90 | 120.499 | 328,211 |  |
| 2890-1 | 122,158 | 129.176 |  |
| (1891-2 | 123.456 | 130.359 131.119 |  |
| 1893-4* | 125.008 | 134.334 | 73 |
| 8894-5 | 127,287 | 1351,309 137 |  |
| - $88950-6$ | 129.757 $\mathbf{1 3 2 , 4 2}$ | 137.015 <br> 138,760 <br> 1 |  |
| ${ }^{1897}{ }^{-6}$ | 1325.46\% | 1310.967 $\mathbf{1} 9$ | 36 |
| 1896-9 | Not published. |  |  |

This table is perhaps relevant rather to the history and progress of rating than to income tax, since the closer approximation now attained is due to improvements in rating, but some comparison of the two chief valuations we possess is of interest in a work of this kind. No information is available for years subsequent to $1897-8$, but there is no doubt from an inspection of the gross totals that the divergence increased considerably in the 1898 and 1903 reassessments. Local authorities have lately been so active
in revising their ratings, however, that the difference is probably now under 4 per cent. ${ }^{1}$

> Table A2.-Classification of Ratoable Heroditamenta, England and Wales.

Compiled from House of Lords Return 183 of 1906 and other Sources ( $£ 000$ omitted).


- Uncertito to to extent to which Crown acespetion is inctoded.
${ }^{1}$ Earty details of rateable values for England and Wales may be found in the Poor Law Reports. Appendix XXXII. of R. C. on Agriculture, 1896. gives the following (in thousands):-1841.
 gross t) ; ${ }^{1866}$ E 93.638 ( $\mathbf{E 1 1 0 , 0 7 9}$ gross $\ddagger$ ). Also sce H. C. 215 of 1874 and $\mathrm{H}_{0} \mathrm{C}_{0} 461$ of 1875: 1867-8, (100,669 ( $(118,431$ grose) ;
 gross); 1871-2, E109,447 (E129,039 grose); 1872-3. E112,318 ( 1132,453 gross).
$\ddagger$ Vide F. Purdy, S. J., 1869, " Premare of Taxation on Real Property."

Vide also S. C. on Burdens affecting Real Property, 1846, p. 17. The rateable value is given as $\mathbf{f} 6,540,030$, "below the true figure," Sch. A. being $£ 85,802,735$ -
H. C. 332, 1860, shnwed that for 1856, the grows poor rate was 8.9 per cent. below the Sch. A.

Metropolis.-Parish details are given in H. C. 254 of 1854-5:Total, Sch. A, $£ 13,462,000$; county rate, $\{9,294,300$ (rateable value); poor rate, $\{9,975.600$ (rateable value).

## Poriodical Revaluation: Relative approximation to true facte in intervening years.

Except in Ireland, the income tax, Sch. A figures undoubtedly represent most closely the real facts, but in revaluation years far more closely than at other times. Indeed, in those years they are probably slightly in excess of the true figures, because many adjustments are made during the collection of the tax (after the totals have been made up) and allowed by way of "schedule" or repayment. But in non-valuation years they are, in England and Wales more especially, below the true figure. The reason is that while effect is given in practice to all bond fide reductions in rents wherever they occur, no effect is, or can be, given to increases in rents, and the totals are only maintained by new properties and structural alterations. There is a continuous drag downwards, and the " slack" is not taken up until the next revaluation year. No analysis of the Sch. A totals which omits to recognise this fact can therefore give valid results. As the metropolitan revaluation falls generally in a different year from that for England and Wales (ex. met.), the totals for the two combined rather mask the effect, but if they are taken separately it is very clear.

In Table $\mathrm{A}_{3}$ the effect of revaluation is very obvious, especially in the case of messuages (see particularly 1893-4, 1898-9 and 1903-4). The peculiar history of " Lands " since 1880 serves to mask the effect of revaluation when the two are taken together, for it seems that reductions in the case of farms are most freely made on the occasion of new assessments ${ }^{1}$ (see Table A3, 1882-3, 1885-6, 1888-9). Prior to 1876 the effect upon lands was the same as upon buildings-a marked rise in the revaluation year: and when the two are taken together it is cumulative (see especially 1857-8, 1861-2, 1864-5 and 1867-8). This "statutory " result must not be taken as representing the actual facts. Probably the true rise would be represented by a line, practically straight, joining points slightly below the position reached in each re-assessment year (vide Graph I.).

[^14]If the true increase in a year (TI) consists of the aggregate rent increases (i), minus the aggregate rent decreases (d), plus the value of new structures (s),

$$
\mathrm{TI}=i-d+s,
$$

but the increase shown by Sch. A figures in non-valuation years is

$$
s-d,
$$

and that shown in a revaluation year is, after four nonvaluation years,

$$
5 i+s-d .
$$

Now $i$ can always be found from the formula, and $s-d$ also, but $s$ and $d$ separately are not determinable.
The bearing of the analysis will be clear from the following attempt to use the annual increases exhibited by the figures :
" The allocation of the new capital of the United Kingdom between different forms of investment cannot be made with any precision on the basis of existing information. The erection of houses on land on the borders of urban areas absorbs much new capital. The gross profits from the ownership of houses, as shown in the reports of the Inland Revenue Commissioners, were greater by $£ 3,155,000$ in 1907-8 than in 1906-7, and a further increase of $\mathfrak{£ 3 , 1 1 3 , 0 0 0}$ was shown for $1908-9$. Capitalising the. indicated increase in revenue at fifteen years' purchase, there is an addition of about $£ 47,000,000$ to new capital in the form of houses (including sites) " (Census of Production, Final Report, p. 32).

In this instance the endeavour was made to capitalise s, but as a matter of fact $s-d$ was taken, and the decrease in rents has been ignored. The result obtained represents a minimum, and the true figure may be much greater.

Any comparison of the annual increases with each other will lead to fallacious results if the effect of re-assessment years is forgotten :-

Examining the connection existing between the average value of building land per head and the wealth per head, Mr. Mallock seeks to show that a constant proportion has existed, and appeals to the "facts":-" If we take the annual increase in the value of houses, as given in the Statistical Abstract for the years 18931907, there are only three years out of the fifteen in which the average was very greatly exceeded. These were the years 1898, 1901, and 1903. Now for the two years following the year 1893. the gross amount assessed to income tax exhibited a continuous
decline, and had in 1896 not so much as recovered its previous level. In 1897 it exceeded this by $£ 30,000,000$. Next year the increase in the value of houses rose to nearly twice the average. Two years later, in 9900 , the gross amount assessed to income tax showed an increase on the previous year of $£ 42,000,000$. The year following (1903) the increase in the value of houses exceeded the average by more than 50 per cent. . . . But not only do the figures thus show us the close connection between the increase in total income and the increase in the gross value of houses. They also show us that with each fall in the increase of gross income the increase in the grojs value of houses in a similar way falls. Thus after the record increase in gross income in 1897, with record increase in the value of houses that followed it, the annual increase in the gross value of houses sank to one half of the maximum to which the record year had raised it. In 1902 the same phenomenon repeated itself. The increase in gross income was $£ 42,000,000$ in 1900, and $£ 33,000,000$ in 1901. In 1903 it was not more than $£ 13,000,000$. The increase in the gross value of houses was, in 1904, less than one half of what it had been in 1903. . . . These facts show that the amount which the population will consent to spend in house rent . . . is limited by the amount per head which the population has to spend on its wants and enjoyments."

Mr. Mallock omits (a) to look at the 1893-4 increase over 2892-3: (b) to observe that statutory as well as commercial reasons account for a stationary state in 1896 gross income (vide, p. 288) : (c) to take account of 1893-4, 1898-9, and 1903-4 as re-assessment years-although warned by a footnote-and of rgor-2 as a year of revaluation in the metropolis. The whole "connection" falls to the ground.

Mr. Mallock proceeds in a similar manner to show that when there is a special increase in dwelling-house values, there is also one in business premises ! But this is alleged to have ceased about 1903. After much manipulation of the figures in the Statistical Abstract (Table aI, Inhabited House Duty) and confusion through mixing the columns, he concludes that business premises are falling in value or stagnant, while dwelling-houses increase in value. He finds "the clue to the riddle "in the table dealing with foreign investments, Sch. D, in which, after 1903, a marked advance in the rate of increase is shown I It is unnecessary to labour his conclusion, since the premises are worthless ("Phantom Millions," Nimetemeth Centwry, November, 1909).

An examination of Table A3 shows that, of a total increase of $£ 39,000,000$ in messuages, 1845-6 to 1870-I, England ade
and Wales, $£ 24,000,000$, or 62 per cent., was registered in the eight assessment years, and only 28 per cent. in the other seventeen years. For messuages (England and Wales, extra-met.), 1871-2 to 1910-11, the increase was $£ 93,500,000$, of which $£ 40,000,000$, or 43 per cent., took place in ten valuation years, and the remainder in thirty ordinary years. So in the first period the normal rise or surplus of new structures over rent decreases was just under one million pounds per annum, while the amount of increased rents taken up on each revaluation was about two millions, or two thirds of a million per annum. For the second period, the ordinary surplus ( $s-d$ ) was over one and two-third millions, the increased rents for valuation were two and a third millions, or just over half a million annually.

Just as the effect of revaluation may be to cause the assessments to lag behind the true values when ascending, so there are sometimes reasons why they should also descend less rapidly. In the case of houses, first, in a town where there has been great overbuilding, and there are many houses standing empty, such houses remain in the assessments at the old rents until, upon re-occupation at lower rents, the assessments are reduced. A re-assessment year affords a statutory opportunity for putting them all upon the correct basis, and if there has been a general fall in rents, the aggregate for all houses, occupied or void, may be suddenly much less than before the re-assessment. Secondly, with regard to lands, in time of depression reductions of rent commonly start as temporary abatements or remissions, which, made year byyear, end in becoming permanent. ${ }^{1}$

This point is well dealt with by R. J. Thompson," An Enquiry into the Rent of Agricultural Land in England and Wales during the Nineteenth Century." ${ }^{2}$ He constructed a table and graph showing index numbers for rents of specimen estates, income tax values, and Sauerbeck's price index number for each year from 1846 to 1900 .

[^15]*S.J. 1907.

He remarks: " Looking at this table, it will be seen that the income tax figures in column 3 start at practically the same level as the rent figures in column I , and in 1851 showed a decline, corresponding to the fall in column 1 , which was the result of the short period of depression in prices which occurred in 1849-52. The influence of the decline in rents operated in the case of the income tax returns until 1856 , from which date a steady rise set in and continued until 1879, though the influence of the triennial valuation is very well marked.
"The income tax figures moved much more slowly than the rent figures. It is interesting to notice that they stood several points above the figures for rent in each of the periods of depression, for instance in 1849-53, 1864-67, 1870-2, and 1879-1900, whereas in prosperous times of rising rents they are usually a few points lower. This is only natural, as their adjustment must come subsequent to alterations in rent; but there is, I think, another reason why they should remain higher than a falling rent, vir., that, as explained above, abatements and deductions are not shown in the income tax figures, which represent the gross rent payable under agreement. The rent curve, on the other hand, shows only the rent actually received, and it must be remembered that the decline in rent is very largely caused by abatements, which are called ' temporary' for several years (and sometimes for long. periods) before they are made permanent. It is natural, therefore, that the rent curves should reach a lower point and reach it earlier than do the income tax figures. The latter attained their lowest point in 900 , when they stood nine points below what they. were fifty-four years earlier."

The metropolitan values since $\mathbf{1 8 7 x}$ have been dealt with .by Mr. J. Calvert Spensley :-
"These figures " (totals of supplemental valuation lists) " may be taken to fairly represent the case, for although in the fxis 873,819 there is probably included some increment of value ... on the other hand, there is no doubt a considerable amount of decrement of value, due to the fact that an individual ratepayer will procure a reduction of assessment consequent upon a decreased rent, while he will not declare an increase of his rent until he is required to do so at the next quinquennial valuation " (S. J., 1903, p. 73).

Vide also Mr. Sidney Webb's use of the metropolitan valuation lists to show the increase due to new buildings, and the "uncarued increment ": S. C. on Town Holdings 1890, p. 341; and Criticisms, 1891, p. 136
Table A3.-Effoot of Re-aasosumont Yoars.
Gross Sch. A. England and Walcs ( 5000 omitted). (Excluding Metropolis after 1870-7r.)
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Graph III.
Gross Schedūle A, England and Wales (excluding Metropolis), 187 TO tole.
Lands and Messuages together.
Cbange of direction in Re-assessment Year indicated.


## SCHEDULE A. REAL PROPERTY. <br> $36 c$.

## Graph IV.

Gross Schedulr A, England and Wales (excluding Metropolis), I87I to 1912.
Lands and Messuages shown separately.
Change of direction in Re-assessment Year indicated. Yourn


Graph V.
Lands, England and Wales, $18 y \mathrm{y}$ to 1912 (enlarged scale).
Change of direction in Re-assessment Year indicated.


Sch. A Gross Assessments--Sequence. Comparability of Different Periods.

## (1) Logal Changes.

Apart from the regularly recurring effects of revaluation, the gross Sch. A assessments from 1842 down to date are affected by only one statute of importance, and when correction has been made for this change, and for various administrative changes in the statistics, the series remains perhaps the most stable and consistent of all the income tax statistics, reliable and eminently suitable for purposes of comparison with reference to different periods of time.
Peel's Act of 1842 copied the earlier Act in the inclusion of certain trading and profit-making concerns, to which were added railways, under Sch. A instead of Sch. D. They were concerns closely allied to real property, and are known as "Concerns No. III., Sch. A," comprising :-I. Mines of coal, tin, lead, copper, mundic, iron, and other mines. II. Quarries of stone, slate, limestone or chalk : ironworks, gasworks, salt springs or works, alum mines or works, waterworks, streams of water, canals, inland navigations, docks, drains and levels, fishings, rights of markets and fairs, tolls, railways and other ways, bridges, ferries, cemeteries, and other concerns of the like nature.

By 29 Vict. c. 36 these assessments were transferred to Sch. D as from $\mathbf{~} 867-8$ inclusive, when they amounted to £ $32,600,000$. The reason for the change is given in the Report. Since this date they have been regularly included under Sch. D in the Inland Revenue details, and by a mere "accident of birth" in r803, such items as salt springs. alum works, and cemeteries have received a degree of distinction in regard to the wealth of record and analysis lavished upon them that has been denied to the cotton, woollen and other staple industries !

The classifications in the 13th Report are somewhat defective for the early years, and in order to eliminate these assessments from the Sch. A totals from $\mathbf{1 8 4 2}$ to $\mathbf{x} 865$ inclusive (Table A4) some estimates have been necessary. These have been made with careful regard to the probable
facts of each case-they are negligible in absolute amount, and the possible error is not worth consideration, since it is necessary (a) for each series to be consistent in itself, and (b) for the estimates to aggregate to a known total. The deduction of the total for "Concerns No. III., Sch. A," from the full Sch: A gives the necessary unbroken sequence of figures 1842 to 1912 (Table A4, third part). The corresponding sum is added to Sch. D (see Appendix II. for Table Di). $\because$ It is obvious that omission to pay regard to this important "break" would vitiate almost any comparisons. But such omissions have been made on many occasions.

In his essay on "Taxes on Land," Giffen says: " In 1815 the annual value of real property-in other words, the annual return of the business (of land-owning)-was $£ 53,000,000$; in 1853 it was $£ 85,000,000$; in 1868 it was $£ 143,000,000$." This was written in 1871, but the 1904 edition has a footnote: "In 1884 it was (193.000,000, and in 1901-2, the latest year before me, $£^{238,000,000 " \text { " ("Economic Studies," I., p. 262). The footnote }}$ shows clearly that the gross Sch. A for the United Kingdom is intended. The $\mathbf{1 8 r 5}$ figure represents England and Wales only, the second figure also represents England and Wales, and should be 1843 , not 1853 , while the third figare (1868) represents the United Kingdom. The 1815 figures include profits of quarries, mines, and ironworks; the " 1853 " figure includes, besides these, railways and gasworks profits, but the 1868 and subsequent figures are exclusive of these items.

## (2) Administrative Improvement.

- There is some reason for believing that the first assess-. ments in 1842 were not very good, from an administrative point of view, ${ }^{1}$ and there was probably no great improvement until the general "efficiency campaign" in the early sixties, of which the reports give evidence. But an addition of not exceeding 5 per cent. to these early figures should be an ample addition to make them comparable with later figures. A great deal of attention was certainly given to fine and technical questions in assessment.

[^16]It appears that the valuation in Wales in the early seventies may have been rather low. ${ }^{1}$ As regards the metropolitan valuation, there is some evidence that between 1870 and 1890 there was some "screwing-up," and the increase was not in reality equal to appearances. ${ }^{2}$ But on the whole it may be said with some confidence that in the last forty years there has been no appreciable difference in the degree of exactness to which the work of assessment has attained.

## Sce. A Gross Assessments-Comprehensiveness.

" Under this head is included the annual value of every description of property in the nature of realty that can be brought into valuation, but it should be borne in mind that there is a certain class of property which is not subjected to valuation for income tax purposes, viz., property vested in, and in the occupation of, the Crown, cathedrals, churches, etc. Further, it should be pointed out that although railways, quarries, mines, etc., are in the nature of real property, the profits therefrom appear in class 4 , 'Profits from Businesses, etc. (Sch. D).' It may be observed that the gross assessments represent the annual value of property the owners of which are exempt from income tax on the ground of their total incomes from all sources not exceeding Ex60 per annum. . . . Further, it includes-inter alia-the annual value of colleges and halls in universities, hospitals, public schools, almshouses which are specially exempted." "
The points specially to be noted are :-
(x) Omission of Crown property eceupiod by the Grown. Most cases are "occupied" in the ordinary sense, but the word has also a statutory significance. The owner is regarded as, and is assessed as, the statutory occupier of properties "under fio," and properties "let for a less period than a

[^17]year"; small " weekly" cottages are in the " occupation" of the Crown if owned by the Crown, and would be omitted from assessment.

In a consideration of the "Census of Production and Agriculture," Mr. L. W. Wilsden attributes one-nineteenth of the gross production to those who pursue agriculture as a secondary calling, and in order to ascertain the expenditure he takes the income tax figures for total rent and tithe, deducting onenineteenth. He then remarks that the rent of Crown lands let as agricultural holdings is not included in the tax returns; "this tends to make the balance available for the reward of labour seem larger than it is. This sum should be added to the expenditure side of the account." It is just this class of Crown property which is included in the official statistics (Economic Reviev, April, 1914).
The woodlands belonging to the Crown have been given as 67,000 acres, or $2 \downarrow$ per cent. of the whole (J. Hyder, " The Case for Land Nationalisation," $p$. Ing).

The exact value of the property omitted from assessment is not known, but it cannot be greater than the value of property in the occupation of the Crown, for which contributions in lien of local rates are paid, because these cases include not only property owned by the Crown, but also property rented by the Crown. This maximum value is shown in Table Az for England and Wales as $£ 1,306,000$ in 1899 and $£ 1,635,000$ in 1906 (rateable values). H. C. $22 I$ and 222 of 1900 give details which I have totalled for present purposes:-


If we add one-fifth to obtain the gross estimated rental, the total is $£ 1,928,000$. The actual sum omitted from
assessment is probably between one and one and a half million pounds.
(2) Omission of places for Divine worship. This covers chapels, mission-halls, etc., not rated, and reserved for religious uses entirely. Where, however, a mortgage or loan is secured thereon the interest is frequently, but not invariably, charged under Sch. A.
(3) Concorns under No. III., Sch. A. It is the property actually in occupation of these concerns for the purposes of the concerns that is omitted-property owned by them, but let, is charged and included. Thus, many assessments exist on property owned by railways.
Although railways and gasworks come under this head, " tramways " and electricity works do not, so that buildings, etc., in occupation and ownership of these latter concerns are assessed Sch. A. But it has not been the practice to assess mains, wires, sewers, etc., even though they be rated. ${ }^{1}$
(4) Sch. A reviowa all the property concerned and not merely that part belonging to income tax payors. In this respoot it resombles Sch. B, and diffors antiroly from Schn. D and $E$.
This is of importance when the figures for different schedules are aggregated.
(5) Hospitals and other charity properties are assessed "gross " in full, and the net amount that would be assessable is allowed as an "exempt " deduction under a special head.

Sch. A Gross Assessments-Classification.

## (1) Lands.

The first of the classes making up the total gross assessments under Sch. A. is known as "Lands," including rentcharges under Tithes Commutation Act, farmhouses, farm buildings, etc.
Deifition.-It has been continuously recorded since 1842, and furnishes a very stable series for purposes of

[^18]comparison (vide Table A4). "Lands" include woodlands, farm lands, lakes, building land, gardens in excess of the one acre assessed with mansions, etc., to House Duty. Theterm does not include farm cottages let with a farm. The tithes that are not now commuted are insignificant in tctal amount. The commuted tithes are included on the full gross commutation reckoned upon Willich's tables for the year of new assessment, the rates thereon being allowed as a deduction in the assessment. "Farmhouses" included in " lands" do not comprise all premises commonly so called, but have a statutory meaning, i.e., houses occupied by tenant farmers with a farm for the purpose of farming. A farmhouse" occupied by the owner or let off to a private resident is not included, and it is thus quite possible for the same premises to pass in and out of this category by mere change of occupier (vide House Duty, p. 115).

The numbers of these assessments on "lands" is not given; the number of "statutory" farmhouses whose value is over $£ 20$ is ascertainable from the House Duty statistics, but the rumber of those under $£ 20$ is not exactly known.

As to how much of this class represents properties belonging to persons exempt, see under Sch. A, DeductionsExemption, p. 67.

As the amount of tithe not commuted has steadily decreased, ${ }^{1}$ for comparative purposes it is best to include all tithes with lands.

Sir R. Giffen (Quarterly Review, July, 1909), on the question of increment in land value, quotes the 1843 value of lands as $\mathrm{f} 42,127,000$, bat the figure for "Lands including Commuted $^{\text {L }}$ Tithes" is $£ 40,167,088,{ }^{2}$ and he has rightly added in "Tithes not Commated" $£ 1,960,331$. The figure he compares it with in 1906-7 corresponds with the first item only, the "Tithes not Commuted" (now mach attenuated) being now included in "Other Property," $£ 888,970$, and amounting to about $\{200,000$ (vide also Final Report, R. C. on Agriculture, 1896, p. 26; Goschen, "Report on Local Tazation"; Palgrave, "Local Taxation," etc.).

[^19]The amount of tithe appearing in the Sch. A classification should be examined in conjunction with works upon the Tithe Acts if its variations are to be understood.

The actual method of assessing tithe may vary, but the aggregate figures are not affected. For instance, it may be included in the gross assessment upon each parcel of land; it may be separately assessed upon each landowner; or, as is generally the case, it may be assessed iss cumulo for a whole parish upon the tithe receiver, all assessments upon lands being exclusive of tithe. (In every case, however, the Sch. B assessment will be inclusive of tithe.)

Statistics relating to tithes may be found in the numerous works upon the subject. The gross commutation is commonly taken at about $£ 4,000,000 .{ }^{1}$

Garnier quotes Sir James Caird as showing that between 1836 and 1876 the rent of titheable land increased from $£ 33,000,000$ to $£ 50,000,000$, while the tithe rentcharge remained constant. "In this sense, therefore, the titheowner has lost $\left\{2,000,000\right.$ per annum by the Act of $1836{ }^{\circ \prime}$ (" History of English Landed Interest," II., p. 457). This conclusion rather ignores the fact that rents and prices have moved together, and that prices effectively influence the tithe commutation annually. In 1875 the value per £ 100 was $£ 1122$ 15s. $6 d$.

## (2) Houses, eto.

This class, houses, messuages, tenements, etc., comprises all buildings of every description, except
(a) farmhouses and farm buildings (see "Lands ");
(b) houses owned and occupied by the Crown (see p. 39) :
(c) places used for Divine worship;
(d) premises owned and occupied by Concerns under No. III., Sch. A. Thus, it includes cotton mills, but not railway stations, though refreshment rooms let to contractors

[^20]would be assessed. Properties rented by the Post Office and other Government departments are included.
A sub-classification of this section is made under Inhabited House Duty annually, and notes on the various classes will be found in Chapter III.
These statistics of "buildings" or messuages have frequently been used, in various connections, as evidence of the growth of industry, activity of building, rise in rents, etc.
W. Mathews compares $\mathbf{1 8 7 0 - 1}$ with $\mathbf{1 8 8 2 - 3}$. Buildings rose 45 per cent.-an "extraordinary difference." The increase in population was only 17 per cent., and "it is difficult to resist the conclusion that some other causes than natural increase of buildings must have contributed to the rise in assessment" (Institute of Surveyors, Transactions, 1884, p. 308).

## (3) Other Properity.

This consists of " manors, fines, certain tithes, certain sporting rights," etc. The details of each were given separately for many years. In the last year for which they were classified (1903-4) we find the descriptions:
(a) "Tithes raised by Ratos and other Tithos not arising from tho Land":-


The basis of assessment is as follows:-Tithes, taken in kind, " dues and money payments in right of the Church. or by endownment, or in lieu of tithes (not being tithes arising from lands) and of all teinds arising in Scotland" on an average of the three preceding years; " all tithes arising from lands, if compounded for, and of all rents and other payments in lieu of tithe arising from lands (except rentcharges confirmed under the Act for the Commutation of Tithes) on the amount of such composition, rent or payment for one year preceding." ${ }^{2}$
${ }^{1}$ Surplice fees, mortuaries, and other items; see the Tithe Act, 1836, s. 90.

5 \& 6 Vict c. 35. s. 60 (ii.), repealed so far as the metropolis is concenned by 32 \& 33 Vict. c. 67, 3. 77.
(b) Manora, etc. (Igo3-4 figures) :-

|  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | ¢ | E |
| Metropolis | 6,121 | 12,558 |
| Rest of England | 98,176 | 83,681 |
| Scotland | 51,410 |  |
| Ireland | - | 74 |
| Total | 155,707 | 96,313 |

The basis of charge is the average of the seven years preceding the year of assessment. Manorial profits cover " casual profits, fines on admission, alienation, for licence to demise, heriots certain and compositions for heriots." 1 No allowance is made for cost of collection. ${ }^{*}$
To a very considerable extent assessments upon manorial profits represent a "legal duplication" of income." The annual value of the properties concerned is already assessed in full, and these payments of manorial dues and fines are paid out of that annual value. Thus a landowner who has a number of farms assessed in full on their rack rents can deduct tax from any mortgage interest or other charges paid by him out of that taxed income, but he cannot deduct tax from these manorial payments, though they are equally an expense to him, reducing his income. These payments are assessed again upon the recipients. The matter is not of great importance statistically, but these sums should be ignored when annual values are being capitalised.*
(c) Finos.-The basis of assessment is as follows:-" All fines received in consideration of any demise of lands or tenements (not being parcel of a manor or royalty demisable by the custom thereof) on the amount so received within the year preceding . . . provided that in case the party chargeable shall prove . . . that such fines, or any part thereof, have been applied as productive capital, on which a profit has
${ }^{1}$ Dowell. P. 127 (7th Ed.).

- Stevens V. Bisiop. (1888) = T. C. 249: Dwhe of Nedfore 7. Lemengue, ( 1890 ) : I. C. 579
- See the evidence before the S. C. on Income Tar. 1852, and also the S. C. of 1861, and the Report. There was considered to be some evasion under this head (Qs. 2,840, etce, 1852), and H. C. 165 of 1845 gives some material evidence.
- Vide pr 405.
arisen or will arise otherwise chargeable under this Act, for the year in which the assessment shall be made, it shall be lawful . . . to discharge the amount so applied from the profits liable to assessment under this rule." ${ }^{1}$
This peculiar proviso is quite sufficient to render the attempt at assessment nugatory for the great majority of " fines," since investment of proceeds is a natural and simple matter (but a temporary deposit in a bank does not come within the proviso ; there must be some element of permanence about the application ${ }^{\text {) }}$. It is a principle unique in the Income Tax Acts, and the rule is practically carried bodily from the Acts of 1805 and 1806. In Pitt's Act, 1799, the annual value of lands let to tenants in consideration of a fine paid, plus a rent, was directed to be based on the rent plus an additional sum in respect of the fines which would amount on an average of years to the receipts of fines for one year. ${ }^{2}$ In the 1803 Act income from fines was charged in proportion to the length of the lease. ${ }^{4}$
The figures for this heading are practically worthless for statistical purposes; it will be seen that at one time the total was three times as great as in $\mathbf{1 8 9 9}$, since when it has probably diminished still further, and with the proviso as to re-investment it is not likely to increase. In any case, an assessment on fines is in the nature of "legal duplication" : of income, since the gross value of the property assessed covers the full consideration payable on an annual basis, and any lump sum paid is payable out of this annual value.

[^21][^22]of the lessors should, in the opinion of your Committee, be discontinued, and the tenant who now recoups what he pays as income tax on the full annual value, only partially upon the small reserved rent, will then either deduct income tax upon the fine he pays to the lessor, if it be a fine certain, or regulate the optional fine he agrees to pay by the consideration of the additional burthen of taxation he has to bear" (Draft Report by Mr. Hubbard, Income Tax Committee, 1861).
Similarly, where two houses of the same value are built, one on a freehold and the other on a leasehold site, the annual value assessed is the same and the aggregate tax received by the State is the same, so that the special reversion duty payable on the " lump " advantage falling to the reversioner in the one case is in the nature of a clear addition to the tax burden, and is analogous to income tax upon a " fine " payable at the beginning of a lease. ${ }^{1}$

Statistically this category is unimportant, but, like " Manors," the figures should be left out of any capitalisation process. ${ }^{2}$
(d) Sporting Rights, oton I903-4 figures:-


The sporting rights for Ireland are assessed under Sch. D, and so also are various other fishing and sporting rights not included here.

It must not be assumed that these figures include the whole value of sporting and fishing. The law and practice relating to them are rather involved. The value of sporting attached to lands in the occupation of the owner are included in the ordinary assessment under Schs. A and B upon the
: But this must not be understood as bearing npon the equity of the reversion duty, which is based, not on comparative receipts by the State, but upon special faculty principles affecting the payers. and has its justification in somewhat abstruse questions of incidence. These questions, together with that of the "fines "above mentioned, are discussed by the writer in an articie on "The Incidence of Tametion of Leaseholds "in the Ecomomic Reviem, July. 1912.
"See chapter on "National Capital"

- Vide pres.
lands. The value of shooting over lands let, if kept in hand by the owner, is not assessed at all. As soon as he lets it as a separate subject it is assessable. The loss to the Revenue in this respect is said to be considerable in Scotland, where the chief value attaching to large areas of land is its sporting value.
(c) Other Profits from Lands, 1903-4 figures:-


This is the last of the subsidiary categories of Sch. A. The legal basis of charge is-
" All other profits arising from lands, tenements, hereditaments or heritages, not in the actual possession or occupation of the party to be charged, and not before enumerated, on a fair and just average of such number of years as the commissioners shall judge proper . . . to be charged on the receivers of such profits or the persons entitled thereto." ${ }^{1}$

It is the " sweeping clause of Sch. A," and includes such miscellanea as rents of foreshores, shingle, and ooze, easements for telegraph and telephone poles, and encroachments and wayleaves.

## County Details under Sch. A: Gross Assessmonts.

The total Sch. A assessments in each county are frequently very useful for comparative purposes. They have not been given consistently in the Reports, the earlier ones merely giving specific cases with the amount of increase, and the later ones (since 1900) a comparison of tctals for particular

[^23]Table A4.-Incomo Tax (Sch. A).
Lands (including Tithes) (fooo omitted).

| Years |  | Sootland. $(+ \text { or }-)$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Irsland. } \\ & (+\cos -) \end{aligned}$ | United Kingdom. $(+ \text { or }-)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2814-15 | 37,063 | 5,075 |  |  |
| 1848-3 | 44,137 | 5.587 | 10,550 | 58,264 (300) |
| ${ }^{1843-4}$ | 49,000 (100) | 5,150 (100) | 20,350 | \$7,700 (500) |
| 2844-3 | 42,000 (100) | 5,000 (100) | 10,550 | 57,550 (500) |
| ${ }^{28459}$ | 42,031 | 5,509 (500) | 20,350 | 58,090 (300) |
| 184007 $3847-8$ | 42,015 41,985 | 3,500 3,638 | 20,550 <br> 10,560 <br> 2000 | $38,065(350)$ $\mathbf{5 8 , 1 7 2}$ |
| $8{ }^{3} 480$ | 42,853 | 3,638 | 10,500 80,530 | 58,172 59,037 |
| 8849-90 | 48,819 | 3,566 | 10,350 | 38.765 |
| 8890-4 | 40,790 | 3,543 | 10,280 | 58,6r3 |
|  | 41,490 | 5.487 | 9.540 | 56517 |
| 2854-s | 41,449 | 5.499 | 9.160 | 36,208 |
| 28530 | 41,430 | 3,037 | 8,900 | 56,027) |
| 1834-3 | 41.397 | 5.745 | 8.950 | 56,272 |
| ${ }^{28396}$ | $4{ }_{4}{ }^{1} 485$ | 3,173 | 8,890 | 36,248 |
| $3856-7$ 3897 | 41.34s |  | 8,840 $9+400$ | $\left.\begin{array}{l}36,317 \\ 58.549\end{array}\right\} \times 10$ |
| 1896 | 41,983 | 6,290 | 9480 | 58,509 |
| 1899-00 | 41.905 | 6, 3 S2 | 9430 | 30,707 |
| 1600-8 | 43,096 | 6,357 | 9,490 | 58,883 |
| ${ }^{2805}$ - | 44.006 | 6,675 | 9.723 | $6 \mathrm{r}, 084$ |
| 1869-3 | 44.063 | 6,723 | 9.720 | 61,098 |
| 8897 | 44,744 | 6,713 | 9.699 | 61,241 |
| ${ }^{1864} 8$ | 40,408 | 0,53t | 9,877 | 63.170 |
| 1865-6 | 46483 | 6.850 | 9.887 | 63.219 |
| 18600 | 46,356 47.759 | 6,965 | 9.991 | $6_{3,513}{ }^{6} 90$ |
| 1806-9 | 47.709 | 7,129 | 9.952 | 64,908 |
| 180900 | 47,859 | 7.195 | 9.879 | 64.931 |
| 8890-2 | 49,015 | 7,908 | 9.386 | 66.198 |
| 8572-4 | 40.047 | 7.336 | 9.64 | 66,197 |
| 3574-3 | 49035 | 7.303 | 9.885 | 66,283 |
| 16794 | 49.956 | 7.497 | 9924 | 67.377 |
| ${ }^{18} 89$ | sa, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $7 \times 493$ | 9.93 | 67.683 |
| 2875 | 50.101 | 2.505 | 9925 | 67.834 |
| 280-7 | 52,016 | 2.690 | 9.938 | 69.044 |
| $887{ }^{8}$ | 51.934 | 7,606 | 9.937 | 69337 |
| 18780 | 51,80 | 7,606 | $9.90{ }^{\circ}$ | 69.478 |
| 1879-20 | 51,048 | 7,769 | 0.011 | 69798 |
| 3as\% | 31.419 | 8.716 | 9.981 | 69,940 |
| 288t-3 | 48,639 | 2.373 | 2.081 | 66,213 |
| 28850 | $4{ }^{4} 818$ | 7,505 | 9.085 | 6s,696 |
| 1884 | 47.0.44 | 746 | \$935 | 65.309 |
| ${ }^{868}$ | 40, 25 | 7.300 | 595 | 63590 |
| ${ }^{3800-9}$ | 450035 | 7.200 | 9951 | 62.693 |
| 885 | 44.730 | 643 | \$938 | $6 \mathrm{~L}, 513$ |
| 280,900 | 42,534 | 6,50\% | 294\% | 50.085 |
| 1090-8 | 4t,0.93 | 6477 | 9942 | 58.488 |
| ${ }^{3} 9 \mathrm{Pr}-\mathrm{t}$ | 41.305 | $\mathrm{C}_{315}$ | 9 g 4 | 37,647 |
| 180t-3 | 41,059 | 689 | 3874 | 57.224 |
| 3805-4 | cases | cest | 8305 | g6, ${ }^{\text {ck }}$ |
| Sepa- | S2.04 | $6 \times 8$ | 8898 | S6038 |
| seos-9 | Snom | 6840 | 5104 | \$5066 |
| ${ }^{4}$ | $5{ }_{3}$ | Grats | 9394 | 5S010 |
| 180 | 370306 | 5.807 | 2945 | 53100 |
| 8top-ryen | 3ysya | $5 \mathrm{Se5}$ | 575 | \$3096 |
| 2900-1 | \$7,100 | ST94 | 2738 | $5 \times 884$ |
| c90t-6. | 37.037 | Sges |  | 38687 |
| 29003 | 3085 | ${ }_{5}^{245}$ | 9035 | stest |
| 1993-4 | 37.109 | St3 | 9 | Silas |
| 508- | 3480 | Stat | 578 | 5 m 35 |
| 19001 | 3ans | Sirs | 378 | $5{ }^{5}+153$ |
| 170\% | 54 | 510 | 974 | Sxict |
| ${ }^{10009}$ | 5assy | 5076 |  | SE.04s |
| 596-85 | 31.044 | 5759 | >004 | seans |
| 3937-88 | 3 A 00 | 370 | Se9 | 580 |
| 1914-13 | 37,013 | 570 | sens | $5 \mathrm{Sa}+{ }^{2}$ |
| 4985-4 | 3Rege | 5773 | Mos | Stac |



Houses and Messuages ( $£ 000$ omitted).

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Year. \& England and Wales. $(+\infty-)$ \& Scothand.
$$
(+ \text { or }-1)
$$ \& Iroland.
$$
(+\infty-1
$$ \& United Yingiocen
$$
(+\infty-2)
$$ <br>
\hline 1814-15 \& 14,895 \& 1,364 \& \& <br>
\hline 1842-3 \& 35,556 \& 2.919 (100) \& 2,790 \& 48,265 (200) <br>
\hline 1843-4 \& 35,000 (r00) \& 2,700 (100) \& 2,790
3,790 \& 41,090) 3000 <br>
\hline $1844-5$
$1^{845-6}$ \& 35,800 (100) \& 2,700
2,961 \& 2,790
$\mathbf{2 , 7 9 0}$ \& 41,237 (200) <br>
\hline 1846-7 \& 37,010 \& 3,000 (50) \& 2,790 \& 42,000 (aso) <br>
\hline 1847-8 \& 37,282 \& 3,199 \& 2,790 200 \& 43,275 <br>
\hline ${ }^{1848-9}$ \& 38,822 \& 3.493 \& 2,790 \& 45,105 <br>
\hline 1849-30 \& 39,056 \& 3,607 \& 2,740 \& 45.403 -200 <br>
\hline 1850-1 \& 39,354 \& 3,634
3,784 \& 2,720 \& 45,691 <br>
\hline 2851-2
$\mathbf{2 8 5 2 - 3}$ \& 40,047
40,621 \& 3,784
3,847 \& 2,530
2,450 \& 46,351 <br>
\hline 1853-4 \& 42,828 \& 4,138 \& 2,360 \& 49,319 <br>
\hline 1854-3 \& 43.425 \& 4,209 \& 2,364 \& 49.995 <br>
\hline 1835-6 \& 44.710 \& 4,239 \& 2,358 \& 31,300 <br>
\hline 2850-7 \& 44.094 \& 4.358 \& 2,342 200 \& 31,094 <br>
\hline 1857-8 \& 47,439 \& 4,704 \& 2,480 \& 54.023 <br>
\hline 1858-9. \& 48,138
48,779 \& 4.842 \& 2,489 \& 56,469 <br>
\hline  \& 48,779 \& 4,989 \& 2,504 \& 56,172
57,125 <br>
\hline 1867-2 \& 53,235 \& S.353 \& 2,634 \& 61,324 <br>
\hline 1869-3 \& 54,108 \& 5.447 \& 2.644 \& 62, 39 <br>
\hline 1863-4 \& 55,121 \& 5,576 \& 2,691 \& <br>
\hline 1864-5 \& 59,286
60,812 \& 3,802 \& 2,713 \& 67801 <br>
\hline 1865-6 \& 60,812
62,467 \& 5,952 \& $\left.\begin{array}{l}2,731 \\ 2.797\end{array}\right\}_{00}$ \& 69,493 <br>
\hline 1869-8 \& 68.013 \& 6,346 \& 2,8471 \& 77.406 <br>
\hline 1866-9 \& 69,540 \& 6,729 \& 2.900 \& 79.169 <br>
\hline 2869-70 \& 70.949 \& 6.930 \& 2.926 \& 80,805 <br>
\hline 1870-1 \& 75,307 \& 7,309 \& 2046 \& 85.542 <br>
\hline 1871-2 \& 76,475 \& 7.530 \& 2.995 \& $87,000 /$ <br>
\hline 1872-3 \& 77,832 \& 7,876 \& 3.035 \& 88,743 <br>
\hline 2873-4 \& 80,723 \& 8,531 \& 3.060 \& 92,309 <br>
\hline $1874-5$
2875 \& 82,033
83853 \& 9.083 \& 3071
3091 \& 94,127 <br>
\hline 2875-6 \& 83,853
90,457 \& 9.397
10.372 \& 3, 3 [121 \& 96.340 <br>
\hline $2876-7$

$2878-8$ \& 90,451 \& 10,372
10,829 \& 3,128 \& lo3n965 <br>
\hline r870.9 \& 95,585 \& 14,291 \& 3.185 \& sotes <br>
\hline 2879-80 \& 100,079 \& 11,766 \& 3,260 \& 115,106 <br>
\hline 2880-1
$\mathbf{1 8 8 1 - 2}$

180 \& 102.417
105022 \& 1x,038 \& 3.309 \& 117,565 <br>
\hline  \& 105.622
209.374 \& 11,999
120047
18 \& 3,357 \& 130.971
124.025 <br>
\hline 1883-4 \& 111,565 \& 12,130 \& 3 H 51 \& 127,144 <br>
\hline 1884-3 \& 212,791 \& 12,200 \& $3-482$ \& 12.573 <br>
\hline 1885-6 \& 225-436 \& \%2,557 \& 3.510 \& 231,503 <br>
\hline 1886-7 \& 117,183 \& 12,615 \& 3.1508 \& 133.359 <br>
\hline [8878-8 \& 128,524
120,54 \& 12,716
12007 \& 3.5\%\% \& 834836 <br>
\hline r888-9
1889-90 \& 120,54
121,907 \& 12,907
13027 \& 3.600
3,650 \& 137070
139.590 <br>
\hline +890-1 \& 123,721 \& 131246 \& 32716 \& 140.603 <br>
\hline 1891-2 \& 225,946 \& 13.426 \& 3.775 \& 143147 <br>
\hline x89a-3 \& 127,544 \& 13,643 \& 3.736 \& 144,723 <br>
\hline [893-4 \& 131886 \& 1400 \& 385 \& L49, 726 <br>
\hline $\mathrm{rB94}^{5}$ \& 133.512 \& 4,303 \& 3.933 \& 151,747 <br>
\hline +895-6 \& 1350939 \& 14,595 \& 4016 \& 154540 <br>
\hline 2896-7
1897- \& 139070
142120 \& 14.899 \& 4.105
4.335 \& 154735 <br>
\hline 1898-9 \& 1493632 \& 16,104 \& 44353 \& 170, 1 星 <br>
\hline 1899-8900 \& 153.193 \& 16,664 \& 4.573 \& 174-438 <br>
\hline 1900-1 \& 157,160 \& 17,215 \& 4.59 \& 174,403 <br>
\hline 1901-2 \& 162,263 \& 17,636 \& 4.683 \& rt, 373 <br>
\hline 1900-3 \& 165,609 \& 18,076 \& 4800 \& 197903 <br>
\hline 1903-4 \& 1774063 \& 18.556
19076 \& 47754 \& 1901,573 <br>
\hline 1905-6 \& 271,153 \& 19,473 \& 4.938 \& 205485 <br>
\hline 1906-7 \& It5,453 \& 19935 \& 5018 \& 210,347 <br>
\hline r907-8 \& 588,286 \& 20,193 \& 5073 \& 813598 <br>
\hline 1900-3 \& 1291077 \& 20,473 \& ${ }_{50}^{5157}$ \& arinet <br>
\hline 1910-KI \& 196.19\% \& 30,76I \& 3027 \& 248435 <br>
\hline x917-84 \& 1977637 \& 3098 \& 5,323 \& 273683 <br>
\hline $1912-83$
1919 \& z99,048 \& 31,2008 \& 5,364 \& =13098 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}

Gross (Sch. A: Assessments).
Lands, Houses and other Properly (£000 omitted).

cases. For example, 13th Report, p. 114, compares 1803 and 1867 for certain counties.

Details of total Sch. A. in each county are available as follows :-1814 (not Scotland or Ireland), 24th Report, Supplement, H. C. 331 of 1831, 238 of 1814-15; Marshall's Digest, 1814 and 1842 to 1869 inclusive in H. C. 511 of 1866, and 454 of 1870 ; $\mathbf{1 8 4 2 , ~ 1 8 5 2 , ~ 1 8 6 2 , ~} \mathbf{1 8 7 2 , 1 8 7 4 , ~ 1 8 7 6 , ~}$ 1879, 24th and 28th Reports ; 1874, 1876, 1879, in 19th, 21st, and 24th Reports ; 1876,:1879, 1882, 28th Report ; 1883 to 1894 inclusive in H. C. papers, 292-1882 to H. C. 217-1896; 1894 to 1899 inclusive, 40 th to 44 th Reports ; Ig02 and 1903, 56th and 57th Reports; IgII and 1912, 56th and 57th Reports.

The important division into Lands and Messuagen is, however, not so extensively available:-1813 and 1814; Parliamentary returns in 1814-I5 and Marshall's Digest, II., 30 ; 1842, H. C. $102-1845$; 1859, H. C. $546-1860$; 1894 to 1899, 40th to 44th Reports; 1902 and 1903 and IgII and 1912, 56th and 57th Reports.

In view of the interest of these details, and their lack of general accessibility, the chief features are repeated in Table A5.

A similar classification of poor rate values for 1840-I is given in H. C. 235-I842 (reprinted in the Appendix to the evidence before the S. C. on the Burdens on Real Property, Vol. II, p. 150), where for each county in England and Wales the details are given under these heads:-

Total $\&$


The rate per $£$ in each county, the rate per head for value of property, and the value per acre are also given.

It is only necessary to compare the income tax values in 1842 to see how little real effect had been given to the law enacted a few years before to secure a poor rate valuation upon the full rental values.

## SCH. A. DEDUCTIONS AND ALLOWANCES FROM THE GROSS ASSESSMENT.

These may be classed under three heads :-
(I) Deductions from assessable gross income in the nature of expenses, impersonal and objective.
(2) Allowances in respect of the whole gross value of properties which is not enjoyed as personal income assignable to individuals.
(3) Allowances from personal incomes, facultative and subjective, designed to procure the progressive graduation of the tax on individual incomes, i.e., exemptions and abatements.
The different categories have been treated separately for many years in the official statistics, and are summarised from 1868 to 1883 in the 28th Report.

## How Doductions are mado in Practice : Effioct on Statistics.

It is necessary to draw attention to a very important feature in the earlier statistics prior to $1900-\mathrm{I}$. Deductions and allowances may be made in three ways, or at three stages in the tax administration.
( I " In the assossmont " itself, at the time it is made, and before it is closed and totalled. (2) "By schodulo," in which case the collector is authorised to make the allowance of duty, and return it in part satisfaction of the total charge against him in a schedule of discharges. Allowances for empty property, except in Scotland, are made in this way. and, speaking generally, it may be applied to all the allowances, and it is often an accident of time whether ( x ) or (2) operates. (3) "By repayment," where an error is discovered, or where, by the machinery of the tax, repayment is the remedy provided. This is the method naturally applicable to cases where persons exempt from tax have received income, with tax already deducted, by way of mortgage interest, dividends, ground rents, etc.
Now all the early tables give the deductions under I.
Table A5．County Classifications（fooo omitted）．

| Countr． | Lands． |  |  |  |  |  |  | Houreer． |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 3806． | 1814. | 2848. | 2059. | $1894-9$. | 1909. | 3984. | 2806． | ${ }^{81} 4$. | 1842． | 2839． | 8894－3． | 1903. | 2912． |
| Mstropoula． | 8 | E | $\varepsilon$ | ＊ | 8 | $\varepsilon$ | $\varepsilon$ | 3 | ＊ | E | $\ldots$ | 1 | 5 | s |
| Kont ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | － | 二 |  |  | $\rightarrow$ | 88 | ${ }^{3}$ | － | － |  |  |  | 2，93x | 3，286 |
| ${ }^{\text {M }}$ Muriditamar ： | － | 二 | Inoluxded In onatior |  | － | 17 | 12 | 二 |  | Inctuded | \％ | － | 33，908 | 36，414 |
| Total－Matropais ． | － | － | － |  |  | 76 | 68 | － | － |  |  | （37，443 | 43，036 | 49，08 |
| Rata of Emolayt． |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bedtord | 160 |  |  | 416 | 380 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Buentin | 417 | S38 | 803 | \％18 | 404 | 335 <br> 429 <br> 18 | 436 | 308 | 233 | 310 | 380 | 336 $\times, 039$ | 8，393 | 2，939 |
| Buckis． | 48 | css | （808 | 696 874 | ${ }^{\text {cos }}$ | Sis | 947 | 73 | \％ | 183 887 867 | 252 | － 560 | － | 2，003 |
|  | 600 | 238 | $8{ }^{818}$ | 2，043 | 2,123 | 2，130 | 2，113 | 163 | ${ }^{3} 5$ | 780 | x，398 | 2，878 | 3，793 | $\begin{array}{r}\text { 4，39 } \\ \hline 4.643\end{array}$ |
|  | 343 | 60 | ${ }_{3} 80$ | 238 | 8 | ${ }^{\text {ats }}$ | ${ }^{6} 83$ |  | 119 |  | ${ }^{293}$ | －373 | 3073 | 4．898 |
| Cumbarinad． | $4{ }^{419}$ | 308 900 | ${ }^{614} 8$ | ${ }^{6}$ | ${ }_{3}^{48}$ | 601 | 608 | 63 64 | ${ }^{89}$ | 2a8 | 318 | 794 8.560 | \％ 8180 |  |
| 1 Dovoa | ${ }_{2} \mathrm{Nan}^{\text {a }}$ | 2.443 | 3，670 | 2，581 | 2，359 | 2， 507 | 2，623 | 3 s | 37 | 767 | 303 969 | 7， 269 8,147 | 8,279 8,703 | 2.395 3.117 |
| Dartare | 409 | cos | ${ }^{670}$ | cor | 043 300 | 56\％ | 370 | 700 | 87 | 231 | 261 | 559 | 730 | ${ }^{3095}$ |
| Emax | 037 | ${ }^{\text {s，as3 }}$ | 8，306 | 8，442 | 2，059 | ${ }^{63}$ | ${ }^{6}$ | 100 | 308 | 489 |  | 2,964 3,15 | 4.869 3.390 | ${ }_{6.659}^{4.963}$ |
| Giovemation <br> Hanta | \％os | \％os | 2，162 | 2，178 | \％ | 87 | 85 | 198 | 008 | 40 | 981 | 3，0001 | 3，402 | 2，46t |
| Hanta． <br> Hespoford | ${ }_{409}$ | ${ }_{3} 13$ | S02 |  | －${ }^{844}$ |  | 709 | － 28 | 938 | 338 | 996 | 3.016 | 4.154 | S． $2 \times 1 \times 1$ |
| liertiond | 440 346 | 19 483 | 608 | 378 | － 638 479 | 309 | 600 | 23 98 | 33 | 39 340 | 147 | \％ 818 | 8，299 | 8， 359 |
| Mrintingtoan | 178 | \％ 8.009 | （370 | ${ }^{3137}$ | 2， 23 | 8 | \％ 814 | 44 | 30 | ${ }^{72}$ | \％ 6 | 830 | 135 | ${ }^{268}$ |
| Kanozite： | 8， 8 dot | 8，410 | 2，488 | ${ }_{\text {2，006 }} \mathbf{8 , 1 7 7}$ | li， $\begin{aligned} & \text { 2，75 } \\ & 8,649\end{aligned}$ | 8，120 4,307 | ${ }^{8,814}$ | 8，077 | － 3186 | 1,371 <br> 4.77 | 2，911 |  |  | Q．0460 |
| Levostior ： | ${ }_{6} 6$ | 880 | 919 | 285 | 793 | ${ }_{730}$ | ${ }^{238}$ | ${ }^{8} 8$ | ${ }^{2166}$ | 4．173 | 8，3\％ | ${ }_{2,36}$ |  | 25， |


COUNTY CLASSIFICATIONS－：ontinued．

| County． | Lande． |  |  |  |  |  |  | Houses |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1806. | ${ }^{8814 .}$ | 2844． | 8859. | 1894－3． | 1909－4． | 1983＋13． | 1806． | 1814. | 1842. | 1899. | 1894－3． | 2903－4． | 1912－13． |
| Aberloon Scorland． | $\underline{\square}$ | $\underline{\square}$ | 419 | 508 | 625 | 62 | 68 | $\stackrel{\underbrace{}}{2}$ | $\underline{2}$ | 5 | $\varepsilon$ | 5 | ， | 8 |
| Arayll． | ニ |  |  | S08 | ${ }^{6} 18$ | 623 108 | 631 179 |  |  | 145 45 | 268 38 | 723 | 962 | 2，036 27 |
| Ayr： | ＝ | 二 | 390 | 471 | 474 | 494 | 444 | 二 | 二 | 86 | 205 | 201 | 262 807 | 278 958 |
| Bann | － | ニ | 318 317 | 1308 | 218 313 | 143 219 | 134 | － |  | 8 | 13 | ${ }^{83}$ | 303 | ${ }_{118}$ |
| puta | 二 | 二 | 13 | ${ }_{31}$ | 838 | $\begin{array}{r}217 \\ 23 \\ \hline 3\end{array}$ | 214 27 24 |  |  | 37 <br> 80 <br> 0 | 33 37 | 53 | ${ }^{61}$ | 66 |
| Calthioma | － | － | 58 | 96 | 80 | 74 | 7 |  | － | ？ |  | 91 | 125 | 125 |
| Clackimannan | 二 | － | 35 | 34 | 29 | 13 | 8 | － | 二 | 8 | 18 | 89 | 106 | 125 |
| Duminarton | － | 二 | 727 | 76 | 78 | 70 | 69 | － |  | ${ }_{6} 8$ | 102 | 344 | 450 | 633 |
| Eista． | － | － | ${ }_{84} 8$ | 308 | 340 209 | 319 110 | 307 |  | 二 | 46 | ${ }^{65}$ |  | 1903 | ${ }^{23}$ |
| Filo | － | 二 | $38:$ | 438 | 336 | 309 |  |  |  | 75 | 183 |  | 112 | 131 <br> 808 <br> 808 |
| Forfar | － |  | 318 | 348 | 338 | 323 | 326 | 二 | － | 180 | 340 | ${ }_{976}$ | 8，143 | 8，230 |
| Haddinutan： | 二 | 二 | 318， | 218 | 384 <br> 886 <br> 88 | 178 | 178 |  | － | 38 | 40 | 89 | 130 | 150 |
| Xlucardius ： | － | － | 188 | 140 | 14. | ${ }_{3} 131$ | 129 | － | － | ${ }^{8}$ | 48 | 158 68 68 | 199 | 509 |
| Kinmoun | － | $\rightarrow$ | 30 | 46 | 36 | 31 | 30 | － | － | 4 | 30 |  | ${ }_{17}^{94}$ | ${ }_{21}$ |
| Lemarat． |  |  | 183 318 | 209 363 | 334 |  | 207 |  | － | 9 | 33 | 76 | 89 | 202 |
| Binlithmow | $=$ | － | ${ }_{3}$ | 38 | ${ }_{7} 7$ | 337 | 344 7 | － | － | ${ }_{21}$ | 8，736 33 | 4.744 | 6，180 | 6，935 |
|  | － | ＝ | 239 | ${ }^{208}$ | 44 | 238 | 231 | 二 | － | 781 | 953 | 2，636 | 2.368 | 3.664 |
| Orkney ： | － | $=$ | 13 | ${ }^{3}$ | 8 | 39 | 29 | － | － | 2 | 4 | 19 |  |  |
| Prebite | － | 二 | 6 | ${ }_{71}$ | 8 | ${ }^{\circ}$ | 6939 | ＝ | 二 | $\frac{1}{6}$ | ${ }^{4}$ | 3 | 24 | ${ }^{26}$ |
| Porth， |  | － | 392 | 386 | 404 | 44 | 424 | － | － | 35 | 13 <br>  <br> 32 <br>  | 345 | 54 | 59 |
| Roin and ciomariy | － | － | 295 139 | 14 3 3 | 189 888 88 | 147 167 | 318 | 二 | － | 266 | 383 |  | 8，674 | 2，084 |
| Rozbursh： | 二 | 二 | 133 | 180 | 48 | 130 | ${ }^{18}$ | ニ | － | $\stackrel{7}{4}$ |  | 166 | ${ }^{88}$ | 95 |
| Sturling | 二 | ＝ | 888 | 193 | ${ }^{36}$ | 180 | 438 | $\cdots$ |  | 12 | 38 | 71 | 73 | 79 |
| Sutherfand． |  |  | 34 | 4 | 95 | 49 | 49 | － | － | 6 | 9 | 332 |  | 533 |
| Wataowa |  |  | 223 | 838 | 239 | 138 | 150 | － | － | 80 | ${ }^{3}$ | ${ }_{64}$ | 6 | 66 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3 | $x 9$ | 43 | 33 |
| Tou－Soolind | 2.836 | 4，050 | 2， 367 | a，8a | Q 293 | 3.853 | 3.750 | 92 | 5，244 | 2，919 | 4.989 | 34，303 | 28336 | 30，978 |

only. After 1870 there are some rather intractable details of deductions under III. (Classification of Repayments), but no information is available on deductions " by schedule" until r900-I, when the " net assessment" was replaced by " net income on which tax was received," a much lower figure, and the deductions under each head included all the allowances, at whatever stage they were made. The comparative figures were carried back for ten years, but prior to that we have no details. Hence no attempt has been made to estimate the figures for earlier years on these lines in detail: no important purpose would be served thereby, but in Table $\mathrm{G}_{4}$ the total deductions have been estimated, in order that a true net income comparable with the present one may be given for all schedules together.

Sch. A Allowances-I. Deductions from thr Gross Assessment (Objective or Impersonal).
( 1 ) Land Tax.-" The amount of land tax charged on lands, tenements, hereditaments, or heritages," under the Land Tax Act, 1797, "where the charge thereon shall not have been redeemed."

This is recognised as a landlord's burden, payable out of the rack rent, so that where a tenant covenants to pay land tax, the amount has to be added to the rent to arrive at the gross assessment, Sch. A, and then allowed again as a "deduction." This secures uniformity for statistical purposes, both under Sch. A. and Sch. B.

The full land tax charged, in the statutory sense, is allowable, although half the charge may be excused under the Finance Act of 1898 on the ground of the owner's income being under $f_{400}$ per annum.

It will be seen from the Reports that the total amount allowed has gradually become less, pari passw, with the process of "redemption." But in any case the amount allowed as a deduction is considerably less than the total sum charged, which in 1910-1I was over $£ 700,000$, the allowance being only about $\{400,000$. The difference is mainly accounted for by the fact that there are very many
small sums which on individual properties are only fractional deductions and are not worth including as such. For example on a $£ 40$ house charged to Land Tax at Id. in the $£$ the deauction of $3 s$. makes an insignificant difference to the net assessment and duty payable.

The statistics of land tax are now of very little value for economic investigations. The original assessments themselves are sometimes useful for local inquiries, where they are available. The statistics have been used todetermine distribution and occupying ownership, with a device to give an acreage classification; "numerous traps are spread for the unwary statistician" (Johnson, " Disappearance of the Small Landowner," 1909, p. 13I).

In allocating "Deductions" between "Lands" and "Messuages" Sir T. H. Elliott referred land tax, sea walls, ecclesiastical deductions, repairs of churches, rates on tithe rentcharge to "Lands" and divided the remainder in the proportion of three-fourths to buildings and one-fourth to lands. ${ }^{1}$

Lord Milner, in a general division of tax burdens, assigned $£ 802,700$ Land Tax to lands and $£ 219,000$ to houses. ${ }^{3}$

The question whether land tax, redeemed or not redeemed, is to be regarded as a tax or burden upon lands, or whether it is now a rentcharge, is of some importance when matters relating to relative tax burdens or site values are under discussion. ${ }^{3}$
(2) Sea Walls, ete. : Drainage Ratesm-An allowance is made for the amount expended by the owner of lands in respect of the actual average of the preceding twenty-one years in making or repairing sea walls or other embankments necessary for the preservation and protection of the lands against the encroachment or overflowing of the

[^24]sea or a tidal river, although the sums expended may not have been charged by any public rate or assessment. ${ }^{1}$ This came into force in 1853 . It does not apply to expenditure in order to increase the value of the land to the owner by changing its condition, either in reclamation or permanent improvement.'
Drainage rates have been allowable since $\mathbf{1 8 4 2 - " ~ f o r ~ t h e ~}$ amount charged on lands, tenements, hereditaments or heritages by a public rate or assessment in respect of draining, fencing or embanking the same." ${ }^{2}$
The economic justice of treating these as specific deductions from the gross value rather than as items to be allowed for in computing gross value is referred to in Chapter II.
(3) Ecolesiastical Paymonta, and Repairs of Churchos.Tenths and first fruits and duties and fees on presentation, paid within the year preceding the assessment year: procurations and synodals on the average of the preceding seven years: repairs of collegiate churches and chapels and chancels, or of any college or hall in any of the universities, on the amount paid in the preceding year ${ }^{\text {a }}$ by any ecclesiastical or collegiate body, rector, vicar, or other person bound to repair. These allowances are granted from assessments upon the persons liable to the payments. They are, for statistical purposes, negligible ( $£ x 6,809$ in $\mathbf{1 8 9 9 - 1 0}$ ).
(4) Parochial Rates on Tithe Renteharges ( $£ 326,802$ in 1899-00 and considerably more at the present date)."For the parochial rates, taxes and assessments charged upon or in respect of any rentcharge confirmed under the Act passed for the commutation of tithe on the amount paid in the year in which the assessment shall be made." ${ }^{\text {s }}$

Except for the next case (Public Burdens in Scotland) this is practically unique as a method of allowance, the burden of rates being provided for in other cases before the gross assessment is arrived at (as in the case of weekly pro-

[^25]perties where the owner pays the tenant's rates). The origin is doubtless in the old method of assessing commuted tithes, ${ }^{1}$ where the titheowner receiving his income from various quarters, with full tax deducted, had to claim these expenses by repayment.

As in the case of land tax, the allowance is to be for the " amount charged," and not the actual sum paid by the recipient of the gross income. Therefore, although under the Tithe Rentcharge Rates Act of 1899 half the burden of the ordinary rates upon tithe rentcharges paid to incumbents is borne by the State, the allowance of the full rates is still made from the Sch. A assessment.
(5) Public Rates and Burdens (Seotland) (Roliei to Landlords nuder Aet 19 \& 20 Vict. e. 80), £ $1,352,265$ in 1899-1900, and at the present time probably about twice that amount.In Scotland landlords are charged with a share of public rates, taxes, and assessments which in England are by law a charge on occupiers, and since these are a deduction from the gross rent received before the net income is ascertainable, and the gross assessment is made upon the rent, it was necessary to provide for the exceptional deduction in this way. As to the effect for statistical purposes upon the gross figures Sch. A, Sch. B, and House Duty, see Pp. 20, 86, and 133 respectively.
(6) Ropairs-The original Income Tax Act, 1799, allowed, in the case of farm buildings of a farm with a principal messuage, repairs up to 8 per cent. on the annual value, and where there was no principal messuage, up to 3 per cent. In the case of houses and buildings not occupied with a farm, the limit was 10 per cent. ${ }^{2}$ In 1806 the allowance for repairs was discontinued, the reason being that cases of fraudulent claims had occurred, "where landlords, demanding an allowance for repairs, in fact done by the tenants, had obtained an advantage over others who were correct in their returns." ${ }^{3}$

No provision for the allowance was made in the Act of

[^26]1842, and the omission was the subject of much discussion and debate for many years. Gladstone opposed the allowance and considered that by its absence differentiation was provided between income from property and income from personal exertion.
In 1894 the increase in the tax rate was partly offset by a higher exemption limit, a higher abatement allowance, and the allowance for repairs.

The chief points to note are-
( $x$ ) The one-eighth on lands is allowed upon the gross, or Sch. B, value, including tithe, and in the case of farm cottages excluded from the Sch. B assessment one-sixth is allowed.
(2) The one-sixth is not always allowed, or fully allowed, in the case of lease rents.
(3) The "repairs" allowances are given on all classes of properties, whether exempt, abated, or allowed as "charities," etc.
"The Report of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue for the year 1908-9 shows that the sum of about $£ 33,000,000$ was allowed in respect of $1907-8$ by way of deduction in respect of repairs to houses; a small portion of this sum is doubtless included in the amount allowed for industrial repairs, but on the other hand, ropairs axeculed by house oumers whose incomes fall below the exemption limis were not induded" (Census of Prodaction, Final Report, p. 36).

The assumption in the sentence italicised is incorrect. It can be seen on examination that the repairs allowance is given generally, and without regard to ownership, the income assigned to exempt owners being pro hanto reduced.
(4) The "repairs" allowances in Scotland exceed those in England in proportion to the annual value (vide p. 20).
(5) The "repairs" allowances in Ireland are specially affected by statute. The one-ighth on lands is allowed in practically all cases, but in the case of buildings the existing valuation is already so much below the true rental value that where it is mors than one-sith below no allowance is given. ${ }^{1}$ The allowance given in Ireland is therefore far

[^27]less than one-sixth of the whole gross value of buildings. ${ }^{1}$ The effect upon the net assessment is sometimes peculiar: assume two different cases with a rental of $£ 120$ and valuations of $£ 102$ and $£ 98$ respectively, the net assessment in the first case would be $£ 102$ minus one-sixth $£ 17$, or $£ 85$, and in the second case $£ 98$.

How closely does the statutory " ropairs " allowance approximate to the facts?
The one-sixth allowance for buildings was adopted by Sir William Harcourt in 1894 , following on the suggestions by Mr. Hubbard in 186r, and it was intended to provide not only annual repairs, but also " a sufficient sinking fund for the eventual replacement of the building." ${ }^{2}$ For ordinary dwellings the allowance is generally regarded as adequate, and it covers also the cost of insurance, but probably most owners do not greatly concern themselves as to whether it is sufficient to provide a sinking fund in passing an opinion on the general question. Its adequacy in the case of trade premises is discussed in another connection, as very different and difficult issues are raised. ${ }^{4}$ It has been called into question in relation to cottage property, and was the subject of special legislation in 1910. For some years the heavy outgoings in the case of agricultural estates had been urged as a reason for more liberal allowances from cottages and lands. The Central Land Association gave evidence for 241 estates covering nearly two million acres, with details as follows:-


A little uncertainty naturally exists about the second item, and the ultimate concession was said to be due to it being shown that " costs of upkeep averaged $27 \frac{1}{3}$ per cent. of the gross rents." ${ }^{1}$
The provision actually made in 1910 allows for repayment wherever an estate owner proves an average expenditure on farms and cottages (not exceeding $£^{8}$ in annual value ${ }^{5}$ ) in excess of the existing one-eighth and one-sixth allowances, up to a maximum of 25 per cent., i.e., it doubles the allowance on land and increases the allowance for buildings from onesixth to one-quarter. The amount of duly (at rs. 2d. in the $屯)$ assigned for this additional relief was $£ 500,000$; one writer says the Chancellor " hoped they would be contented with this paltry sum." ${ }^{3}$
There seems to be confusion between this figure and the amount of assessment allowed:-" If they had been able to get $f 6,000,000$ off land under the 1894 Act, they ought to be able to get a great deal more than $\{500,000$ under section 69 . .." ${ }^{4}$
Up to 3rst March, 1910, only $£ 7,900$ was repaid-" very disappointing." The actual statistics of repayment have been given as follows:-1910-11, $£ 9,000$; 1911-12, £53,000; 1912-13. $£ 65,000$.
An allowance of $£ 500,000$ would provide for an additional 81 millions of assessment to be deducted, and this is equal to more than the maximum claim on all the agricultural land in the United Kingdom. ${ }^{\text {© }}$

The additional allowances have been included in the statistics of deductions under the heading " Repairs," so that this item is much more complete than formerly.
(7) Empty Housee not chargod to Daty.-This covers not only properties void for a whole year, but also for
${ }^{2}$ A. R. Stenning. Transactions of Surveyors' Institate, 1909. Vide also Evidenco before R. C. on Agricultural Depression: and Nicholson, "Rates and Taxeo as affecting Agriculture."
: Since extended to fra. W. A. Haviland, loc cif., p. 107.

- W. A. Haviland, ibid, P. 115.
- It was an estimate of the "maximum amount which might be repayable in any one year." Mr. Lhoyd George, 30.5 . 19 II (Hansard, Val. 26).
-The statutory limit of as per cent, has since been removed.
- 5 \& 6 Vict. c. 35, an 70
portions of a year, even down to a week. Since 1894-5 the amount has represented net assessments after allowance for repairs, i.e., if a house is void for three months, one quarter of the net assessment is allowed. If it is desired, therefore, to deduct from the gross values the value of empty property, one-fifth should be added to the figures given.
Sir Thomas Whittaker divides the total allowance for empty property proportionately between land and buildings (" Ownership and Taxation of Land," p. 87). But the amount applicable to lands is infinitesimal (probably not more than 2 per cent.), as there is no statutory provision for such an allowance. Only small building sites and waste land are included. Practically the whole sum should be assigned to buildings.
There is an administrative peculiarity which affects the earlier statistics (up to 1900-1) in an important way. It will be seen that the statistics given were for Scotland only, and none were available for England and Wales or Ireland. The reason is that practically the whole allowance for Scotland is made in the assessment, whereas elsewhere it is given " by schedule." ${ }^{1}$ The present reports give all sums, however allowed.
(8) Other Allowances: Lost Rent-There is no statutory provision for any allowance when premises have been occupied but the tenant is in default with his rent, which is finally lost. But the concession made in such cases dates almost from the beginning of the tax. ${ }^{2}$ The amount allowed is not separately shown; it is not a large part of the whole " adjustment" item, but it mainly relates to small house' property.

Scr. A Allowances-II. Non-personal Income.
(1) Colleges or Halls in Universitios ( 646,408 in $\mathbf{1 8 9 9 -}$ 1900). -" For the duties charged on any college or hall in any of the universities of . . . in respect of the public buildings and offices belonging to such college or hall and not occupied by any individual member thereof, or by any person paying rent for the same." ${ }^{3}$

[^28]The sum exempted appears in the tables since 1894-5 as the five-sixths of the value, i.e., after deducting the onesixth for repairs, so that to get the gross value of these cases one-fifth should now be added.
(2) Hospitals, Public Schools, Almshouses $(£ 2,472,077$ in 1899-r900).-" . . . any hospital, public school or almshouse, in respect of the public buildings, offices and premises belonging to such hospital, public school, or almshouse, and not occupied by any individual officer or the master thereof whose whole income, however arising, . . . shall amount to . . . $£ 150$ per annum, or by any person paying rent for the same . . . or any building the property of any literary or scientific institution, used solely for the purposes of such institution and in which no payment is made or demanded for any instruction there afforded, by lectures or otherwise: provided also, that the same building be not occupied by any officer of such institution, nor by any person paying rent for the same." ${ }^{1}$ The value appearing since 1894-5, as in the preceding case, is generally fivesixths of the gross value.

Throughout these two cases the exemption is narrower than the popular use of the words quoted in the headings. Many cases in the courts have been necessary to determine the question of liability in individual cases. Thus, the Manchester Free Library fell within the exemption and the Dundee Library did not ; the City of London School was allowed, but the Free Church of Scotland Theological College was not : the Nottingham Lunatic Asylum was within the oxempting clause, while the Dundee Royal Lunatic Asylum was chargeable.

Vide also House Duty-Exemptions, p. 12x.
(3) Reata and Profita of Landa applied to Charitahle Purposee ( $(762,120$ in 1899-1900).-"On the rents and profits of lands, tenements, hereditaments or heritages belonging to any hospital, public schoal or almshouse, or vested in trustees for charitable purposes, so far as the same are applied to charitable purposes."

The word "charitable " is interpreted in a wide sease.

[^29]мม

Lord Macnaghten says: " ' Charity,' in its legal sense, comprises four principal divisions: trusts for the relief of poverty, trusts for the advancement of education, trusts for the advancement of religion, and trusts for the other purposes beneficial to the community, not falling under any of the preceding heads. The Act of 1842 has nothing to do with casual almsgiving or charity of that sort, nor indeed has it anything to do with charity which is not protected by a trust of permanent character." ${ }^{1}$
Since 1894-5 the figure appearing in the tables has been after the repairs allowance. But whereas the old tables gave only the sums exempted in the assessments, the recent reports show the total sum, including the very considerable amounts granted by repayment.

## Deductions and Allowances-III. Personal Allowances.

(I) Exemptions.-The sum given in the official reports as exempted is that assignable to recipients of the income assessed under Sch. A (owners, mortgagees, ground landlords, etc.) who had total incomes below the exemption limit. This sum is a necessary deduction when the total income of taxable persons is being ascertained. It is, moreover, sometimes desirable to ascertain the approximate value of land owned by the working classes, and this figure gives a good maximum limit. It indicates that the following is excessive:-
"Would it destroy the moderation of my estimate if I put the value of all the urban and rural property of small landlords of the working class at $£ 20,000,000$ ? (previously defined as " value of houses actually acquired by workmen, properties of small freeholders, farmers, market gardeners, owners of allotments, etc., crofters in Scotland, and peasant proprietors or small tenants who have purchased their holdings in Ireland ").Jesse Quari, "The Wealth of the Workers," Contemporary Revies, August, 1907.

## Division in "Lands" and "Houscs."

The "exemptions" are always given in one sum for all classes of property, and there is nothing to indicate how

[^30]much of the gross value of " lands " is exempt, as distinct from " messuages."

Mr. Christopher Turnor gives the gross income from land in Great Britain as $£ 42,000,000$, of which $£ 4,000,000$ goes to "exempt owners," $=£ 38,000,000$ for agricultural landowners,
less 30 per cent. $\quad \mathbf{1 2 , 6 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ for upkeep
$\{25,400,000$ net, or 6.6 million pounds
" less than the Land Conference memorandum of 20th January" (Letter to The Times, 23rd February, 1914, on "Income of Agricultural Owners ").

An opportunity for computing the relative proportions of the net exempt Sch. A belonging to " Lands " and "Houses " respectively, and, therefrom, the respective gross assessments belonging to exempt persons, appears to occur at the first occasion for the allowance of repairs. At present it is not possible to say what fraction, between one-fifth (for houses) and one-seventh (for lands) should be added to the net exemptions to give the gross, because these proportions are not known. If $1893-4$ and 1894-5 were in all other respects alike, the latter year would show an amount for exemptions less than the amount in the former, by the repairs allowance, and this allowance would represent a composite of allowances one-eighth and one-sixth, from which the proportions of the two could be determined. But apart from a normal growth in the year we have the complication that 1893-4 was a re-assessment year, and the amount and number of exemptions as recorded were in consequence much lower than usual, and lower than the true figure (as explained elsewhere). Moreover, the repairs allowance was not the only change, but the exemptions in 1894-5 were up to $£ \mathbf{E} 60$ instead of £150. In the net result, for England and Wales, we had exemptions :-


Despite the higher exemption limit, and the increased number of properties erempted, the repairs allowance made the sum
"exempted" smaller than before. With the three complications it is not possible to work upon the aggregate charges, though the average value of properties exempted, which was constant, should apparently furnish a standard unaffected by re-assessment years ${ }^{1}$; but the material is too rough to give satisfactory results on a fine fractional difference. It points to the fact that a mere transfer from one deduction column (exemptions) to another deduction column (repairs), having no fiscal significance, did not receive full administrative effect at once in assessments already made up, and all other methods based upon this change fail for the same reason. ${ }^{1}$
In evidence before the R. C. on Agriculture, 1896, the Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, Lord Milner, put in a table ${ }^{2}$ (which may be regarded as an official estimate) as follows (England and Wales) :-

| I |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Lands, 1893-4 gross assessment | 40,065 83 I |
| Approximate statutory deductions and abatements. |  |
| Discharges and repayments by way of |  |
| appeal, etc. . | 3,457,079 |
| Net annual value | 31,684,574 |

As far as I have been able to analyse the deductions, they seem to be computed by taking separately the deductions specifically applicable to lands (or almost entirely so), land tax, sea walls, ecclesiastical deductions, rates on tithe rentcharge, rents and profits applied to charitable purposes, and dividing the deductions not specifically belonging to any single category directly in the ratio of the lands and messuages. Therefore in this figure exemptions and abatements have been alloted to lands and messuages respectively almost in proportion to the gross assessments.
(The "discharges by schedule" were heavy in that year, decause it was a re-assessment year.)

By the formula :-Difference in average $=\frac{L+M}{m}-\left(\frac{7 L}{8}+\frac{5 M}{6}\right)^{2}$ from which $L$ (lands) should be found in terms of $\mathbf{M}$ (mesuages).

- Vide also Appentix IL., p. 500.
- Evidences, $\mathbf{p} \boldsymbol{4} \mathbf{I I}$.

From this it may be gathered that, on the best evidence available at that time, the lands in the hands of persons exempt in 1894-5 (£160 limit) amounted in annual value to about-


This sum was strictly only the amount allowed in the assessments, and therefore (except in Ireland ${ }^{1}$ ) did not generally include the interest payable to exempt mortgagees : such interest would form the major part of the repayments under Sch. A applicable to lands, and the amount is not ascertainable from the Reports.

It is unlikely that the present total exemption should be similarly divided in proportion to the total value of lands and houses respectively. The greater part of the increase in exemptions is assignable to houses, except in Ireland, and, although doubtless the splitting up of landed estates has added to the numbers of exempt owners, the change must be relatively small. On the proportional method, it would give-

but in my judgment these figures are more likely to be, in fact-

assuming the figures for 1894-5 to be correct. This figure, however, includes repayments, and therefore mortgagees who are exempt.

In cases where exempt owners pay mortgage interest to persons who are liable, the annual interest is of course not included in the exemption, but in the remaining "net assessment." But this rule is completely interfered with in the case of interest paid to building societies, because these concerns are assessed under special arrangements. Generally the property is exempted outright, and the society receives its interest without any tax being deducted. Then the society is assessed (under Sch. D) for interest which it pays to liable shareholders, members, or other recipients. The effect of this arrangement is to make the " exempted" interests in real property appear rather larger than they really are at the moment. There is a similar arrangement in Ireland for dealing with interest paid under the land purchase schemes. ${ }^{1}$ There the value appearing as exempted is the value that woill belong to exempt purchasers, when they have paid off all their indebtedness.
(2) Abatements.-The sums allowed under this head are not closely indicative of the numbers of incomes from property, which fall between certain limits. In the case of mixed incomes the abatement for property owners may be allowed under another schedule. In general, however, since " earned income" rates were introduced in 1907, abatement in such cases is allowed in the first instance from such income, e.g., in the case of a total income $£ 280$, $£ 140$ from property and $£$ It 0 from salary, the salary will be "abated" and the balance ( $£ 20$ ) of the $£ x 60$ abatement allowed from assessment on the property. It is because information is lacking as to the number of these part abatements that no inference can be drawn from the total sum allowed under Sch. A.
Prior to 1900 only the abatements "in the assessment " were given in the tables, ${ }^{3}$ and these were always much restricted in the re-assessment years. ${ }^{3}$
(3) Lito Insuranee Promiums-These are allowed only

[^31]by schedule and repayment under Sch. A, and therefore did not appear in the tables before 1900.
(4) Reliof in respect of Childron.-This is more fully dealt with in Chapter VIII. No inference can be drawn from the sectional allowance here.

## Sch. A Net Assessments-Sequencr.

The " breaks" are much more numerous than in the gross assessments, and practically rob the net assessments (as given in the Reports) of any value for comparative purposes over long periods. The chief breaks are-
(I) 1853-4. Ireland introduced (exemption limit altered).
(2) 1866-7. Concerns No. III., Sch. A, transferred to Sch. D.
(3) 1863-4. Abatements introduced.
(4) 1872 -3. Abatements altered.
(5) 1876-7. Abatements altered and exemption limit changed.
(6) I894-5. Abatements altered and exemption limit changed.
(7) 1898-9. Abatements altered.
(8) $1894-5$. Repairs allowance introduced.
(9) 1900-I. Methods of statistical presentation altered, "Net income on which tax received" substituted for " net assessments."

The ned income from property, free from personal allowances, can now be computed for comparative purposes.

Breaks (6). (7), and (8) ignored :-
"Sch. A exhibits a rather puzrling anomaly, inasmuch as its gross assessments show for the decade $189 \mathrm{r}-2$ to $1900-\mathrm{I}$ an increase of 31 millions sterling, while the income actually taxed declined more than II millions."-W. R. Lawson, "Two Record Budgets," Fortmighty Revian, May, 1903.

> Ownership and Distribution of Property : The New Domesday Book.

The tax statistics furnish very little information about the ownership of land. Owners are assessed as statutory
" occupiers " in certain cases, such as property let for periods less than a year, or houses under $£ 10$ in annual value, but otherwise, in taxation " at the source," it is the tenant to whom the Revenue looks, and the name and circumstances of the owner are immaterial. Only where the owner is concerned to claim exemption or abatement or some allowance from the assessment is it necessary to take notice of him. The poor rate authorities are even less involved in matters of ownership, and it may therefore be understood why the " ownership" column of the valuation list is often so unreliable and out of date: it is only from casual information that the opportunity arises for its correction.

In 1873 a classification of owners as given in the rate books or valuation lists was undertaken and issued as a Parliamentary Return in 1875 . It has since been widely known as the "New Domesday Book," and is the chief source of information as to the distribution of ownership. A good summary is given by F. Purdy. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Classification by extent of holdings:-

(Total, 972,836 owners.)
Another summary may be found in Dawson's "The Unearned Increment " (p. 54):-

One quarter of the land of the United Kingdom was beld by 1,200 persons (average acreage, 16,200 ) ; a quarter by 6,200 persons (average acreage, 3,150); a quarter by 50,770 persons (average acreage, 380 ); a quarter by 261,830 persons (average acreage, 70). One-half was held by 7,400 persons, and the other half by 312,500 . While 4.500 persons held half the area of

[^32]England and Wales, 1,700 held nine-tenths of Scotland, a single owner having in his hands more than a million and a quarter acres.
" The returns placed the number of landowners at $1,173,724$, but the estimate was far too high, as it included hundreds of duplicates and thousands of leaseholders, and besides, 852,438 of the reputed owners held less than an acre of land, their average not being a quarter of an acre each. Recent returns show that the number of separate holdings in France exceeds five and a half millions, and in Germany five and a quarter millions.DAWSON, op. cit., p. 53.

Similarly, J. Ellis Barker quotes the figures in comparison with Germany (1895), and states that $12 \cdot 2$ per cent. of the English acreage was occupied by owners against 87.4 per cent. in Germany (Nineteenth Contury, September, 190g).

Major Craigic gave a somewhat destructive criticism of the return before the S. C. on Small Holdings, 1889, ${ }^{1}$ dealing with the uncertainty of owners' names and their duplications. It is quite certain that all inquirers do not bring away the same lessons.

A "Re-examination" by W. H. Mallock with regard to the value as well as the extent of the properties, lays stress upon the fact that in Great Britain and Ireland (excluding the metropolis) there were 900,000 "estates less than one acre," gross rental £ $38,000,000-a v e r a g e$ rent per acre, $£ 190$ (" Statistical Monograph," I.).

## Ownorship and Use of Proparty.

Other information has been obtained from returns of agricultural holdings. Major Craigie handed to the S. C. on Small Holdings, 1889 , an analysis of the agricultural returns, in counties, showing the following results :-

| - | England. | Walea, | Scothand. | Great Britain. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ( I Returns from occupiers farming their own land. | 60,935 | 6,454 | 6,044 | 73.433 |
| (a) Total returns |  |  |  |  |
| from occupiers | 425,886 | 62,127 | 82,193 | 570,206 |
| (3) Percentage of (i) | 14.3 | 10.4 | $7 \cdot 4$ |  |
| owned and occupied | 3.967.675 | 315,844 | 626,557 | 4.910,076 |
| (5) Total acreage . <br> (6) Percentage of $(4)$ | 24.964 .483 15.9 | 2,841,408 | 4.878 .514 12.8 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,684.399 \\ 150 \end{array}$ |

In the Appendix ${ }^{1}$ to the Report of S. C. on Poor Law in Scotland, 1869-70, details are given by counties and parishes, the totals being-

J. Ellis Barker quotes the agricultural holdings returns (from Cd. 4533) to show that freehold properties are in the greatest proportion among smallest holdings (except for those over 300 acres), and to show that freehold is mostly desired by the smallest holders (Nineteonth Century, October, 1909).

In 1867 the following classification was given for Irish agricultural holdings ${ }^{2}$ (thousands) :-

| - | Counties. | Towna | Total. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Less than $£ 4$. | 175 | 157 |  |
| $f_{4}$ and under 68 | 142 | 41 |  |
| $\pm 8$ and under $£ 10$. | 48 |  |  |
| E10 and undet 615. | 78 | 44 |  |
| f15 and under $£ 20$. | 46 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{E}^{20} \mathbf{2 0}$ and under $£ 50$. | 83 36 | 30 |  |
| Total | 609 | 272 |  |
| Area (acres) | 20,190 | 97 | 20,815 |
| Valuation | 10,191 | 2,451 | 13,245 |
| Population | 4,286 | 1,512 | 5.798 |

Another classification gave five-sixths as being under $£ \mathbf{I} 5$ per annum, as follows:-Less than $£ 15,512$; $£ 15$ and under $£ 30,94 ; £ 30$ and under $£ 50,38$; $£ 50$ and under $£ 100$, 25 : over $£ 100,13$-total, 682 : of which tenancies at will numbered 429, 63, 21, 10, and 3 respectively-total, 526.

[^33]In 1872 a parliamentary return ${ }^{1}$ gave a classification of the assessments on property owned by corporate bodies, in counties. The totals were (in thousand $£$ ):-

|  | Munidipul Corporathans. | Reclostantical and Educationa Bodien | $\begin{gathered} \text { Joint } \\ \text { Sompack } \\ \text { Comien } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Other } \\ \text { Corpara- } \\ \text { tomas. } \end{gathered}$ | Totale |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| England and Wales | 707 | 3,14I | 2,006 | 2,386 | 8,240 |
| Scotland . | 143 | 330 | 195 | 197 | 866 |
| Ireland | 27 | 197 | 28 | 58 | 310 |
| United Kingdom | 877 | 3,668 | 2,229 | 2,64I | 9,415 |

It is not possible at the present time to state what amount is similarly held, but it must be very much greater so far as corporations and companies are concerned.

An interesting return ${ }^{\text {² }}$ gives details of the deer forests and lands exclusively devoted to sport in Scotland, in counties other than crofting counties. In eleven counties, with a total area of six million acres, 557,544 are so used, the rental value being $\{36,118$, or less than IS. 4 d. per acre. There were 87,000 acres at 51d. in Aberdeen, 40,000 at 7d. and 160,000 at IId.

## Early Sch. A Statistics used as Evidence of Increase in Property.

The following are given by way of example :-
"A few years after the beginning of the century, viz., in 1802-3, the average annual value of real property, according to the income tax returns, amounted only to about $\{35,000,000$ In 1814 the amount was $\{53,500,000$. In other words, in about ten years time the property of the nation, so far as it was derived from real property, increased about 50 per cent., and we may assume that there was an equal increase in the property itself."Sir R. Giffen, "Are we Living on Capital?" Economic Inquiries," II., p. 29 I.
$V i d e$ also under " Sequence " ( $\boldsymbol{p}$. 38) for similar extended use by Giffen.

Goschen makes similar use, and it would serve little purpose to multiply exemples.


A Prophecy.-Writing in 1871, Giffen said that the real property worth $£ 150,000,000$ then would be worth $£ 250,000,000$ in thirty years ("Taxes on Land," "Economic Inquiries," I., p. 275). The actual period was thirty-three years.

## Statistics of Mossuages used as a Test of Prospority in the Building Trade.

These figures have been used for this purpose by Sir Algernon West, ${ }^{1}$ Mr. W. H. Mallock, ${ }^{2}$ and others.

As it is usually desired to consider this prosperity from year to year rather than over long periods, the statistics are not well adapted for the purpose. In valuation years it is difficult to distinguish increases in values from new values, and in intermediate periods it is necessary to estimate for the downward "drag.": The total numbers of all premises are not subject to quite the same limitations, however, and inferences may be more safely drawn therefrom. ${ }^{4}$

## Comparison of Increase in Seh. A and Pauperiom.

(1) 1847-65. Sch. A increase 6 r per cent., and pauperism $49 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent. (S. C. on Poor Law in Scotland, 1869-70, Appendix, p. 479).
(2) Various heads of poor law expenditure measured annually against the aggregate Sch. A assessments from 1845 (S. C. on Poor Law in Scotland, 1869-70, Appendix, p. 453).

## Use of Schs. A and B (County Details).

(1) Trend of Agriculture-Caird uses figures for 1878 and 1869, grouped into corn districts, arable, grass, etc. (" Ten Years of British Agriculture," S. J., 1880). F. Purdy compares 1814-15 and 1864-5 (S. J., 1869, p. 308). R. C. on Agriculture, 1896, compares 1870-1, 1879-80, and 1893-4, p. 554. Royal Agricultural Society's Journal, 1858, p. 301. R. C. on Land in Wales: comparisons 1842-decadal to 1892. Vide also Chapter IX.
${ }^{1}$ R. C. an Depression in Trade and Industry, 1886, Q. 729.
Vide p. 33.

- Vide p. 3 I.
- Vide Quarterly Jownal of Ecomomics, 1915, p. 816, R. S. Tucker on "The New Land Taxes in Fractice."
(2) Burdon of Land Tax as a Fixed Charge.-Proportion of Sch. A in each county to the total for comparison with land tax percentages at different periods (F. Hendriks, " British Land Tax Statistics," S. J., 1857).


## Use of Sch. A Details (Parishos or Towns).

Ratings and Sch. A comparod.-Lumley, S. J., 1858, quotes II. C. $337-1856-7$, sess. 2 ; Purdy, S. J., $\mathbf{1 8 6 9 .}$

Miscellaneous Sources of Information, other than Annual Reports.
(x) Parliamontary Papors.
H. C. 235-1842. Return of Real Property for England and Wales in Counties, giving the annual value, 1815, and the net rental rated in 1840-I, and annual value per acre.
H. C. 316-1844. Sch. A Assessments, 1842-3: valuation by Parishes and Counties. The total valuation given in subsequent reports is not fully accounted for.
H. C. 102-1845. Return for 1842-3 by Counties, distinguishing details: Lands, Messuages, Quarries, Mines, etc.
H. C. 165-1845. Similar Return to the foregoing, with full details, by Parishes.
H. C. 449-1849. Burdens on Land. Tables comparing 1814-15 with 1842-3. Comparative value of poor rate. Unfairness of Sch. B if profits small (Lord Monteagle's report).
H. C. 185-1851. Sch. $A$ in classes 1814, 1842, 1845, and 1848.
H. C. 680-1852-3. Sch. A Assessments in Metropolitan Parishew.
H. C. 254-1854-5. Sch. A Assessments in Metropolitan Parishes, with comparison, County Rate and Poor Rate Valuations.
H. C. 408-1856. Scotland: County and Parish Return of Valuations.
H. C. 317-1857 (2). County and Barough Return of Sch. A and Population.
H. C. 3-1859. County and Borough Return of Sch. A.
H. C. 123-1859. County and Borough Return of Sch. A.
H. C. 155-1860. Counties and Burghs, Scotland. Income Tax, Voters, Population, etc.
H. C. 332-x860. Cities and Boroughs, England and Wales. Comparison between Sch. A and Gross Poor Rate.
H. C. 393-1860. Sch. A Statistics for certain Cities and Large Towns.
H. C. 400-1860. Poor Rate Assessments by Counties and Parliamentary Divisions (England and Wales).
H. C. 546-1860. Sch. A Assessments, Great Britain, by Parishes, 1859-60, giving in great detail Lands, Messuages, Tithes, etc.
H. C. 155-1861. Assessments in Chelsea, Kensington, Hammersmith, Fulham, and Scotland.
H. C. 455-186I. Metropolitan Parishes-Sch. A on Houses.
H. C. 518-186r. Metropolitan Parishes-Sch. A and Poor Rate, Sewers Rate, County Rate Valuations, with rating deductions (gross to net).
H. C. 518-186x. Ditto, Kent, Middlesex, and Surrey.
H. C. 199-1863. Unions in Lancashire. Gross Poor Rate, Rateable Value, and Sch. A, 1860.
H. C. 548-1853. Metropolitan Parishes. Gross Poor Rate and Sch. A $1861-2$ and 1862-3.
H. C. 321-1864. Ditto.
H. C. 116-1864. Scales of Rating Deductions in different Unions.
H. C. 568-1864. Cities, Boroughs, and Counties in United Kingdom. Gross Sch. A, 1857 and 1862.
H. C. 113-1865. Scotland-Valuation of Lands and Heritages-in Parishes: (1) Land let; (2) land occupied, including woods; (3) houses; (4) mills and factories; (5) gas and water works; (6) mines, quarries, and railways.
H. C. 477-1865. Classification of Lands, etc., 1864-5.
H. C. 485-1866. Metropolitan Assessments, 1863-4 and 1864-5, by Parishes, Sch. A, and Gross Poor Rate.
H. C. 5II-1866. 1814-5, England and Wales, Sch. A, by Counties.
H. C. 524-I866. Scales of Rating Deductions in different Unions.
H. C. 53-- $867-8$. $\quad$ 1862-3, 1863-4, 1864-5, England and Wales, Sch. A, and Ratings.
H. C. 454-1870. 1842-3 to $\mathbf{1 8 6 9 - 7 0 ,}$ Great Britain, Sch. A, by Counties.
H. C. 287-187I. Local Taxation-Return for various dates, 1748 to 1870 . Population, Sch. A, rate per head, etc.
H. C. 397-I872. Assessments, Sch. A, in Liverpool.
H. C. 42 -1874. Scotland-Valuation Rolls: Parish Returns for 1855, 1861, 1867, and 1872.
H. C. 368-1869. Five decadal Returns: Gross Assessments.
H. C. 461-1875. England and Wales-Classification in Lands, etc.
H. C. 335-1876. Owners of Land, by Counties, in Great Britain, with Acreages of Holdings and Gross Values (Poor Rate).
H. C. 7-1877. Government Property not rated (no totals).
H. C. 234-1878. Annual Value chargeable under different heads, and duty thereon.
H. C. 292-1882; 206-1883; 25-1884; 235-1884. Return by Counties.
H. C. 20-1884. Agricultural Depression. Repayment of Income Tax to Landlords under certain conditions, 1881-2 and 1882-3.
H. C. 170-1890. Government Property (London)Rateable Contributions.
H. C. 32-1892. Return by Counties.
H. C. 124-1894; H. C. 42-1896; and H. C. 309-1898. Similar return to 170-1890.
H. C. 204-1895. Rateable Value of Lands, $\mathbf{1 8 6 9 - 9 0}$, and Gross Value and Rateable Values, 1894 : Lands, Buildings, Railways, in each Union. Appendix gives quotation from Goschen's 1870 Report comparing Income Tax on Lands, Houses, etc., 1814, 1843, 1850, 1860, 1868.
H. C. 454-1895 (2). Government Property in the

Provinces: Contribution in lieu of Rates and Valuation (not totalled).
H. C. 217-1896 (continuing 32-1892) County Returns, 1889 to $1894-5$, and comparison with $1869-70$, 1874-5, 1879-80, and 1884-5.
H. C. 312-1898. Similar return to $454-1895$.
H. C. 150-1900. Rateable Values and Wages: Comparative Return 1870, 1894, 1899.
H. C. 307-1901 (continuing 216-1896). Assessments, 1895 to 1899-1900.
H. C. 183-1906. Rateable Hereditaments by Unions, 1899 and 1906 : Gross and Rateable Values.
H. C. 344-1907. Deer Forests, Scotland, and Lands devoted to Sport.
H. C. 414-1912-13. Sch. A Classification in Counties. Lands, Houses, etc.
H. C. 119-19I3. Agricultural Land and Rates paid, 19ri-12: Details for each Municipal Borough and Urban District Council.

## (2) Parliamontary Questions. (See also " (3) Miscellaneous.")

Hansard (7), 1st July, 1909. Gross annual income Sch. A, Lands, England, Scotland and Ireland, with repairs and agricultural depression statistics.
(3) Miscellancers.

Division of Rateable Property into Lands, Houses, Railways, etc., and percentage of total-1798, 1814 and 1868 ; Tables 9 and 10. Appendix A, p. xxxii., R. C. on Agriculture.

Decline in Value of Lands, Sch. A-Agricultural Depression. R. C. on Depression in Trade, 1886, Table 3.

Wales and Six English Counties, 1842, decadal to 1892. R. C. on Land in Wales, 1893-6.

## CHAPTER II.

Schedule B. Income from the Use of Land.
Definition.-" For and in respect of the occupation of all such lands, tenements, hereditaments and heritages as aforesaid, ${ }^{2}$ and to be charged for every twenty shillings of the annual value thereof . . ." " in addition to the duties to be charged under Sch. A . . . except a dwelling house," not being " occupied . . . with a farm for the purpose of farming . . . and except warehouses or other buildings occupied for the purpose of carrying on a trade or profession." "The profits arising from lands occupied as nurseries or gardens for the sale of the produce . . . shall be estimated according to the rules contained in Schedule D . . . and charged under Schedule B as profits arising from the occupation of lands." "
An official definition runs as follows:-" The tax under Schedule B is chargeable in respect of the occupation of all lands. It is in effect a charge on the profits made by the occupier from the exercise of his capital and skill in husbandry, just as under Schedule $\mathbf{D}$ a charge is made on the trader in respect of the profits derived by him from the exercise of his capital and skill in trade." ${ }^{\text {s }}$

It will be observed that the statute begins by making the Sch. B co-extensive with Sch. A, and then proceeds with exceptions. It is probable in strict law that these exceptions do not really limit the sphere of operation to "lands," to which it is in practice confined, but that Sch. B could

[^34]actually be charged upon a town-hall or a university lecturehall !

The Character of "Sch. B" Income.

It is important to note that Sch. B is different in character from all the other parts of the income tax. The other schedules, though having conventions and rules, give assessments which move in close relation to actual money income. The Sch. A assessment upon a house occupied by its owner is no real exception when the original assumption is admitted, viz., that every one must pay rent for the house he lives in, even if he pays it to himself, and that a dwellinghouse is sui generis in a man's possessions or expenses. But Sch. B is made up of two quite different parts:-
(I) A tax on farming products, based on a presumptive or conventional proportion, and independent of all actual variations due to personal factors or temporal changes. This basis was, in 1803, three-fourths of the rental value for England, and one-half in Scotland ; in 1842 and 1853 onehalf of the rental value in England and one-third in Scotland, and in 1853 one-third in Ireland; in 1896, one-third uniformly for the United Kingdom. ${ }^{1}$ " It was doubtless owing to the fact that in 1803 farmers did not as a rule keep trade accounts that this system was adopted. . . . In 1842 a suggestion was made by Lord Howick that it would be better to charge farmers under Sch. D, but it appears not to have met with any considerable support." " As a reason for altering the proportion in 1842 Peel expressed "his perfect conviction that the rent of the farmer had been raised in proportion to his profits," and he considered the reduction was "consistent with justice." There is no doubt, moreover, that the reduction of import duties on corn in 1842 was also a reason. This basis is obviously "rough and ready." Its soundness in economic theory is quite open to question'

1 The basis was raised to the full rent in the Budget of September, 1915, while these pages were passing through the press.

28th Report, p. 8I.

- Vide article on "Land Valuation and Rating, Reform" by the present writex, Economic Jonomal, 1911. Some objections on similar lines were ineffectively raised in 1842 (vide Hansard's Debates).

Aspume that form $A$ is on the margin of cuttivation, and yielden no

If a farmer makes more than the assessment he cannot be charged more; if he makes less, he may claim a reduction. The favourable treatment formerly given to Scotland had its basis partly in a supposed difference in the actual proportion ${ }^{2}$ and partly in the fact that the owner bore certain charges or rates which were paid by the tenant in England and which made the rent correspondingly higher. An adjustment for the latter by itself almost sufficed to equalise the charges to duty. For example:-

economic rent, but $f r 00$ interest on owner's capital is paid by the tonant in the name of rent; that farm B pays troo interest and $^{2}$ (r00 economic rent, or $\mathbf{2 0 0}$ rent in all ; and farm C pays $£ 100$ and $Z_{300}$ economic rent, or $\$_{400}$ total. Assume that the degree of skill. otc., required is the same in all three and that their profits are in equilibrium, and oqual, at $£ 100$. The Sch. $B$ profit will bo-A $£ 33$. B 666 , and $C$ E 133 .
Suppose farms A and B each vield a net divisible product of $f_{500}$ of which $6 x 00$ is retained by the farmers, and rents of $£ 400$ paid. If the ownor of farm B has to pay froo drainage or embankment assessment rate for keeping the soe out, it is a deduction under Sch. A, but not under Sch. B, and to that extent the law and economic theory agree. But if, as sometimes happens, the tenant pays half the drainage assossment, obviously his rent will be 4350 , from which the $E 50$ allowance is made for Sch. A, but for coonomic consistency the assossment under Sch. B should be one-third of 4400 , and not of E350.

Vide Hansard (12th May, 1853. col. 240). Mr. Gladstone"The hon. member had demanded that he should be placed in the tame position as the Scotch and Irish farmer ; but if that were done ... that concession would bo at once made a standing ground for a further appeal to altor the ln m in favour of the Scotch and Irish farmer. As for the Scotch farmer, his case was irresistible, and wat founded partly on acknowledged facts, and partly on reasonable belief. It was founded, in the irst place, upon the fact that the public burdens in Scotland, which were mostly borne by the tenants in England, were borne principally by the landlord, and constituted a portion of the rent. .. The case of the Scotch faruner also rested on the belief that the had a smaller share of the protite from the land than the English farmer bad."*

For evidence of the feeling that Irish farmers were " over-rented," $\infty$ Chapters IV, and X.

English income computed at one-half, ${ }^{1}$ £3,425,000; Scotch income computed at one-third of the gross $£ 2,403,000$. The reduction of the proportion in England in 1896 was made regardless of this difference, and on the presumed merits of the case at that time. ${ }^{3}$
(2) A large part of Sch. B is not a tax on profits, but a privilege tax or licence, akin to a carriage licence. All land, even though it is not occupied for husbandry or profit, is liable to Sch. B. This is a unique feature in the income tax-the inclusion of an element that is not, and never can be, "income." It is a tax incidental to possession or enjoyment, but represents nothing that comes within the category of profits or gains. An illustration may perhaps make the fact clearer. If A. is owner of a farm, and B. is tenant, the total net produce (which we assume is not sold) is divisible between A. and B. as rent and profits, and if A . works the farm himself the two elements remainthey correspond to the Schs. A and B. If, however, A. owns a beautiful park which yields no physical produce, he may let it to B. and go and live abroad himself. B. pays a rent (which A. turns into consumable goods, so that he is in the same position as before), and this rent represents the whole annual value of the enjoyment income of beauty yielded by the park. ${ }^{3}$ B. consumes what he has paid for, and what he consumes is purchased, it is neither earned nor unearned income. So that when he pays the tax under Sch. B he pays a licence to keep a park, or a sumptuary presumptive tax on an expenditure indicative of wealth paid out of that wealth which is already wholly reached and taxed by the other schedules of the tax. This part of the assessed "income" may be an element in reaching true faculty, but it is not a part of true national income in the ordinary sense. One might quite consistently convert carriage licences by the carrent

[^35]
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rate of tax into terms of "income" and add them to the national income. I draw a distinction between consumption of corn and consumption of beauty for this purpose-they both minister to human needs, but they are of a different order. Let us assume that economic rent is non-existent because there is no differential yield, and because satisfactions are equal to what equivalent effort in other businesses will obtain; the " labour " of walking round a " blackberry farm " provides a fund of food which I may consume as I go along, or which I may store and sell and buy bread with. The equivalent "labour" of walking round my "beauty farm," and securing points of vantage, yields me satisfactions which I must consume as I go along and cannot exchange; meanwhile I want for a living, in the vital sense. The satisfactions in the first case are of the order of an income, within the sphere of an income tax; the satisfactions of the second are of a different order altogether and cannot yield a part of themselves as a moncy tax. ${ }^{1}$

These considerations are of some importance when the income tax figures are being used for computing national income and national capital, ${ }^{2}$ and also when that section of the whole assessments actually applicable to persons liable to tax is being treated as the income of liable farmers. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Unlike the tax on farmers' profits, this tax on occupation is payable in any event, and absence from home does not render the occupation "void." If farmers' profits were to be transferred to Sch. D, this section would stand out clearly in its own special character.

The distinction between the two sections is of course not always clearly cut. There are some lands which are yielding produce, but not to the fullest extent of ordinary husbandry : the experimental or hobby farming of some home farms attached to great estates, in which the making of a commercial profit is a secondary consideration, is a case in point.

[^36]Actually what comes within the terms " occupying lands for purposes of husbandry only ${ }^{1}$ is sometimes a nice question.

The abolition of Sch. B and the transfer of farming profits to Sch. D has been advocated for many years. It was mentioned in the evidence before the $\mathbf{1 8 5 1 - 2}$ Committee, and also by Giffen before the R. C. on Trade Depression, $1886 .{ }^{9}$

Scope of Sch. B Statistics.
The Sch. B assessments, like the Sch. A, are comprehensive ${ }^{3}$-they cover all land, and not merely land owned or occupied by persons liable to tax. They approximate as closely to the true values as Sch. A assessments; ${ }^{4}$ they exhibit the same effects of re-assessment as Sch. A assessments on lands; ${ }^{5}$ and the differences between England and Wales, Scotland and Ireland, are precisely those detailed under Sch. A.e In fact, they are so closely similar to thelatter that for all ordinary statistical uses the two sets of gross assessments may be used indifferently.?
It is not an uncommon error to suppose that small holdings and allotments as well as peasant farms are omitted from the Sch. B values :-
(x) Quotation from Report of Committee of the British Association on Amount and Distribution of Income below the Exemption Limit, p. 103
(2) Professor Sidgwick, misled by Giffen's statement that a large part of the $£ 7,000,000$ Irish Sch. B exempt assessment (then assessed on the full rent) was "peasant class income," deducted $£ 3,000,000$ on this account, comparing the balance with Great Britain, from which he made no corresponding deductions, apparently assuming that no "peasant class tenants" were included in our assessments (note in Appendix 1., p. 180, R. C. on Financial Relations, 1894).

[^37]But it is important to note that the official tables give only the net Sch. B liable to duty in Ireland for the earlier years (see Appendix III. and Table B).

The actual omissions from the assessments are :-
(1) Property occupied by the Crown;
(2) Gardens under one acre in extent attached to dwellings and assessed to House Duty (q.v.) ;
(3) Various profits enumerated under the " Differences between Sch. A assessments on lands, etc., and Sch. B assessments."

Differences between Sch. A Assessments on " Lands, etc.," and Sch. B Assessments.
Although similar, the two sets of figures never exactly agree. ${ }^{1}$ In the first place, there are some few items classed under this head for Sch. A that are not assessed to Sch. B, such as land in connection with works, waste and building land, and public recreation grounds rented. In the second place, nurseries and market gardens are assessed on their rental value under Sch. A, but on their profits under Sch. B. In the third place, since farmers may " elect to be assessed under Sch. D, ${ }^{18}$ no assessments exist under Sch. B to correspond with the Sch. A assessments upon the lands affected by the operation of this clause. Fourthly, there are some minor administrative reasons for other differences. In the net result it will be found that the Sch. A totals are generally slightly in excess of Sch. B.

## Sch. B Gross Assessments-Statistical Sequence from 1842.

(1) Break in 1858-4 (introduction of Ireland).-The Irish figures introduced at this date into the official tables are wot only. The estimated gross assessments for these early years may be taken as practically the same as Lands. Table A 3.
(2) Braak in 1873-4.-The Irish Sch. $B$ is given in the official tables for the first time (grass).:

[^38](3) Brosk in 1876-7,-The value of farmhouses was not previously included in the Irish statistics. The estimated correction is made in Table A3 (vide Appendix III.).
(4) Breat in 1896.-The gross assessments under Sch. B were subjected to a change of great statistical importance by the Finance Act of 1896, which simplified previously existing methods of making assessments upon farm profits and of estimating a farmer's total income for purposes of exemption and abatement. Under the Acts of 1842 and 1853 the assessments were made upon the full annual value of the land, but a special rate of duty was charged thereon, subject to a deduction of one-eighth of the duty on lands that were tithe free. A farmer's income, for the purpose of computing his total income for exemption or abatement, was deemed to be one-half of the full annual value in England and Wales, but only one-third in Scotland and Ireland; ${ }^{2}$ while the special rates of tax charged were based upon these proportions-i.e., a leading rate of 7 d. for the other schedules gave a rate of $3 \frac{1}{d} d$. in England and $2 \frac{1}{2} d$. in Scotland and Ireland, while $5 d$. gave $2 \frac{1}{2} d$. and $1 \frac{1}{2} d$. respectively, and $8 d$. gave $4 d$. and 3 d. respectively. ${ }^{2}$ In 1894 the rate was made uniform- 3 d. for the whole kingdom, with a leading rate of 8d. But in 1896 the one-eighth deduction ceased to exist, the special rate was abolished, and the leading rate was made payable upon one-third of the full annual value. The proportions in the old income tax, which obtained from 1803 to 1816, were three-fourths of the rent in England, and one-half of the rent in Scotland.
The alteration has been frequently misunderstood:-

[^39][^40]been assumed that they amount only to one third."-W. H. Mallock, " The Nation as a Business Firm," p. II4.

The same statement is repeated in "Statistical Monograph," No. 30. Vide also p. 94.

Statistically these changes are of great importance. Down to $1896-7$ the statistics given for Sch. B are those of "gross assessment " or gross annual value, and what they are intended to represent in terms of income must be computed by reference to the proportions above quoted. But since 1896-7 the gross assessment under Sch. B is only one-third of the gross annual value, and it is intended in itself to represent "income." Assuming for the moment that the present proportion is a correct one, the Sch. B assessment is now comparable with other schedules, whereas before 1896-7 it was not comparable, and when the totals were included in a general aggregate of assessments under all schedules, to represent total taxable income, it was a quantity wholly unlike the others, as if one should include 50 fowls with 100 bullocks and 100 horses and speak of a total of 250 cattle. Before inclusion with the totals of other schedules the Sch. B totals should be reduced to terms of income.

As examples of errors arising through treating the assessments as income ${ }^{2}$

All the computations in the evidence, etc., given before the R. C. on Financial Relations between Great Britain and Ireland, dealing with Sch. B, treated the assessments as equivalent to income ${ }^{1}$ (vide Appendix and Qs. 7.722 , etc.)
" In the year 1890-1 the assessments under Sch. $D$ in respect of profits from the occupation of lands, the occupiers of which availed themselves of this option, amounted to $\mathbf{t} 6,826$, wheroas the assessments which would have been made under Sch. B on the yearly rent or value of such lands would have amounted to C55.977 " (Board of Agriculture Leafiet, A $\frac{2-93}{I}$ ). This is certainly so expressed as to suggest that the two sums are comparable.

Giffen took the Sch. B, and "for some reason which was not made quite clear he took the gross assessment." instead of onehalf, as the income, and multiplied by 10, getting twice Craigie's Ggure. He afterwards defended this course: "The presumption

[^41]of law . . gives no better guide what those profits are than the rental itself. The one is just as good as the other."-Rew, "Farming Revenue and Capital," Journal of Agricultural Society, 1895.

The majority of cases arise, however, not upon the use of the Sch. B figures by themselves, but in the aggregation of all the schedules, where this change can easily be overlooked.

Two courses are open for this purpose. We may assume that the proportions in force under the statutes from time to time were the true ones, or we may assume that the general " one-third" should properly have existed throughout.

In making comparisons of years not far removed from each other and on either side of the change, it is perhaps desirable to treat the matter uniformly by employing one proportion. Over a long period, however, it may fairly be assumed that the statutory difference did reflect a real difference, and therefore it may be better to adhere to the statutory terms. On the one hand it would be absurd to assume that in 1892 profits really were one-half the rent and that in 1900 they were one-third, while on the other hand in the middle of the nineteenth century it is probable that the proportion was actually higher than at the end. In any case, the method employed must be clearly stated.

The most frequent " pitfall " brought about by the change of method is in the comparison of aggregate tax assessments without allowing for the break of $£ 37,000,000$.

For examples, vide p. 288, on "Comparisons of Years."
Table Br gives the actual gross assessments under Sch. B since 1842, reduced to the income computed therefrom on the statutory basis actually existing at the time. The income on the present basis is given officially from 1888-9 to $1895^{-6}$ with a corresponding comparison of net assessments. ${ }^{1}$ It is necessary to deduct from the gross total for England the profits of nurseries and market gardens (charged according to the rules of Sch. D), to divide the remainder by 3 or 2 as the case may be, and to add the

[^42]Table Br.-Seh. B: Ineoma, on Statutory Bacis (million $\AA$ ).

| Liable. |  |  |  |  | Exempt. |  |  |  | Total. Exempt and Liable. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Elghad and Walen. | Scotiand. | Ireland. | Total. United Kingdom. | England and Wales. | Scotland. | Ireland. | Total. |  |
| $1842-3$ $1843-4$ $1846-7$ $1849-50$ $1852-3$ | 12.20 12.03 11.67 11.69 10.84 | .81 .74 .74 .76 .74 | 1.06 1.06 1.06 1004 .93 | 14.07 13.83 13.47 13.49 12.58 | 8.72 8.42 8.99 9.64 9.79 | -96 1.00 1.11 1.10 1.10 | 2.45 2.45 2.45 2.40 2.15 | 12.13 11.87 12.55 13.14 13.04 | $\begin{aligned} & 26 \cdot 20 \\ & 25.70 \\ & 26.02 \\ & 26.63 \\ & 25.55 \end{aligned}$ |
| 1854-5 | 13.74 | 98 | .$^{87}$ | 15.59 | $6 \cdot 72$ | -92 | $2 \cdot 11$ | $9 \cdot 75$ |  |
| 185099 | 14.0 | 1.14 | -92 | 16.96 | 6.47 | -93 | $2 \cdot 22$ | 9.62 | 26.58 |
| 1862-3 | 1583 | 129 | -98 | 18.10 | 6.52 | -94 | $2 \cdot 23$ | $9 \cdot 72$ | 27.82 |
| 1865-6 | 16.97 | 1.24 | .98 | 19.19 | 6.28 6.28 | -94 | 2.38 | 9.43 | 28.62 |
| 1866-9 | 17.61 18.38 | $2 \cdot 46$ | 1.08 | 20.08 | $6 \cdot 28$ | 94 | 2.31 | $9 \cdot 53$ | 29.61 |
| $1871-2$ $8874-5$ | 18.38 19.06 | 1.50 1.58 | .98 .96 | 20.86 21.60 | 6.13 5.98 | -93 .98 | $2 \cdot 31$ | 9.37 9.24 | 30-23 |
| 1877-8 | 18.62 | 1.50 | -98 | 21.03 | 7.23 |  | 2.40 | 9.24 10.68 | $30-64$ 31.71 |
| 1880-1 | 17.72 | 8.47 | -91 | 20.10 | 8.10 | 1-09 | 2.48 | 11.60 | 31.70 |
| 8883-4 | $15 \cdot 69$ | 140 | -9r | 18.00 | 8.39 | $1{ }^{10}$ | 2.42 | 11.98 | 29.91 |
| ${ }^{1840-7}$ | 14.06 | 8.26 | -86 | 16.18 | 8.65 | 1-10 | $2 \cdot 43$ | 12.18 | 28.36 |
| 2859-90 | $12 \cdot 38$ | 1.19 | .86 | 14.34 | $8 \cdot 76$ | 1.03 | $2 \cdot 46$ | 12.25 | 26.59 |
| $1894-5$ $1890-1900$ | 11.91 5.29 | 1.00 .88 | .86 | 13.77 6.94 | 9.02 7.09 | 1.06 | 2.43 2.47 | 12.50 10.65 | 26.27 $\mathbf{1 7}$ |
| $1899-1900$ $1904-5$ | $5 \cdot 27$ 4.76 | .88 | 78 .74 | 6.94 6.32 | $7 \cdot 09$ 7.54 | 1.10 1.12 | 2.47 2.50 | 10.65 12.15 | 17.59 17.48 |
| 1913-2 | 4.41 | -82 | . 72 | $5 \cdot 95$ | 7.90 | 1.10 | 2.51 | 11.51 | 17.46 |

Noth,-The yoar following the re-masemment year has been taken in each case, the intermediate fluctuations being insigalficant. For Englend and Wales the basis of ono-half the rent existed down to 1896 ; the remainder is upon the basis of onethird. The effecte of the changes in exemption limit. 1853-4 and 1876, are obvious. Vide Appendices for details, and estimates cor Ireland.
profits of nurseries, etc., to the result. The intervening steps are omitted in the table (see Appendix II.).

Deductions from Gross Assessments.
(x) Exemptions-The official tables have given the actual sums deducted from the assessment under this head, without showing the estimated equivalent in income, down to 1896. ${ }^{1}$

At the present time, upon the basis of assessment at onethird the rent, by far the greater part comes under this head, and a considerable part of the eleven and a half million now "exempt" is really the income of persons who should be regarded as liable. Exactly what proportion would be exempt on any other basis of assessment cannot readily be computed. The net assessment on liable persons is given in Table Br.
(2) Empty Proporty-These allowances refer mainly to building sites and land which has become waste. In the ordinary course " land" does not become void, in the same sense as houses do, for income tax purposes.
(3) Othor Allowances, Reductions, and Discharges_-This covers reductions in rent, temporary abatements and remissions in rent (to the extent of one-third), losses and cases where profits are reduced below the one-third basis on appeal.
(4) Abatements, Life Insurance Premioms and Rolief in respect of Children-No comment beyond that given under Sch. A in Chapter I. and also Chapter VIII. is necessary.

Sch. B Net Assessyents: Statistical Sequence.
The chief breaks are as follows:-
(I) 1853-4. Ireland introduced.
(2) 1853-4. Exemption limit lowered.
(3) 1861-2. Abatement introduced.
(4) 1872-3. Abatement altered.
(5) 1876-7. Abatement altered and exemption limit raised.
${ }^{1}$ For the effect, see notes in Appendix III. on Table Br.
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(6) 1894-5. Abatement altered and exemption limit raised.
(7) 1898-9. Abatement altered.
(8) 1876-7. Farmhouses in Ireland (vide "Appendix III. " ${ }^{12}$.
(9) 1879-80. Method of computing one-eighth deduction altered.
(10) 1896. Basis of assessment changed.
(II) 1900. "Net assessments" in statistics altered to "net income upon which tax is received."
The following is an example of fallacious comparison (breaks (6), (7), and (x0)) :-
" Sch. B makes a deplorable exhibit. The gross assessment fell during the decade from $£ 19,487,000$ to $£ 17,608,000-a$ loss of nearly two millions. But the tax-paying income of the farmers appears to be a rapidly vanishing quantity. In $\mathbf{r g 0 0 - r}$ it had declined to $£ 4,706,000$ as against $£ 7,138,000$ ten years before-a shrinkage of fully two and half millions sterling. In both years notice should be taken of the large proportion of farming income that had-no doubt for good and sufficient reasons (1)-to be exempted. In 189x-2 . . . less than 40 per cent. paid income tax. In $1900-\mathrm{I}, 80$ per cent. had to be let off. These at least are not signs of very progressive eealih."-W. R. Lawson, "Two Record Budgets," 1860 and 1903. Fortnightly Revies, May, 1903.

## Farmers "electing to be assessed under Sch. D."

It has already been pointed out that a farmer need not be prejudiced by the " one-third " basis if his profits are less. He has three remedies :-
(I) Profits falling short of the Seh. B Asseamont-In 185I a reduction was conceded to tenant farmers. In 1853 and 1880 it was extended to all persons occupying lands for the purposes of husbandry only, whether principally engaged in husbandry or not. These provisions were superseded in 1896, when it was enacted that any person

$$
{ }^{2} \text { P. } 88
$$

occupying lands for the purpose of husbandry only could appeal at the end of the year, and obtain reduction of assessment and repayment of tax, if necessary, down to the profits of the year. This does not affect gross assessments in the statistics at all; the allowances are made by schedule or repayment, and at the present time form part of the deductions (overcharges).
(2) Losses,-Under the Customs and Inland Revenue Act of 1890 , not only is the duty on the Sch. B assessment waived, but the amount of loss is repayable against any other duty paid. This again does not affect gross assessments.
(3) Assessment undor Sch. D.-Since 1887 any person occupying land for the purposes of husbandry only can elect to be assessed under Sch. D by giving notice within two months after the commencement of the year of assessment. The following table shows the number who have so elected, and it will be seen that the effect has been unimportant. The "boom" in 1893-4 came at the time of the depression when the provision was, in a re-assessment year, published very widely. The Sch. B profits now are one-third of the third column, and the actual profits in the fourth column may be compared. These figures do affect the gross assessments, being omitted altogether.

Mr. W. H. Mallock says the one-third is " obviously untrue to fact: for if it were true, a farmer reating 100 acres of land at about $£ \mathrm{I}$ per acre would not make an income of more than £33, which is absurd. This fact receives comment and illustration in Blue-book Cd. 4868, p. 149 (52nd Report), where it is made evident that the true profits of the farmer are really about equal to his rent, as had always been assumed previously. The gross profits, therefore, arising from the occupation of land were in 1905 about $f 52,000,000$ " (" The Nation as a Business Firm," p. 115). A glance at the "comment" referred to will show that Mr. Mallock has quite misunderstood the facts. The official Table 186 gives the number of farmers who elected to be assessed under Sch. D instead of Sch. B for ten years to 1907-8. To the heading " Rental Value of the Lands occupied by such Farmers-United Kingdom" is an asterisked footnote: "Had the farmers been assessed under Sch. B the assessments would
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have been on one-third of the amounts shown in this column "; and his inference was that the column showed profits, whereas the adjoining column gives the aclual profits, which so far from being equal to the rent, or even one-third of it, are only one-eighth (rental value, $£ 140,820$; profits, $£ 17,758$ ).

Table B2.-Farmere who elocted to be assessed Sch. D instead of Sch. B (United Kingiom).

| Yems. | Number who Emoted. | Annual Reatal Value of Lands nacoted, 1000 | Amonnt of Probta Amemetio. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Gross, 4000. | Not fiable camar. |
| 1887 | 143 | 28.8 | 1.6 | $1 \cdot 4$ |
| 1888 | 163 | 56.7 | 9.6 | $7 \cdot 4$ |
| 1899 | 136 | 54.6 | 6.7 | $5 \cdot 0$ |
| 1890 | 134 | $56 \cdot 0$ | 6.8 | $5 \cdot 4$ |
| 1891 | 116 | $47^{-2}$ | $7 \cdot 2$ | 5\% |
| 1892 | 112 | $48 \cdot 4$ | $17 \cdot 9$ | 12.6 |
| 1893 | 552 $\dagger$ | 2297 | 12'7 | $8 \cdot 3$ |
| 1894 | 485 | 208.7 | $12 \cdot 9$ | $8 \cdot 2$ |
| 1895 | 431 | $190{ }^{\circ}$ | 9.9 | $5 \cdot 5$ |
| 1896 | 405 | 1787 | 10.7 | 67 |
| 1897 | 376 | 172.9 | 10.9 |  |
| 1898 | 301 | 1248 | $12 \%$ | Not |
| 1899 | 265 | 116\% | $13 \cdot 3$ | given. |
| 1900 | 260 | I15.4 | 14\% |  |
| 1901 | 287 | 115•I | $12 \cdot 5$ |  |
| 1902 | 302 | 116.2 | IIO |  |
| 1903 | 218 | 99.8 | 10-1 |  |
| 1904 | 254 | 135.4 | $12 \cdot 3$ |  |
| 1905 | 256 | 128-1 | 13-8 |  |
| 1906 | 255 | 126.9 | 14.5 |  |
| 1907 | 291 | 140.8 | 178 |  |
| 1908 | 312 | $146 \cdot 3$ | $18 \%$ |  |
| 2909 | 292 | $132 \cdot 4$ | 18.8 |  |
| 1910 | 348 | $142 \cdot 7$ | 192 |  |
| 1912 | 364 | $126 \cdot 4$ | $28 \cdot 3$ |  |
| 1912 | 322 | 1226 | 21.5 |  |
| 1953 | 332 | 1241 | 130 |  |

[^43]It should be noted that these provisions apply to the occupation of land for husbandry only; and therefore woodlands and park lands are excluded, while it is sometimes a debatable point whether certain kinds of fancy farming and experimental farming come within this clause. Although "home farms" are often managed by capable bailiffs, they frequently make continuous " losses "-obviously the commercial element is not really present, and although produce may appear to be valued at reasonable prices, early or fine specimens may be responsible for expenses quite out of proportion to the value assigned.

## Sch. B"Statutory Income" and the True Incoue of Farmers.

The extent to which Sch. B " statutory" income differs from, or approximates to, the true income from farming has been many times under discussion. ${ }^{1}$ Dr. Bowley says " the average income of farmers is . . . a task which has always proved beyond the power of statisticians." 2 But nearly all are agreed that the present statutory proportion of one-third of the rent is far too low. Dr. Bowley's comment is a typical one :-
" No one will believe that the average income of farmers holding 300 acres and under is as little as $£ 43$, i.e., one-third of the average computed rental. ${ }^{3}$ It is just conceivable that the cash income may not be much greater, but in such a case considerable value of the produce grown is consumed at home by the farmer and his family, who are also provided with a house. We shall probably be on safe ground if we take the average income for this group as $£ 60 \pm 30$, that is, the average profit per acre is between 75. 6d. and 22s. 6d" ("The Amount and Distribution of Income," S. J., 1910, P. 58).

But his conclusion that the one-third average profits is not to be accepted becanse less than 300 farmers choose the alternative of Sch. $\mathrm{D}^{4}$ is not really inevitable. The farmer

[^44]who elects to be assessed Sch. D is assessable on his actual profits, whereas the farmer who accepts the ordinary Sch. B assessment gains by it whenever his profits are more than the assessment, and whenever they are less he can get the assessment reduced to the actual amount. ${ }^{1}$ It is a case where sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander. Moreover, it is too wide an inference to draw from the small number of farmers liable to tax who are interested in making the "election" referred to ; even if true of the few large farms it would not necessarily be true of the farms of average size.
The R. C. on Agricultural Depression ( $\mathbf{I 8 9 4}$ to $\mathbf{1 8 9 6 \text { ) }}$ examined closely into the question of farmers' profits, and obtained a number of actual accounts which are summarised in the Appendix to their Report, where the relation of profits to rent is expressly examined. The following is a condensed summary of the conclusions :-
Summary of 106 Farm Aceounts, 1897. (1889-94, years generally available.)-Acres, 42,966 . Outgoings, E217 $^{2}, 424$, or $\mathrm{E} 5 \cdot 12$ per acre on $38,94 \mathrm{I}$ acres. Labour, $\mathrm{E47,099}$, ( $£ \mathrm{r} 45.6 \mathrm{~d}$. per acre), or 21.9 per cent. of total outgoings. Cost of fertilisers and seeds, E47.548 ( $^{2} \mathrm{I} 5 \mathrm{~s}$. per acre), or $22 \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}}$ per cent. of outgoings. Rent, $£ 39.530$ ( $£ \mathrm{I}$ OS. 7 f d. per acre), or $\mathbf{x} 8.5$ per cent. of outgoings. Rates and taxes imperfect, and tenants' capital incomplete. Average profits, $£ 6,553-$ loss, $£ 6,452=$ net profit, $£$ ror on $\mathbf{4 2}^{2,966}$ acres.

These totals are given on p. 137 of the Appendix. But on p. 49 we are told that "it would be a grave mathematical orror to place all these accounts on the same level and strike an average result." They really consist of three classes :-
A. Detailed accounts given by bond fde tenant farmers.
B. Summary accounts given by bond fde tenant farmers.
C. Accounts furnished by persons occupying their own land.
For Class $A$ results are given covering the period 8875 to 1894, but they do not relate to the same cases for the whole period. Only from 1885 do they exceed twenty cases, being

[^45]forty-eight for $\mathbf{1 8 9 3}$. The variations are such that they can hardly be regarded as an ideal sample, but if dealt with solely in percentages, the disadvantages are minimised. The report says: " Up to a recent period a tenant farmer's average profit was estimated at one-half of the gross rent minus one-eighth, that is, seven-sixteenths or 43.75 per cent. of the gross rent. If the profits and losses of the several years be compared with this standard, it will be seen that in only nine years out of twenty did the profit exceed that proportion ; but in some cases the excess was considerable. . . ."
The percentages were as follows:-

| cood Y | Lean Yeam | 4 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1875+47 \cdot 5$ | $1878+2.8$ | 1880-18.1 |
| $1876+76 \cdot 4$ | $1879+8.5$ | 1893-1788 |
| ${ }^{1877}$ + 78.3 | ${ }^{1881}$ | 1894-23.6 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1882 \\ & 1883\end{aligned}+56.5$ |  |  |
| 1888 + 44.2 | $1886+14.2$ |  |
| ${ }^{8889}+68.0$ | ${ }^{1887}{ }^{88}{ }^{+10.9}$ |  |
| 1890 <br> 1897 | 1892-0.27 |  |

Taken in four-yearly averages:-1875-8, 49.5; 1879-82, 12.0; 1883-6, 20.6; 1887-90, 45.8; 1891-4, 3.8.

It should be noted as an important fact that the average size of the farms in these samples was over 500 acres in all years, and sometimes over 700 acres.
The Report says: "Prima facie, accounts of this character are presented by men of exceptional business capacity and fairly sound position, and they therefore represent conditions more favourable than the average. Taking the whole of these accounts as one for each separate year, it appears that the average profit over the twenty years was about a quarter of the rent ( $26-66$ per cent.) . . . instead of $43 \cdot 75$, the old basis of estimation for purposes of income tax." ${ }^{1}$ A later paragraph tends to criticise this as rather lower than the facts on account of the use of the farmhouse as a

[^46]residence, and expresses a doubt as to whether in all cases proper account had been taken of the consumption of farm produce. ${ }^{1}$

The question whether this sample of large farms has any value in application to farms generally is not dealt with by the Commissioners. They endeavour to summarise the conflicting evidence as to large or small farms "feeling the depression more or weathering the storm" better. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ With such a large number of witnesses there were naturally differences of opinion, but my own view is that those who considered small farms had been less affected give the clearest testimony, and that moderate-sized farms (roo to 300 acres) held the securest position. But even a definite answer on this point is not necessarily conclusive as to the value of the sample. Proportionate reductions of income are not fell as proportionate sacrifices, otherwise the whole theory of progressive taxation is unsound. If the $£ 160$ income was reduced by one-fourth-to $£ 120$, the depression would be felt as more severe than a similar reduction of the $£ 480$ income to $£ 360$. Therefore, if all farms felt the depression equally, the actual reduction of profits was progressive, and if the small and moderate-sized farms folf depression less than large farms (as so many witnesses thought), then the reduction of the smaller profits was far less in proportion than that of the larger farms. There is nothing in these samples or in the whole of the evidence to compel the belief that the average farmer of I50 acres had an income (including that taken in kind) for twenty years of less than 20s. a week to cover his own labour and that of his wife. This figure includes the interest on his own capital, which at 5 per cent. on an average sum per acre would alone amount to $£ 45$ or $£ 50$ per annum ; yet the evidence is clear that even at that time there was no lack of applicants for medium farms. The present Sch. B besis is hardly equal to a reasonable percentage upon capital, and leaves nothing as remuneration for labour or "profit." One witness regarded twenty acres as the least upon which a

[^47]" living " was possible ; the Sch. B profit is about 3s. 6d. per week on such a holding!

Just as we should decline to draw from the results of a period of depression inferences to be applied to periods prior and subsequent thereto, so we should hesitate to apply the results derived from the accounts of large farms to farms of smaller acreage. It is undeniably difficult to get good evidence for the latter. While it was possible for a professor of agriculture fifty years ago to say " the necessity for keeping some kind of accounts is generally admitted by farmers," ${ }^{1}$ we find an expert declaring recently: "I suppose it is true that the majority of farmers keep no accounts, and it might be argued that theyget on well enough without them." ${ }^{2}$ i My own experience is that a fair number of farmers keep a rough list of their chief expenses, and some account of their sales, but that stock is rarely taken periodically with any exactness, and an account purporting to show the annual profit generally contains a good many estimates. A common admission (when taxation is not under discussion !) is that a profit equal to the rent on the average is a reasonable experience for normal years. This was a general view forty years ago, well on into the seventies. ${ }^{8}$ In 1875
${ }^{2}$ J. Coleman, Journal of Royal Agricultural Society, 1858, p. 122. $V$ ide also S. C. on Income Tax, $1851-2$, Q. 2,930.
${ }^{3}$ C. S. Orwin, "Farm Accounts," Journal of Farmers' Club, March, 1913. Vide also D. C. on Imperial and Local Taxation, Qs. 9,084, etc.
. Vide C. Oakley's Presidential Address to the Surveyors' Institute, Transactions, 1897. Laverge, writing on "The Rural Economy of Great Britain and Ireland "in 1854 . gave the following estimates:-

|  | England and Wales. | Scotland. | Ireland. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \& s. 4. | $t$ s. $d$. | 6 3. 4. |
| Proprietor's rent, per acre |  | 0100 | 0100 |
| Profit of farmer | 0126 | 080 | - 28 |
| Local taxes. . | - 7 9t | 010 | - 18 |
| Accesaory expenses | - 157 | - 60 | - 18 |
| Wages . | - 19. | - 8 - | - 160 |
| Total | E3 18 42 | \& 130 | $f 1120$ |

Quoted in Appendix to Report from the S. C. on Tasation of Ircland, p. 335.

Mr. F. Clifford ${ }^{2}$ said that over an average of years 8 to 10 per cent. on the farmer's capital was "fortunate"; this would represent about $£ \mathrm{I}$ per acre, or rather less than the average rent. One instance given for the eight years 1865-6 to 1872-3 related to a farm of 367 acres, rent $£ 538$, labour bill $£ 597$; and the profit averaged $£ 392$ after charging interest at 4 per cent. on capital $£ 3,800$, or a profit of 14 per cent. in all. The extent to which rents have been reduced since this date must be remembered. "The higher the rent a man pays the less are his profits and the higher his income tax." ${ }^{2}$ There is no doubt, however, that profits for medium farmers fell much below this standard subsequently, and that income equal to half the rent was " not very wide of the mark for an average estimate." ${ }^{3}$
Coming to more recent times the proportion has probably risen again. Sir Richard Paget, in an actual instance of a farm letting on a profit-sharing scheme of his own, has based the contract on the following facts and assumptions:Assume divisible profits $£ 4$ per acre at least ( r 00 acres ) $=£_{400}$; this divided, $f 60$ as interest on farm capital £1,500 lout to the tenant, and the balance $£ 340$ equally, the value of the farm being taken as $£ 4.500$ and the tenant credited with an equal sum for management. This is really £230 as the farmer's (Sch. B) profit compared with the $£ 170$ (Sch. A) owner's rent. The writer also discusses the division of profits ${ }^{5} 5$ per acre, ${ }^{4}$ in which the farmer's share is even greater.

An interesting comparison between total net income and Sch. B for Ireland is given in Chapter X. ${ }^{6}$

The profits of farmers, for Great Britain as a whole, have been

[^48]estimated from the " net output " of farm produce. The following gives a recent summary :-

$\begin{array}{ccccc}\text { Total sales to non-agriculturists, less materials } & \underset{110,000,000}{f}\end{array}$
Produce consumed by farmers, and allowances
to labourers . . . . . . 10,000,000
Value divisible . . . . . 120,000,000
Rent ${ }^{1}$. . . . $£ 38,500,000$
Wages, according to independent
calculation
£46,000,000
$84,500,000$
Difference, representing profits of farmers (including $£ 8,000,000$ produce consumed by them) . . . . . . . 35,500,000
" There are, of course, very great possibilities of error in the table, ${ }^{2}$ but it roughly coincides with conditions on typical farms where the occupier's family supplies none of the labour required. In such cases $\mathbb{E}$ I of rent for a fr of profit is a fairly common rule, while the wages bill frequently amounts to as much as 40 per cent. more than either rent or profits. If the problem is looked at from the point of view of the occupiers' families as a whole . . . the distribntion . . ." would give $£ 51,000,000$ as their share and £ $30,500,000$ as the share of wage labourers. "The profits of occupiers represent an average anmual income of about froo 2 year, of which $£ 16$ is taken from the farm in kind. Out of it have to be found rates, insurance, and replacement of the tenant's capital, in addition to the personal expenses of the family" (Economist, 1913, p. 1, 177).

The total Sch. A value of agrictiltural land in Great Britain, taken by the Economist for 1907 at $£ 38,500,000$,' is allocated as follows:-

| Tithe, taxes, management, and | ${ }^{\text {f }}$ | 10 per cent. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| insurance | 3,850,000 |  |  |
| Repairs | 3,850,000 | 10 | " |
| Improvements and sinking fund | 5,775,000 | 15 | " |
| Interest on landlord's capital | 16,170,000 | 42 | " |
| Net "economic rent" | 8,855,000 | 23 |  |
| Total | 38,500,0 |  |  |

## 1 Vide p. 49.

2 The actual table referred to is differently arranged from the ono here given, where the profit has been presented as a residuum.

3 Vide p. 27 for comment on the way in which this figure is arrived at.

## SCHEDULE B. INCOME FROM USE OF LAND.

The data for this division are taken from Mr. Thompson's paper in the Statistical Journal for 1907 (Economist, 1913, p. 1,176).

Mr. Mallock has an interesting analysis on similar lines :-


The general conclusion that, on the average, profits are now practically equal to rents has recently been supported by Sir R. Edgecumbe, ${ }^{1}$ who considers that "the best farmers generally clear a good deal more."

## Value of Land per Aore.

In the Report of the Committee of the British Association on "The Amount and Distribution of Income (other than wages) below the Income Tax Exemption limit" (S. J., 1910, p. 57), there is an ingenious attempt to find the average value per acre by fitting the liable Schedule $\mathbf{B}$ assessments against the largest holdings (as given in the Board of Agriculture returns). It is fixed at 32 s ., for if more "is assumed, farms of less than 300 acres would pay tax, and then the acreage included would show more than $\{x 5,000,000$ rent . . . if less . . . the figures fail to be consistent in the opposite direction." The attempt fails upon the first assumption: the liable Schedule $B$ assessment is to a great extent not from large farms at all, but from perks, woods, giebe, home-farms, and odd parcels of land occupied by people atherwise liable. If we assume one half to

[^49]be applicable to large farms, the point of equilibrium would be at a rental of about 24s. per acre. The Committee got into difficulties at the lower end, and were forced to assume, quite erroneously, that " the profits of small holdings are not returned to the surveyor."

Sir J. Barton stated that nearly all the " liable" Schedule B tax paid in Ireland is from landlords on their demesnes. ${ }^{1}$

Numbers of Separate Properties Assessed.
For many years official statistics were available as to the numbers of properties assessed.

The relationship between the statistics of the " number of separate properties assessed under Sch. B" and the " holdings " returned by the Board of Agriculture has been studied by Major Craigie, who found they were " in no sense comparable" (England and Wales, 798,800 against 475,100; Scotland, 79,300 against 80,700; and Ireland, 718,000 against 565,300; United Kingdom, 1,596,000 against $\mathbf{x}, 121,000$ ). He accounted for the differences as follows:(1) Properties occupied by the same man, counted separately for Sch. B; (2) "holdings" exclude plots less than a quarter of an acre; (3) " holdings" refer only to the technical "cultivated area," 24 per cent. short of the full area in England, 40 per cent. in Wales, and 75 per cent. in Scotland. The figures for Scotland he could not explain (" Size and Distribution of Agricultural Holdings," S. J., 1887, p. 88).

Major Craigie, in a return handed to the S. C. on Small Holdings, 1889, ${ }^{2}$ contrasted the numbers of Sch. B assessments from 1869 to 1888 with the Agricultural Returns each year in order to confirm the indications in the latter of increasing subdivisions of holdings. This confirmation was general only, and, in view of the large difference between the two returns, could not be taken in detail.

Mr. W. H. Mallock made an elaborate comparison, using Cd. 6277 and the Reports. The former, he said, refers only to holdings over one acre ( 500,000 ), while 800,000 acres "consist of small cultivated plots of less than one acre in extent, their number being something over 1,000,000 (see 41st Report)." This reference merely gives the statement that the cotal numbers of separate properties assessed (including those exempted and abated) are
${ }^{1}$ R. C. on Local Taxation, vol. I Q. 3329.
$=$ P. 502 , and Q3. 4,964 and $4,994$.

## SCHEDULE B. INCOME FROM USE OF LAND. fos

$\mathbf{9 2 2 , 2 8 2}$, so that the statement is quite unverified, and there is no reconciliation (" Statistical Monograph," No. 30).

In general it may be said that the separate ratings are grouped for income tax assessment purposes in order to make up the whole of one " take," although extending into several parishes. But several separate "takes" between the same parties would be separately assessed. Land in the occupation of the owner is usually assessed in separate parcels, according to the way it is rated, and one holding extending into several parishes would therefore appear as several assessments. No precise statistical computations can be based on these figures.

## Rates of Duty in Earlier Years.

The rates of duty for Sch. B after 1842 were :-

| locomen crse or over. |  |  |  | Hsoomen (reo and mine fasa |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| - | Erghasd | Sootland and Ircland | Compoaition for fithen | Engrand | Sootland and Lrelami. |
| Up to | d. | $d$. | $d$. | $d$. | 6 |
| 1852-3 | 31 | 21 | 2 |  |  |
| inclusive) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1853-4 | 31 | 21 | 2 | 21 | 12 |
| 1854-5 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 31 |
| 1855-6 | 8 | 5 | 41 | 5 | 3 ? |
| 1856-7 | 8 | 5 | 4 | 5 | 3\% |
| 1857-8 | 31 | 21 | 2 | 21 | $1{ }^{188}$ |
| 1858-9 | 21 | 1 | 1 | 21 | 1 |
| 1859-60 | 41 | 3. | 24 | 34 | 21 |
| 1860-1 | 5 | 31 | 8 ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ | 31 | 21 |
| 186x-8 | 41 | 3 | 24 | 3 | 2 |
| 1862-3 | 41 | 3 | 24 | 3 | a |
| 1863-4 | 31 | 21 | 2 |  |  |
| 1864-5 | 3 | 21 | 18 |  |  |
| 1865-6 | 3 | I | I |  |  |
| 1866-7 | a | I | 14 |  |  |
| 1867-8 | 21 | 12 | I |  |  |
| 1868-9 | 3 | 21 | 1 |  |  |
| 1869-70 | 2) | I | 1 1 |  |  |

Parliamentary Papers (containing Additional Information).
H. C. 491-1852. Appeals by Tenant Farmers, Great Britain, under 14 \& 15 Vict. c. 12, s. 3 ( 1,200 cases : 756 allowed, $£ 3,419$ duty relief). Counties detailed.
H. C. 492-1857-8 and (2) of 1859 . County Return.
H. C. 130-1860. Rates of duty, 1852 to 1859 .
H. C. $300-1860$; $1857-8$ and $1858-9$. United Kingdom. Sch. B Assessments classified in amounts.
H. C. 546-1860. Detailed Return of Assessments by Parishes, for Great Britain.
H. C. 57x-1860; 454-1870. 1814-15. England and Wales by Counties (estimated from Sch. A Lands and total Sch. B. 1842 to 1869. Great Britain, Sch. B, by Counties.
H. C. 292-1882; 206-1883; 25-1884; 235-1884; 32-1892. County Returns.
H. C. 217 -1896. County Returns. Gives tables for 1889 to 1894, and comparison with 1869-70, 1874-5, 1879-80, 1884-5.
H. C. 307-1901. Continuation of foregoing, 1895 to 1899-1900.
H. C. 344-1907. Deer Forests and Sporting Lands, Scotland.
H. C. 414-1912-13. Sch. B-Classification in counties.

Other Sources of Information. (See also under Sch. A.)
1882. R. C. on Agriculture. Giffen's evidence. Qs. 64,812, etc.
1886. R. C. on Depression of Trade and IndustryTable 4 Profits under Sch. B, 1864-5 to 1883-4 (as distinct from assessments).
1896. R. C. on Agriculture, Appendix A, p. xxxix. Sums charged to duty, allowed by schedule, and by repayment, with net amount received: England and Scotland separately.
1896. R. C. on Agriculture, Appendix XV. County Table-Lands : 1872-3, 1879-80, 1888-9, 1893-4.

## CHAPTER III.

Income Tax (Schedule A) and Inhabited House Duty.

## THE CLASSIFICATION OF BUILDINGS.

The statistics of these two distinct duties are now combined in such a way as to give a classification of buildings according to value and use or occupation. For the purpose of this work, the House Duty furnishes a sub-class of messuages, and as its values are identical with those for Sch. A, the division of the latter into " Premises Liable to House Duty " and "Premises Exempt from House Duty" is the preliminary step, necessary for clearness, which has been adopted in the Reports for some years.

## Inhabited House Duty (Great Britan only).

This is a "tax on houses which are occupied either wholly or partly as dwelling-houses, and is a charge upon the occupier. It does not extend to houses which are used solely for purposes of trade, ${ }^{12}$ or to houses under $f 20$ in annual value. But it includes premises which are not dwellinghouses in the ordinary sense of the term, e.f., chambers or apartments in the Inns of Court, or in colleges or halls in any of the universities.

A tax on inhabited houses was first imposed in 1696, and was assessed at various rates until April, 1834, when it was repealed.

From 1808 the rates were- $£ 5$ and under $£ 20,15.64$ in the $£: £ 20$ and under $£ 40,25.3 d$. in the $£: £ 40$ and upwards, es. Iod. in the $f^{:}$

[^50]
## 108

## BRITISH INCOMES AND PROPERTY.

When the window tax was repealed in 1851, the present House Duty was imposed, but houses under $£ 20$ in annual value were no longer charged. Houses occupied for trade as well as for dwellings were charged at a lower rate, $6 d$., and the ordinary dwelling-houses at $9 d$. in the $f$. The two rates afterwards became six, but the categories remained the same, viz., houses used for dwellings and trade, $2 d ., 4 d$., and $6 d$. , according to value ; and houses used for dwellings only, $3 d ., 6 d$. , and $9 d$. , according to value.

## Scope of Term "Inhabited House."

There is no doubt that "inhabited" had a wider meaning under the original Acts than has subsequently been attributed to it; it referred to occupation, and not necessarily to " dwelling, residing and spending the night as well as the day." But subsequent Acts narrowed the extent of that considerably. ${ }^{1}$ A building occupied by a working men's club had, since its erection, never been furnished as a dwellinghouse, or slept in at night. The ground floor was used as a club, the upper floor being let as an auctioneer's office. It was held not to be assessable.? But the occupation of club premises by a caretaker would make the whole premises liable, as they do not come within the statutory exemption. ${ }^{3}$ The premises of the Glasgow Philosophical Society and also of the Glasgow Museum were similarly made liable by internal communication with residences of caretakers and curators. Generally speaking, a tenement, structurally self-contained and without internal communication, is treated as a separate house, but the whole subject, involving definition of structural separation and internal communication, in its legal aspects is a very intricate and difficult one. ${ }^{4}$ It is sufficient for statistical purposes to remember that statistics of private dwelling-housee are rider than erdinary

[^51]
## appearancos would indicato, and statistics of residential shops are narrowor.

Houses used wholly for trade are exempted if no person dwells therein. Generally, sleeping accommodation, even though only used occasionally, will render premises liable. But it must not be imagined that " sleeping at night" is a final test of dwelling, for it is only houses used for trade, etc., that are exempted upon the test. Other premises in which there is dwelling, in a broad sense (e.g., clubs), are liable.
If the tenant of a building used partly as a house and partly as a shop (or warehouse) sublots the shop to a person in trade, but retains the other apartments for his own use as a dwelling-house, he is chargeable at the higher rate (x) for the entire premises if there be internal communication between the shop and apartments, and (2) for the apartments only if the shop is entirely cut off from them. ${ }^{1}$
In arriving at the annual value of premises, coach-houses, atables and other offices, together with gardons and pleasure grounds not exceeding one acre, are valued together with the dwelling-house. The acre so included is not chargeable to income tax, Sch. B. Lodges are included in the assessment on the mansion to which they belong, even though they are situated outside the acre above mentioned.

Tradora' Promises adjoining Dwollinga.-There are certain exceptions to this rule in cases where the dwelling-house of a trader has attached to it buildings or gardens, etc., used by him in the course of his business; such buildings, etc., are not included in the value. For instance, barns are not to be included in the value of a farmhouse, nor a livery stable keeper's stables in the value of his own dwelling-house. Market gardens, nurseries and greenhouses attached to the residences of their proprietors are not brought into charge, nor are cowsheds, etc., held with a dairyman's premises." '
Tonemonts, Flate or Lodjings.-In the case of houses let in different storeys, tenements or lodgings, and inhabited by two or more persons or families, the same are to be

[^52]chargeable to the duty as if they were inhabited by one family only, but the landlord is deemed the occupier. ${ }^{1}$

Blocks of artisans' or labourers' dwellings, however, have now been exempted from the duty when it is found on inspection that the occupiers really belong to the industrial class, and that each tenement or set of rooms is self-contained and structurally severed from the rest, and is under the value of $£ 20$. In certain cases, a house specially constructed for the provision of separate dwellings may be the subject of a separate assessment in respect of each dwelling of an annual value not exceeding $\mathbf{f}^{60} .^{2}$ Where any dwelling-house is divided into distinct tenements belonging to different owners, each tenement, if it amounts to $£ 20$ in value, is liable to duty as a distinct house. Where any such tenement is used solely for trade purposes, the assessment in respect of that particular tenement may be discharged. In the case of any house being one property, but divided into and let in different tenements partly for trade and partly for residential purposes, the assessment on the house is confined to the portion residentially occupied. The characteristic flats of Scotland are separately assessed, although structurally they appear to form only parts of houses.

## Specific Exemptions:-

(I) Houses belonging to members of the Royal Family.
(2) Public offices.
(3) Hospitals, charity schools, and houses for the relief of poor persons.
(4) Convalescent homes, lunatic asylums, infirmaries, dispensaries, training institutions, when they are of a strictly charitable character. ${ }^{3}$
(5) Houses wholly occupied for trade.
(6) Houses used for trade and occupied only by a caretaker.
(7) Houses and structurally separate tenements under $\mathrm{f}_{\mathbf{2}} \mathrm{in}$ in amual value.

[^53]
## Comparison with Sch. A (Messuages) and Difference in Scope.

At one time House Duty was re-assessed annually, but it is now assessed at the same time, and almost invariably in the same amount, as the Sch. A income tax. What has been said relative to the effects of the periodical re-assessment under Sch. A applies equally to the House Duty, so far as a consideration of the aggregate amount is concerned. ${ }^{1}$ The peculiar effect upon the details of the classification will be considered below.
The House Duty assessments include " farmhouses " 2 over $£^{20}$ annual value which are excluded from Sch. A (messuages) and included in Sch. A (lands). They also comprise certain railway refreshment premises which are not charged to Sch. A at all, being part of the railway premises included in the Sch. D assessment. But generally the premises excluded from House Duty are dealt with under income tax, Sch. A, even though no duty is paid, as in classes (I) to (4) of the specific exemptions above.

The House Duty statistics therefore provide a subclassification of a part of the field covered by Sch. A messuages and add thereto those farmhouses and refreshment premises which are not included in Sch. A messuages. The assessments are on gross values, and no allowance for repairs is made, so that a house may be assessed to Sch. A £25 net, and to House Duty $£ 30$. But as only gross values are classified in the statistics, no confusion arises.

[^54][^55]
## OFFICIAL TABLES-SEPARATE CATEGORIES.

Private Dwelling-houses.
While this class is doubtless, for the most part, well described by its title, it actually includes a very considerable number of premises which are not ordinarily called private dwelling-houses; for all inhabited premises which do not clearly fall within the legal definitions of the classes entitled to assessment at the lower rates fall here, and this class is the " sweeping clause" of the tax. For example :-
( $x$ A "farmhouse" which is occupied by the owner, or by some person whose living is not confined to farming the land around, despite its outward claim to the title, is not included with " farmhouses," but in this class.
(2) Premises which in a popular sense look like a " shop" may come within this class if nothing is exposed for sale on the ground floor or basement, and in the front. So also may similar premises where the person occupying the shop is not also the person " occupying" the house, and there are numerous cases where the shop premises are divided off from the upper portion, and the latter is assessed at the higher rate as a private house.
(3) Some private houses used partly for letting lodgings, etc., are not included in lodging-houses because the necessary claim is not made with a declaration of the facts. ${ }^{1}$

Then professional premises of all kinds, doctors', solicitors', etc., are classed as private dwelling-houses for their whole value, to include the part occupied for professional purposes. Particularly to be noted are schools, which account for not a few of the large assessments. So, too, large premises which do not come clearly within the exemptions for hospitals, etc. [see exemptions (3) and (4)] rank as private dwelling-houses.

## Residential Shops,

Definition-This is an official, though not a legal, title. It conveys fairly well what is intended. The Act prescribes: "A dwelling-house (a) occupied by any person in trade who (b) exposes to sale and sells any goods, wares,

## INCOME TAX AND INHABITED HOUSE DUTY. II3

or merchandise in any shop or warehouse, (c) being part of the same dwelling-house, and in the front and on the ground or basement storey thereof."

The three conditions of occupation, sale, and position must all be met, otherwise the higher rate is chargeable and the house comes under the " private dwellings" class (q.v.).

Analysis.-Some writers have fallen into the error of forgetting that these are only the shop premises of $£ 20$ in value and upwards, and therefore that there are many shops classed under " Houses " exempt from House Duty.

Vide p. II8 for examples.
> " Dwellings over shops, such as are occupied by minor tradesmen, are not treated as dwellings, but are numbered amongst business premises. The actual number of dwellings, therefore, and specially dwellings of small rental value, will axceed the numbers given in the official returns."-W. H. Mallock, Ninoteenth Contury, 1910, p. 477. This is not the case.

## For " lock-up " shops, see p. 123.

There are therefore many premises which are shops in the ordinary sense of the word not included in these tables.

It will be noticed, on inspection of the tables, that the numbers and values are practically stationary during the past ten years, or exhibit, perhaps, a declining tendency. This is due of course to the constant increase of " lock-up" premises, and the habit of "living away from the shop," which takes away from this class and increases the "Premises not used as dwellings " class, that in the same period has grown enormously. It is not uncommon in the case of the large multiple-shop companies for the premises above, if used residentially, to be structurally divided from the shop and let off for a comparatively small rent, so that really imposing shop premises may not figure in the House Duty assessments at all.

The effect of re-assessment on these assessments should be noticed. By inspection for 1898-9, 1903-4, and 1910-11, it will be seen that a very considerable but transient increase takes place so far as England is concerned. There is a considerable number temporarily "borrowed" from the " lock-up "closs, i.e., re-assessed, and on due claim and
inspection allowed as " lock-ups" by " schedule " and taken out of assessment in the subsequent years. The other characteristic features of the re-assessment years are of course exhibited also. ${ }^{1}$

There is nothing to support the assumption made by Mr. Mallock that the number of "employing owners " may be gauged from the number of shops ("Nation as a Business Firm," p. 117).

## Hotels, Public-houses, Coffee-houses, etc.

Definition-A dwelling-house occupied by any person duly licensed to sell therein by retail beer, ale, wine or other liquors, although the room or rooms thereof in which any such liquors shall be exposed to sale, sold, drunk or consumed are not such shop or warehouse as referred to under (b) (p. 112). Or a dwelling-house occupied by any person who carries on therein the business of an hotel-keeper or an innkeeper or coffee-house keeper although not licensed to sell therein by retail beer, ale, wine, or other liquors. ${ }^{2}$

The Act of 1851 gave a narrower definition: " occupied by any person who shall be duly licensed by the laws in force to sell therein by retail beer, ale, wine, or other liquors, although the room or rooms thereof," etc.; and the Act of 1871 (34 \& 35 Vict. c. 103), s. 3x, brought in the hotelkeeper and coffee-house keeper.

Analysis_No distinction is made in the statistics between the various classes included in the heading. Premises under $£ 20$ in value, although licensed, appear under "Honses under $£ 20$," and there are of course many small beerhouses under this value. Recent statistics exhibit very clearly the falling off due to extinction of licences under the Licensing Act, 1904, but in the last two or three years, since 1908-9, the decline is not wholly due to this cause. Values, for House Duty purposes, have followed a decline in tied rentals and have also been affected by the increased licence duties. Although there were $\mathbf{1 , 3 5 2}$ fewer in 1910-II than in 1909-10, all the classes above $\mathrm{f}_{4} \mathrm{I}$ felt the effect of the re-assessment, and showed increased numbers, the decreases
${ }^{2}$ Vie p. 31.
*5th Report
being 2,878 in the $£ 20$ to $£ 4 x$ class, but for $\mathbf{x 9 1 1 - 1 2}$ the reductions in values put back all the classes below igIo (and all the higher ones below 1909-10 figures) except the " $£ 20$ and under $£ 4 \mathrm{I}$ " class, which received from the classes above and showed an increase. The total decrease of 600 in 19r1-12 is in part real and in part apparent, some going into the "under $£ 20$ " and exempt class. It should not be forgotten that the majority of the premises in this class are assessed on amounts in excess of the " tied " rents paid, which are no criterion of the annual value. ${ }^{2}$

The word "hotel" is not free from ambiguity, and, speaking generally, the private hotel, which is only a superior boarding or apartment house (unlicensed), may not be included in this class. The status of the proprietor is sometimes a factor. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

Farmhouses.
Defnition.-A dwelling-house being a farmhouse occupied by a tenant or farm servant and bond fide used for the purpose of husbandry only.
Analysis.-Here again appearances are deceptive. If the house is occupied by its owner it is liable as a private house, while if the occupier carries on some other business it may also fail to secure the lower rate." According, then, to the character of the occupier rather than the position or external appearance of the house will the classification be settled.

If a house comes within this class for House Duty it falls under "Lands." and not under " Messuages," for Sch. A. and is included in the Sch. B value also, while one-ighth. and not one-sixth, is the proper "repairs" allowance. In the assessment are included such offices as usually belong to a dwelling, and farm buildings are exchuded. It may be
a With regard to the methods of assessment, side "Taxation of the Liquor Trade," Rowntree and Sherwell (second edition), p. 127.

- But a hydropathic establishment in which some visitors were patients recaiving treatment under the edvice of a resident physician, and in which all visitors were smbject to the rales of the house, was admittod to this chas (Sirethemre Hybropethic Establishimem Compering. I T.C. 375).
a In a case in which the statotory" occupier * was not the persom ficensed, the house was mot chargeable as an hotel (McDenged 7. Camphen. (I899) 37 Sc.L. R. 8812 - Vide 56th kepert. P. Ba
remarked that there is no precise criterion for assessment the rent of a farm rarely distinguishing the separate value of the house, and the local rating valuation lists seldom separate it, but include it with the farm buildings, and often with farm cottages. Speaking generally, therefore, assessment is rather lenient. The " value to let by the year" in a remote and not easily accessible situation may be very different from the apparent accommodation value. Nearly 98 per cent. of the whole number of farmhouses assessed to House Duty are under $£ 40$ annual value.

Lodging-houses.
Definition.-A dwelling-house occupied by a person for the main purpose of letting furnished lodgings therein as a means of livelihood.

Analysis-The statute imposes the obligation upon the occupier to claim the relief and to maintain the claim annually. For many of the smaller houses devoted to letting purposes the difference in duty is so small that there is no doubt many occupiers do not trouble to claim, or do not know of their rights, and therefore the statistics do not show the true number of lodging-houses. Those not classed as such are included in private houses. The class dates from 1890-1 only, prior to which all of these houses belonged to the private house class.

In a statement of the numbers of various classes of earners other than manual labourers and productive or manufacturing employers, Mr. Mallock incłudes lodging-house keepers, 207,000, with a note "These figures are no more than estimates, except in the case of lodging-house keepers, the number of which is taken from the Report of the Commissioners of Inland Revenue, and obviously relates to a portion of this groap only" ("The Nation as a Business Firm," p. 110).

The number of lodging-houses (50th Report, p. 185) over $£ 20$ in Great Britain was 25,934, and it does not appear from whence the figure of 207,000 is taken. Apparently, with an addition for Ireland, it was intended for 27,000, but on the other hand Mr. Mallock's aggregate for the group accounts for the larger number. On p. II3, however, the number is given as $27,000,50$ that this aggregation is wrong; on p. 112 the average income of the lodging-honse keepers is put at Ei80. Mr. Mallock's figure
for "shopkeepers living over their own shops" is 3r0,000, and the residential shops in Great Britain assessed to House Duty were 307,000; his hotel keepers and public-house keepers number 90,000 , and the House Duty figures (to include coffeehouses, etc.) were 95,714.
"Separate Dwellings" (54 \& 55 Vict. c. 25, s. 4, and 3 Edw. 7, c. 46, s. II) (or "Artisans' Dwellings" in Reports prior to the 48 th).
Dofinition.-" Where a house, so far as it is used as a dwelling-house, is used for the sole purpose of providing separate dwellings," any dwelling which is under $£ 20$ in annual value is excluded from the assessment upon the whole, while dwellings worth from $£ 20$ to $£ 40$ per annum are chargeable at $3 d$. in the $£$, those from $£ 4 \mathrm{I}$ to $£ 60$ at $6 d$. in the $£$. This renders unnecessary the charge in cumulo of the whole value at $9 d$. , such as might be otherwise necessary if structural separation of the dwellings was not complete.
Analyain.-It will be observed that there are more of these cases in Scotland. The flat system had already been fully recognised by separate assessment of the dwellings as " houses," although technically this might not have strictly accorded with the House Duty law.

The only condition laid down is that as regards the dwellings up to $£ 40$ a certificate must be produced from the medical officer of health for the district that the house is " so constructed as to afford suitable accommodation for each of the families or persons inhabiting it, and that due provision is made for their sanitary requirements."

Premises Exempt from Inhabited House Duty.
(x) Separate Difellings (54 \& 55 Vict. c. 25, s. 4, and 3 Edw. 7, c. 46, s. IX).-An explanation of this class is given above. These represent the dwellings under $£ 20$ in value which form part of large tenement premises.
(2) Houses of Annual Value: (a) Under £io; (e AND UNDER $£ 15$ : (c) $£ 15$ AND UNDER $£ 20.2$-These include

[^56]not only the private dwelling-houses ojusdem generis with those over $\mathrm{f}^{20}$ so classified, but also residential shops under $£ 20$, hotels, beerhouses, etc., under $£ 20$, lodging-houses under $£ 20$, but not farmhouses (under $£ 20$ ) let to tenants, for these are included in " lands" under Sch. A, their number and value not being ascertainable separately, in these statistics. Farmhouses (in the ordinary sense) occupied by their owners are, however, included in this class, as they are not farmhouses in the technical sense. The proportion of this class which is not strictly private dwelling-houses is not known. ${ }^{1}$

Vide quotation from Sir Thomas Whittaker, p. 131.
Zorn (" Incidence of the Income Tax ") ignores these houses (assessed with land;) altogether.
" The highest total of values is reached . . . by the exempted dwelling-houses, of value $£ 10$ to $£ 15$; their total is $£ 2 x, 300,000$. Shops are not included."-J. Bonar, "The Inhabited House Duty,' Economic Revias, 1907.
W. H. Mallock gives the total number of dwelling-houses in Great Britain in 1898 as $6,300,000$ and in 1908 as $7.500,000$ instead of $6,808,000$ and $8,089,000$, because he adds together the dwellings exempt from House Duty (which include small shops with dwellings above) to private dwelling-houses, omitting shops, etc., charged to House Duty. The latter have all residential accommo-
${ }^{1}$ In 1852 the number of houses $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathbf{1 0}$ to $\mathrm{E}_{20}$ and values were:-

|  | Number. | Value: <br> Shops, etc. | Value: Dwellinghouses. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| England and Wales Scothand | $\begin{array}{r} 359,740 \\ 36,930 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} t \\ 1,749,400 \\ 127,400 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{3.337,400}{643,000}$ |
| Great Britain | 396,670 | 1,876,800 | 3,680,400 |
|  |  |  | ,200 |

Average value $=\mathbf{\$ 1 4}$
It appears, therefore, that "shop" premises formed one-third of the whole number, bat this proportion has probably dimimished greatly since that date. (These figures have been computed from H. C. 244-1852.)
dation, or they would not pay the duty ("Phantom Millions," Ninetsenth Century, 1909, p. 761).

The fact that practically all farmhouses are assessed to income tax as land, and are not separately distinguished in the statistics (except so far as they are also assessable to Inhabited House Duty), considerably detracts from the value of these figures as a total of all the buildings and dwellings throughout the country. An attempt may be made to estimate the number of houses let with farm lands and under $£ 20$ in value.
(I) The total number of houses in the Census Reports may be compared with this assessment total and the balance assigned to such properties. This is a rather risky method, because the balance is small in relation to the aggregates, and differences of classification and definition would be important in relation to that balance. ${ }^{1}$ But it indicates rather more than 205,000 for England and Wales. A proportionate addition for Scotland would give 230,000 for Great Britain.
(2) Up to 1910 the House Duty classes were more finely graded (f20 to £25, etc.). From these figures the distribution tendency may be ascertained ${ }^{2}$ and the result continued logarithmically downwards, giving 54,500 in the class $£ 15$ to $£ 20$. It would be dangerous to carry the index unchanged any lower, but if the same proportion for the classes $£ 15$ to $£ 20$, $£ 10$ to $£ 15$, and under $£ 10$ exists as for other houses (not let with farms), the total number would then be 348,000.
(3) Taking the return of agricultural holdings for Great Britain, we get a distribution as follows :-

Thoosands.


At the top of the scale are a good many holdings worked

[^57]with houses not assessed as farmhouses over $£ 20$, but for various reasons as private houses. ${ }^{1}$ Both classes over $£ 20$ account for about 36,000 . A part of the smallest class of holding would fall wholly (both land and house) into the House Duty assessments, but the greater part would be small farm holdings worked by tenants of cottages rented independently. We are left with a maximum of 377,000 holdings for which farmhouses may be assigned, and in many of these cases (holdings by graziers, butchers, cattle dealers, etc.) no houses are necessary. The indication is that there are a little over 300,000 farmhouses under $£ 20$ assessed with lands and omitted from the statistics of houses. ${ }^{2}$ The census of occupations effectively prevents a much higher estimate.

Hospitals, Schools, Royal and Diplomatic Residences, etc.
(1) Houses belonging to His Majesty or any of the Royal ${ }^{\circ}$ Family and Houses oceupied by Foreign Ambassedors.The exempting statute reads: "Any house belonging to His Majesty, or any of the Royal Family, and every publif office for which the duties have been paid by His Majesty, or out of the public revenue" (House Tax Act, 1808). Figures were given separately prior to 1900 . The 1899 statistics were :-


This class does not include properties which belong to the Crown and are actually in the occupation of the CrownGovernment offices and official residences of Royalty. B\&t it includes all non-official Royal residences which, though exempt from House Duty, may be liable to income tax.
(2) Hospitals. - The House Duty exempting statute reads:-"Any hospital, charity school, or house provided for the reception or relief of poor persons" (House Tax Act, 1808). The income tax exemption is:-" On any hospital.

## 1 Vide p. 115.

2 In 1896 G. H. Blmoden estimated the salue omitted at $\{3,500,000$, which at an average of $f 10$ would give 350,000 (S. J., 1896).
public school, or almshouse, in respect of the public buildings, offices and premises belonging to such hospital, public school. or almshouse and not occupied by any individual officer or master thereof " liable to income tax, " or by any person paying rent for the same."

For all practical purposes these exemptions may be regarded as covering the same ground, but the statistics for income tax deductions under this head are wider in scope, because they cover also the exempted rents of ordinary properties, where such rents are applied to charitable purposes. Thus, the gross value of premises used for hospitals, etc., is $£ 4,800,000$, but the net value of property both used for, and applied to, charitable purposes is $£ 8,400,000 .^{1}$

Separate figures for the different descriptions of premises are not available. They have always been classed together, and since 1900 the class preceding (houses occupied by Royalty, etc.) has also been included.

The class includes-
' ( 1 Lunatic asylums, generally, provided they are not wholly supported by the receipts of patients and that there is a substantial element of endowment. ${ }^{2}$. A separate house provided for the medical superintendent, if within the hospital grounds, is exempt. ${ }^{\text {a }}$
(2) Sohools, charity, as distinct from public schools. - The Charterhouse, which was originally a " hospital for the poor and a free school," is now, for the larger part, carried on without the aid of the charitable foundation, and exemption from House Duty is not granted. ${ }^{4}$ But the masters are occupiers of their respective houses and are assessable to House Duty for them. ${ }^{5}$ The school buildings do not, taken by themselves, form an inhabited house. (All the school buildings belonging to and occupied with a house in an ordinary school are assessable therewith.' Westminster School, with $\{3,325$ annual endowment out of $\{16,000$ total

[^58]
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income, was held not to be exempt as a charity school..$^{*}$ Bradford Grammar School and Holloway College failed, similarly in their claim. For income tax exemption as a public school the City of London School succeeded, but the Edinburgh Free Church College failed.

Generally speaking, the statistical significance of this class is in what is excluded rather than what is included, for the public schools help to swell the number of " dwelling-houses " of large annual value.
(3) Workhouses and Almshouses.-"Poor persons" is a relative term, so that "The Mary Clark Home" (in which the ladies in reduced circumstances all have from $£ 25$ to $£ 55$ a year independent means) obtained exemption. ${ }^{2}$

## Premises not used as Dwellings-i.e., Houses, etc., used solely for Trade, etc.

This class was formerly given under three heads, and it comprises three distinct sub-classes (vide 44th Report, p. 90).
(1): Messuages and Tenements not used as Dwellings_In 1899 this group numbered 520,058 out of a total for the whole class of 544,428 , and the value was $£ 33,083,199$ out of £ $37,398,951$. No separate figures have since been given annually. It comprises industrial premises of all descriptions, on which residence is primá facie unlikely or impossible. The following is an approximate classification of all classes (1912) :-
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(2) Parts - d Houses usod sololy for Trade, ate., Purposes (41 \& 42 Viạt. 0. 15, l. 13 (1) ) (I899 figures):-


The statutory exemption is: "Where any house, being one property, shall be divided into, and let in, different tenements, and any of such tenements are occupied solely for the purposes of any trade or business, or of any profession. or calling by which the occupier seeks a livelihood or profit . . ." relief shall be given " so as to confine the same to the duty on the value according to which the house should have been assessed, if it had been a house comprising only the tenements other than such as are occupied as aforesaid." It is the value of the tenements, etc., excluded from the House Duty charge under this section which is included in this statistical class.

The case law interpreting the words "divided into and let in different tenements " is very complex and extensive, and it is quite unnecessary for statistical purposes to attempt closer definition.
(3) Housce used solely for Trade, eten, Purposen ( 41 \& 48 Viet. e. 15, e. 18 (8) ) (I899 figures) :-


The statutory exemption reads: "Every house or tenement which is occupied solely for the purposes of any trade or business, or of any profession or calling by which the occupier seeks a livelihood or profit, shall be exempted from the duties, . . . and this exemption shall take effect
although a servant or other person may dwell in such house or tenement for the protection thereof." Shortly after it became necessary to define " servant"" to mean and include only a menial or domestic servant employed by the occupier, and the expression 'other person' shall be deemed to mean any person of a similar grade or description not otherwise employed by the occupier, who shall be engaged by him to dwell in the house or tenement solely for the protection thereof." ${ }^{1}$ The following points from decided cases will indicate the operation of this exemption :-

[^59]| 144 \& 45 Vict.c. 12, 3. $24-$ | ${ }^{2} 2$ T. C. 594 |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 IT C. 211. | 3 T. C. 376. |
| ${ }^{3} 4$ T. C. 369. | - IT.C. 260. |
| ${ }^{1}$ IT. C. 227. | ${ }^{10} 47$ L. T. 252. |
| - 1 T.C. 342. | 122 T. C. 86. |
| - 2 T. C. 533. |  |

Premises comprising eighteen rooms and concert-hall. Caretaker and wife occupied five rooms, the others being let for meetings, etc. He had other employment as librarian to a library occupying two rooms. ${ }^{2}$

Premises occupied by life assurance company ; two messengers also employed as caretakers. ${ }^{2}$

Other cases decided that a salesman, an attendant, and a bank manager respectively could not come within the description " caretaker." But generally it may be said that if there are no adult children in independent employment resident with the caretaker a fairly liberal interpretation is given in practice.

Writers upon problems of distribution of income who have been concerned with occupied houses have always ignored the class "Premises not used as Dwellings," but it is clear that the sub-class (3) is not a wholly negligible factor, and that an estimate of the number of families resident in such premises in the "caretaker" capacity should be made.

## Houses in the Census compared with Houses nn the Tax Statistics.

The rgri census gives an elaborate classification of buildings which should be theoretically reconcilable with the assessments. But the difficulties of definition were considerable, and differences in interpretation by the many investigators must have been very numerous. The assessment classification and definition are, on the other hand, brought to the critical test of taxation, and have been rendered more uniform by many years of administrative practice and a special code of law.

The first difficulty is that of time. The census is taken for a particular day, and the assessments represent, at the nearest, the conditions of a whole year. But roughly it 'may be said that the year rgio-II must be taken to correspond.

${ }^{2} 3$ T. L. R. 191.<br>${ }^{1} 3$ T. G. 268.

The census for England and Wales gives (in thousands) :-
( 1 Buildings used as dwellings :

| Inhabited . | $\cdot$ | $\cdot$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Uninhabited | $7,14 \mathrm{I} \cdot 8$ |  |
| $408 \cdot 7$ |  |  |
| 7.550 .5 |  |  |



Now it is prima facie probable that the enumeration of " buildings " not inhabited, made for a census not primarily directed thereto, and with inadequate time and powers for the purpose, would be short of the true number, as compared with a long-established assessment based on parish rating and local knowledge. The report shows that considerable difficulties were encountered, and it appears to be beyond doubt that the enumeration is quite incomplete. The test of the division is very similar to that adopted for the tax classification, viz., the existence of sleeping accommodation, but cases of caretakers on business premises come within ( $x$ ) of the census and within ( 2 ) of the assessments. This only makes the disparity between the 355,000 and 525,700 the greater. It is probable, moreover, that premises counted as one dwelling for the census have been divided into dwelling and " lock-ap" shop to a much greater extent in the assessments, and this would account partly for the difference. In the opposite direction is the omission from the assessments of all buildings forming part of gasworks, waterworks, railways, etc. ${ }^{1}$ which should presumably be in the census. On the whole the conclusion appears irresistible that a great number of rated premises were omitted from the census enumeration of "buildings not used as

[^60]
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dwellings," the number shown being about two-thirds of the true number. Proceeding to compare only the " inhabited houses," we may first deduct, say, 10,000 "caretaker" cases from the census figures. The "flats" class presents great difficulties, and the census report shows that there was much lack of uniformity in the methods adopted: it is highly improbable that the method of counting and the definition were quite in accordance with the purely technical tax distinctions, and no kind of exact comparison is possible, so that perhaps the least error will be introduced into the aggregate comparisons if what both methods describe as " flats " or " separate dwellings " are eliminated. The comparison then stands (in thousands) :-

| Conavat <br>  <br> 10 |  | Properting aspesed to Boass Dety. <br> (t) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ordinary dwelling-houses Offices, warehouses, work shops, factories and other premises | 6,869.5 |  |  |  |
|  | $750$ |  |  |  |
|  | 6,940.5 | 1,439-6 | $5.500 \cdot 9$ | 5,349 1 |
| Hotels, inns, and publichouses Shops . | 88-2 <br> 4447 | $\begin{array}{r} 88-5 \\ 308-7 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} -.34 \\ 13600 \end{gathered}$ | $\{135-7 t$ |
| Total | 7,473-4 | 1,836-8 | 5,636.6 | 5.484 .8 |
|  |  |  | Differ accoun | ence unnted for, $51-8$ |

[^61]The point now for consideration is whether the difference 151-8 would be increased if "flats" were dealt with on
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identical lines. In view of the fact that we have taken from the census figures what is equivalent to $253 \cdot 4$ separate flats, and from the tax figures what is equivalent to only 94.7 separate dwellings, the difference 158.7 represents separate flats which are not so classified for House Duty, and which probably appear as at least (one-third) 53,000 houses therein. These increase the unassigned balance to $204 \cdot 8+$. The difference is of course mainly due to the fact that all farmhouses under $£ 20$ are assessed as land for tax purposes, and this is perhaps one measure of the number so assessed. ${ }^{1}$

## Ireland.

The fact that the House Duty does not extend to Ireland has always been a pitfall for statisticians, and in making comparisons with figures which relate to the United Kingdom it is often forgotten. When remembered, a rough estimate is usually made, for no information is available as to the number and value of houses above $£ 20$ at the present time. But in 1864 there were 33,763 houses rated over $£ 20$ by the unions in Ireland ${ }^{2}$ : these valuations were of course very low, and it may be said that, compared with England, this was the number above $£ 25$ in value.
In discussions upon the distribution of incomes, the following estimates have been made :-
Zorn: 100,000, all values over $\mathrm{f}_{20}$ ("Incidence of the Income Tax ').

Morgan Browne: 100,000, all values over $£ 20$ (Naw Liberal Review, April, 1902).

Mallock: 100,000, all values over $£ 20$; 350,000 , under £10; 150,000, $£ 10$ to $£ 15$; $150,000, £^{15}$ to $£ 30$; 40,000, $£^{6} 30$ to $£ 50$; 13,000, $£ 50$ to $£ 60$ (Nineteenth Century, March, 1910). 830,000, under $£ 20$; 15,000 , $£ 20$ to $£ 60$; 15,000 over $£ 60$ ("The Nation as a Business Firm," p. 71).
Money: 9,000, over $£ 50$ (S. C. on Income Tax, 1906).

[^62]
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## Comparisons between Different Years.

(x) Shifting between Values.

Upon the question of the aggregate valuation the remarks that have been made about Sch. A (messuages) as to the effect of re-assessment fairly apply. ${ }^{1}$ But the question of the total numbers and values of houses liable to House Duty is affected in a second way, owing to the $£ 20$ exemption limit, quite distinct from the effect on all houses from highest to lowest values. For in the ordinary years many axisting houses are dropping below $£^{20}$ and disappearing from the statistics of liable houses, and none are coming up from below, but in the revaluation year all the arrears of increasing rents are brought in, and many cases that were standing under $£ 20$ come above $£ 20$. The classes.tend to press upwards throughout in the re-assessment, and, although masked to some extent by the actual new houses, there is a downward drop in the ensuing years that is very clearly visible in the tables. In a reciprocal manner the houses under $£ 20$ tend to be fewer in the re-assessment year and more numerous in subsequent years.
" In 1897 144,000 new dwellings were built . . . in 1898 the number had sunk to 114,000 . . . in 1889 (probably 1899 is meant) it was 147,000, or 17,000 above the average"-MaLLOCx. " Phantom Millions," Nimetoanth Contwry, 1909, p. 761).

It is not possible to see how these figures have been obtained, but they clearly ignore the effect of the quinquennial assessment in 1898. Mr. Mallock uses the houses over f20 as a divisor (the gross income reviewed being the dividend) to obtain an "average assessed income" for use as an annual index number with which to compare wages. It is clearly unsuited for the purpose. The quotient drops from 695 in 1902 to 660 in 1903, because of the effect of the re-assessment on the divisor ("Statistical Monograph, ${ }^{\text {. }}$ p. 26).

The care which is necessary in drawing inferences from the separate classes of these tables is well illustrated by the series of questions by Mr. Royds, M.P., in the House of Commons in 1912 and 19r3, and the ministerial replies. Mr. Royds designed to

[^63]show that the official tables indicated a great slackening in the building of cottages and small houses in 1910 and 1911, and that the whole housing question had also been prejudiced by the Budget taxation of 1909. The small increase in houses under $\mathrm{f}_{20}$ in 1910-11 compared with other years was pointed out and explained to be very largely due to the fact that 1910-xI was a year of new valuation-the first since 1903-4. "Somewhat similas falls have invariably followed the periodical revision of the assessments." The diminished value in 1910-nI (notwithstanding the larger number) was then referred to; and the reply stated that the average had fallen from $£ 9$ Igs. $4 \frac{3}{3} d$. to $£ 9$ 18s. $2 \frac{\pi}{6} d$. "This small decrease of 15 . $2 d$. per hereditament might be due to 2 slight corresponding diminution in the average rent paid by the working-class occupiers of this class of property; but as 1910-1I was a year of new assessment it is probably attributable to other causes, and especially to small differences in estimating yearly rental values from the weekly rents at which a large proportion of this class of property is let." Mr. Royds then got to the root of the matter by taking the total number of all classes together and calling for information as to $1893-4$ re-assessment, when it appeared that the " under $£ 20$ class" showed a decrease of 6,536 and the " over $f 20$ " class an increase of 45,540. He summarised the matter in a motion for adjournment on 14th February, 1913, ${ }^{1}$ in which he dealt with building generally ; and Mr. Masterman in his reply showed that revaluation had the effect of checking the automatic increase in the "under $£ 20$ " class, but did not refute Mr. Royds on the subject of all houses taken together. How easily the matter can be misunderstood is shown by the following comment:-
" He made great play with the 'year of re-assessment,' and declared once more that after every such period 'the number of houses under $£ 20$ valuation decreases automatically.' We confess that both of these statements puzzle us considerably. In the first place, what is a 'year of re-assessment'? If the expression has any meaning at all it is that the whole of the country is re-assessed simultaneously. That is certainly not the fact; every year is, more or less, a 'year of re-assessment.' Moreover, in many unions appeals against assessments are held at least once, and often twice, a year, so that valuations are in a constant state of fiux. Then, is it a fact that the number of houses under $£ 20$ valuation ' decreases automatically ' after every revaluation? In a healthy and normal period it would seem reasonable to suppose that the value of the new buildings would

[^64]at least make up for the reduced value of the old ones. That would hardly be so when the new houses were small in number; but when they reach, or exceed, the average, there certainly ought to be little, if any, fall in the number of buildings assessed up to a given figure, the more especially when the figure is as low as $£ 20^{\circ "}$ (Estates Gaselte, 22nd February, 1913).

Sir Thomas Whittaker quotes the private dwelling-houses table I890-I against 1910-II, and gives the percentage increase in each case.

| Private Dwellinghouses. | 1890-91. | 1910-11. | Increase. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Rental. <br> Under fio | No. 3,271,26 | No. 3,240,22I | Per cent. |
| f10-15 | $3,211,261$ $1,088.329$ | 3,240,221 $\mathbf{2 , 1 0 3 , 8 2 0}$ | 9 |
| 715-20 | $1,088,329$ 586.511 | $2,103,820$ 060,395 | 63.5 |
| 720-40 | 572.506 | 1,087,750 | 89.9 |
| 240-60 | 150,093 | 232,432 | 54.9 |
| 760-80 | 46.362 | 64,827 | $39 \cdot 8$ |
| 780 | 109,208 | 127,679 | $16 \cdot 9$ |
| Total . | 5,824,270 | 7,817,124 | $34^{2}$ |

" These figures indicate a great improvement in housing; . . . the most striking and interesting facts revealed by these figures are-(x) that thers was no increase, but really a small actual decrease, ... in the number of the smallest and poorest houses: and (2) that the smallest increase in actual numbers . . . was in the number of houses the annual value of which was more than $f 80$ a year. . . . The great increase was in houses of from fio to $f_{40}$ a year rental, exclusive of rates and taxes. Clearly the working people are better housad, are able to pay better rents. and now live in much larger numbers in $f 10$ to $£ 15$ houses, where they used to live in $f 6$ to $£ x 0$ houses " ("Ownership and Taxation of Land," pp. 8I-2).

Now the inferences italicised in this quotation are probably carrect, at any rate in part. But they do not mocassumily follow from the statistics. The figures are quite compatible with the following conditions: an increase of nearly two million houses, but all of the worst and smallest type, and a great and general increase in rents of all kinds of property-almost the reverse of the above conclusions !

The first three classes (up to $\mathrm{f}^{20}$ ) do not strictly follow the heading, for they are not ejusdem generis with the remainder. They are officially described as " houses," and include residential shops, beerhouses, etc., that would be charged at the lower rate if over $£ 20$ in value (vide $p$. 118).

Giffen, " Some General Uses of Statistical Knowledge " (S. J., Jubilee volume, 1889, p. 113) quotes :-

|  |  | $1833 .$ | $1880 .$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ", | £15 and under $£ 201$ |  | \{425,000 |
|  | fro and under $£(15)$ | 228,000 | \{755,000 |
| Houses un |  |  |  |

Giffen shows that the lowest class has increased only 40 per cent. against the general increase of 85 and 90 per cent. He deals with the argument that increase of house rent would give these figures and yet not be a sign of better accommodation. "The argument is self-contradictory. The wages of labour being ultimately the main element in the cost of producing houses, becomes a proof that the wages of the builders of houses have increased-probably greatly,. . ." because of labour-saving machinery. "That much higher rents are paid is a proof of the rise in the standard of living."

Giffen's contention surely goes beyond the evidence, for the rise could take place against a stationary wage, by mere pressure of population, and it might be a factor in depressing the standard of living, which can hardly be tested by the fact of a higher payment for the same thing !

In discussing the progress of the working classes (S. J., 1883) he used the 1834 and 1881 returns, and looked entirely at the Exo to $\mathbf{f z o}$ class, ignoring the class below except as a modification, and considered that the worling classes had obtained a better article. The same criticism applies, viz., that the under 620 houses may have gone above $£ 20$, the $f 10$ to $£ 20$ class received the lower class houses at higher rents, and all the new houses may have come in at the lowest class.

## (2) Shifting between Classes.

Ro-asensment Years-An additional feature of importance is that the "private dwelling-house" class is swollen not only actually from the "under $£ 20$ classes," but also from the various exempt classes, and the various lower rate

[^65]classes, to an extent partly real, partly fictitious. The actual title to exemption or lower rate comes up prominently for review, and it may be found to be invalid permanently, or, the onus of proof being upon the taxpayer, it may stand charged at the higher rate when the assessment books are made up, but may be subsequently reduced by schedule ${ }^{1}$ on satisfactory evidence. Thus, title to be ranked as a lodging-house, as a farmhouse, or as a shop, or to be exempt as a charity school, or as a " lock-up," may be called into question. The private dwelling-houses are therefore abnormally increased by the re-assessment, and lock-ups, shops, etc., will be found to show a relative falling off by the transfer.

Private Dwolling-houses prior to 1890. -When any comparisons before and after $\mathbf{1 8 9 0}$ are made, it must be remembered that this class formerly included the whole of the present lodging-house alass.

## Comparisons between Different Places.

The remarks made under Sch. A $^{2}$ about Scotland apply equally here. The values are relatively higher than in England owing to the inclusion of rates.

Mr. C. P. Sanger, writing on the incidence of rates, omits this point, but as he uses the assessment only as a ratio it is not very material ("Incidence of Taxation in United Kingdom," Yale Revicen, 1898).

## Empty Houses.

Under income tax, Sch. A, the net allowance for void pro perty is given, ${ }^{2}$ but the House Duty statistics do not show the amounts of duty " allowed by schedule," " so that we have no means of computing the number of houses void in any year. Mr. Masterman stated in the House of Commons that the percentage of void houses had increased of late years:-


Vide pe 53.
Vide p 60
Vide p 64.

- P. 53.
(Hansard. Vol. 47, col 1,491.

This information was probably obtained from rating sources. ${ }^{1}$

The actual duty irrecoverable from this and other causes was at one time given in the official reports, but it is difficult to compute the number of houses therefrom because of the varied rates of tax involved. The allowance for void property under Sch. A includes mills, factories, etc., and there is no good method of ascertaining therefrom the number of dwelling-houses affected.
The 28th Report ${ }^{2}$ shows the duty not recovered in respect of unoccupied houses and from other causes from 1870-1 to i882-3. From 10.8 per cent. for England and Wales in r870 it sank to 9 per cent. for some years, rising abruptly in $1878-9$ to nearly 12 per cent., and remaining over II per cent. till 1882-3. For Scotland, owing to the administrative methods adopted in making the assessments, it was always under I per cent.
The corresponding figures in recent years must be obtained by computing the duty for each class from the tables and subtracting the actual duty. For 1911-12 ${ }^{2}$ the percentage for private dwelling-houses was 944 , for residential shops 12.6, for public-houses $\mathbf{1 2}$, for farmhouses 3 , and for lodging-houses 16 , the percentage for the whole House Duty being just under 9 . This, it should be observed, has to cover reductions in values and losses from other causes than voids, and since the details under Sch. A show that rather more than 4 per cent. of the gross assessment on houses, messuages, etc., was allowed as voids, it is probable that the House Duty figure is not very different.

The census furnishes some relevant information. "The

[^66]following is quoted from Sir Thomas Whittaker's " Ownership and Taxation of Land ":-

Houses and Persons.

| Year. | Houses Uninhabited to Inhabited. | Persons per House. | Persons per Square Mile. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Por cent. |  |  |
| 18 II | 2.84 | $5 \cdot 65$ | 174 |
| 1831 | $4 \cdot 83$ | $5 \cdot 60$ | 238 |
| 1851 | $4 \cdot 68$ | $5 \cdot 47$ | 307 |
| 1871 | $6 \cdot 14$ | $5 \cdot 33$ | 390 |
| 1891 | 6.83 | $5 \cdot 32$ | 497 |
| IgOt | $7 \cdot 17$ | $5 \cdot 20$ | 558 |
| I9II | $5 \cdot 72$ | $5 \cdot 05$ | 618 |

Mr. Mallock remarked that the new houses provided have exceeded the requirements of the population because " in 1905 £7,000,000 had to be deducted from the assessed value of houses Sch. A" for void property. "The average value of premises being $£ 23$, it thus appears that there were over 300,000 premises unoccupied " ("Phantom Millions," Ninetsenth Contwry, 1g09, p. 76 I ).

But to the amount allowed as above should be added onefifth (because of the repairs allowance), making $\$ 8,400,000$ gross for comparison with House Duty statistics. Then of course some of the premises exompled from tax under Sch. A have also been void, and if these are taken in proportion and the result added, the final figure has at any rate the virtue of being a maximum one. In the absence of any reasons to the contrary it may then be subdivided in proportion to the various classes of premises, making up the whole class of Sch. A messuages in order to ascertain the number of premises void in each class.

## Uses of House Duty Statistics.

( $\mathbf{x}$ ) The chief use for the determination of the distribution of walth and the number of taxpayers is discussed at length in Chapter XIII.
(a) Value of Furniture in Great Britain_-Vide Chapter XI. on "National Capital."
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W. J. Harris used the classification of values to estimate the value of furniture, by assigning an average amount to each grade:-Houses-under $£ 10, £^{18} ; £_{10}$ to $£ 15, £^{40} ; £_{15}$ to $£ 20$, $\mathfrak{£ 6 0}$; $£ 20$ to $£ 25, £^{100} ; £^{25}$ to $£ 30, £ 130$; and so on, making a total of $£ 599,000,000$ (S. J., 1906, p. 726).
(3) The classification tables have been used to show the increase of moderate incomes (houses in classes from $£ 20$ to (50) compared with those above (Goschen, S. J., 1887).
(4) Wages and Profits.-W. H. Mallock uses an index number (obtained by dividing the " gross income reviewed" by the number of private houses charged to House Duty ${ }^{1}$ ) for comparison with an index number of wages. The validity of the method would perhaps be greater if the divisor were confined to houses having a relation to the tax liability, but it might still contain the average income tallacy. ${ }^{2}$
(5) Progress of Housing-Some of the quotations under heading "Shifting between Values" refer to this use.

Palgrave, S. J., 1869, uses Baxter's data from poor rate figures, etc.

The yearly increase in the number of dwelling-houses under £20, 1900-1 to 1912-13, is used to show the progress of housing, reference being made to the effect of revaluations (Report of the Land Inquiry Committee (Urban), p. 72).

This increase represents only the increase in houses ( $\mathbf{7 1 , 5 0 0}$ annually), and takes no account of those built to replace those demolished (estimated at 20,000 ) (ibid., p. 80).

Reference to 1901 statistics and comparison with 1833 -45 per cent. were houses "under $£ 10$," but in 1833 they were five or six times as numerous as those above (Institute of Surveyors, Transactions, 1904-5, H. T. Steward on "Housing'").
(6) Improved Standard of Living-Giffen, " Progress of Working Classes," S. J., 1883; "General Uses of Statistical Knowledge," S. J., 1885. Craigie: full discussion of House Duty Statistics, S. J., 1902.
(7) Income Tar Evasion-Houses over $\mathbf{6} 30$ compared with assessments over $£ 200$ to determine number evading

[^67]
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tax (H. C. 384 of 1872 and 397 of $\mathbf{x 8 7 3}$; Levi, " Reconstruction of Income Tax," S. J., 1874).
(8) Use of House Duty statistics to determine the numbers of shopkeopera liable and not liable to income tax respectively.
(a) Assumption that the residential portion of premises equals one-third of the value and is also one-tenth to one-eighth of the income at about $£ 150$, so that a $£ 50$ shop ( $£ 60$ in London) corresponds to an income of $£ 160$; (b) 80,000 cases above this limit, $\pm 30,000$, as taxpayers, and 230,000 below $£ 50$ (but above $£ 20$ ) ; (c) by deduction from census figures of occupation there would be 280,000 below $\{20$. (The number of "lock-up" shops for small retailers is not large, so that this figure is in conflict with the number gained by using the census enumeration of buildings ${ }^{2}$ ) (" The Amount and Distribution of Income (other than Wages) below the Exemption Limit ": British Association Committee's Report, S. J., rgro, p. 6r).
(9) Inquiries inte the Incidonce of Tazation-G. H. Blunden uses the I. H. D. figures to divide up property and to determine distribution (S. J., 1896). Also Col. G. W. Raikes, Institute of Surveyors, Transactions, 1896.

## Additional Information beyond that contained in the Reports.

(I) Parliementary Papors.
H. C. 125-1845. Houses charged to Window Duty.
H. C. 259-1845. Window Tax and Property Tax compared for certain roads in London, in classes, $\mathbf{1 8 4 3 - 4}$
H. C. $630-\mathrm{I} 849$. Graduation of Ratings in Lancaster. Suffolk, Hants, and Gloucester.
H. C. 54-1852. House Duty, Numbers in Counties, and Window Duty, showing loss sustained.
H. C. 33 x - $\mathbf{r 8 5 2}$. House Tax-City of London appeak.
H. C. $360-1852$. Various Divisions-Houses classified.
H. C. 547-1852. Houses charged at each rate, $\mathbf{1 8 5 1}$. Classified Ratings $\mathrm{f}_{5}$ to $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{fo}}$ and fro to fzo in London, ${ }^{1}$ Yide par se\%. .

Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham and Sheffield, with estimated yield of House Duty.
H. C. 106-r852-3. House Duty, Population, etc., by Electoral Divisions, England and Wales.
H. C. 244-1852-3. An important Return, in Counties, for Great Britain, showing ( I ) the number of houses charged to Window Duty, 1851, and amount charged ; (2) the number and amount charged to House Duty (this information being subsequently included in Official Reports-vide 13th Report); and (3) number of houses between $£$ ro and $£ 20$ in value (either assessed to Income Tax, or rated to the poor), and estimated yield for House Duty at 9 d. for shops, and at 1s. $\mathbf{6 d}$. for houses (vide footnote on p. 118).
H. C. 5-1859 (2). Scotland, in Counties: Houses classified $£ 2$ to $£$ ro.
H. C. 400-1860. England and Wales: Counties and Parliamentary Divisions: Poor Rate Assessments, ratings of f,10 and over, House Duty Assessments, Electors.
H. C. 572-1860. England and Wales by Counties: Numbers of houses in classes $£ 20$ to $£ 25, £ 25$ to $£ 30, £ 30$ and upwards. Cities and Boroughs: Messuages and tenements of $\{8$ and upwards.
H. C. 155-186r. Amounts and numbers in Chelsea, Kensington, Hammersmith, Fulham and Scotland.
H. C. 358-1862. Scotland : Dwelling-houses, 1857 to 1861. Annual values of $£ 3$ and $£ 4$; amount of ratings.
H. C. 410-1862 (reprinted as 1866, No. 131). Return of Population and Houses.
H. C. 428-1863. Return by Counties and Divisions, showing numbers of houses in classes $£ 20$ to $£\{30, \mathfrak{£} 30$ to $£ 50$ $£ 50$ to $£ 100, £ 100$ to $£ 150, £ 150$ to $£ 200$, etc.
H. C. 279-1866. England and Wales: Male Occupiers, various rentals classified-not exceeding $£ 10, £ 10-£ 11$, etc., up to $£ 20$.
H. C. 494-1866. Electoral Returns: Male Persons in each Borough, etc., in occupation of houses, fro to $\mathbf{f} \mathbf{2 0}$, $£^{20}$ to $£ \mathbf{~} 30$, etc.
H. C. 143-1867. Farmhouses, England and Wales (23,582: $\mathfrak{f 5 5 7 , 7 2 0}$ annual value).
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H. C. 341-I867. Certain Parliamentary Borough and County Statistics of House Duty.
H. C. 384-1867. Return by Counties and Divisions for 1865-6 similar to No. 428 of 1863.
H. C. II- $1867-8$. Dwelling-houses, not covered by a Composition Act, on which the owners pay poor rate by agreement with the assessing authorities, in Parliamentary Cities and Boroughs in England and Wales (98,598 cases).
H. C. 300-1871. House Duty in the Metropolis, by Wards ( $1870-1$ ).
H. C. 384-1872. Classification of Houses, by values (vide also S. C. on Town Holdings, p. 663).
H. C. 292-1882. County Return for Sch. A and House Duty charged.
H. C. 206-1883. County Return for Sch. A and House Duty charged, $\mathbf{1 8 8 0 - \mathrm { r }}$ and $\mathbf{~} 88 \mathrm{I}-2$.
H. С. 25-1884-5; Н. С. 235-1884; H. C. 39-1892; H. C. 217-1896, in continuation.
H. C. 344-1883. Very detailed classification by Counties. showing values $£ 20$ to $£ 25$, $£ 25$ to $£ 30$, etc., up to $£ \mathrm{E}, 000$, and also premises exempt from House Duty (see also Leone Levi, S. J., 1884).

## (2) Comminaion Roports.

S. C. on Town Holdings, p. 368, Ap, endix XIV.

Metropolis.-Special information udtained from the Inland Revenue Department, classifying shops and dwelling-houses, 1881-2 and $1887-8$, by numbers in several classes ( $£ 20$ to E25. etc.), with percentage borne by each class to the total

Table H. D.-Numbers of Houses, $£ 20$ and over-Annual Value (Great Britain), 1851 to 1878 (in thousands).
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## CHAPTER IV.

## Income Tax (Schedule A) in Ireland.

## THE VALUE OF REAL PROPERTY.

The conditions in Ireland are so different from those in Great Britain, and are so little understood, while their statistical effects are of such considerable importance, that it is necessary to give special consideration to the subject. Irish valuation is very involved and difficult in its history, and although the literature of the subject in reports of Commissions and the evidence and appendices is voluminous, there has apparently been no attempt to trace the definite statistical facts, absolute and at the same time actually comparable, over the past eighty years in the manner that is here essayed.

## Brief Bistory of the Valuations.

When the tax was introduced into Ireland in 1853 it was directed that the basis under Sch. A should be the annual value of all tenements and rateable hereditaments according to the valuation in force for poor rate purposes. Copies of the last rates made had to be supplied by the local authorities, ${ }^{1}$ but only when required ${ }^{2}$ in subsequent years, because the Sch. A assessments were "continued," as in Great Britain, ${ }^{3}$ until the year of re-assessment. The poor rate valuation and the income tax assessments therefore came into close relationship at recurring intervals of about thiee years, the latter being altered in the intervening years only as regards new properties, structural alterations, and decreases. Provision was made that if, on appeal, the

[^68]valuation was shown to be in excess of the rent the assessment might be reduced, so far as it was assessed upon the tenant, and the balance charged upon the lessor. ${ }^{1}$ There are certain properties, used for public and charitable purposes, which do not pay poor rates, ${ }^{2}$ and which are valued only at half the rent, but the income tax is charged on the full rent, irrespective of the valuation list. It should be noted that in Ireland there is no rating upon agricultural improvements, erection of farm buildings, etc., for the first seven years; and also that shooting rights are not rateable.: The latter, for income tax, are assessed under Sch.. D when separately let.

It is obvious that no estimate can be formed of the comparative value of the Sch. A assessments, and their approximation to true values, without some consideration of the history of poor rate valuation in Ireland. The literature of the subject is very considerable, and the following observations represent a condensed summary of so much as is relevant to the present subject.

The first of the Irish Valuation Acts was that of 1826 , which was designed to provide for a more equal levying of county cess charges and grand jury rates upon various areas. At that time a general Ordnance survey was in progress, and a Commissioner of Valuation was appointed to value the counties already surveyed. The valuation of all lands was to be made according to a fixed average scale of prices for wheat, oats, barley, potatoes, butter, beef, mutton, and pork, and houses were to be valued at the rental value less one-third part of such rent. This Act and subsequent amending Acts dealt entirely with a general townland valuation, and not with the several properties or tenements in each townland, and did not provide for a revision. ${ }^{4}$

In 1838 a poor relief system was introduced, ${ }^{5}$ and a method

[^69]of valuation similar to the English was provided, the basis of valuation being the net annual value of land and buildings, viz., the rent at which each property was worth to be let, the probable annual average cost of repairs, insurance, etc., and all rates, taxes, etc., except tithes, being paid by the tenant. Valuation proceeded rapidly, and was completed, except in three unions, in 1842. A Parliamentary Return in 1843 gives very full details for the whole of Ireland and also for each union, with a classification according to values, in $£ 5$ stages up to $£ 50$, and one class above $£ 50$. The total net valuation was $£ 13,428,787$, but this was before all appeals and adjustments had been dealt with, and was, comparatively speaking, too high. There was no real decrease in values in the years immediately following, but in 1845 the valuation had settled down to $£ 13,204,234,{ }^{1}$ and this on the official evidence may be taken as the valuation for those three years. The return for each union also showed the approximate extent to which it was below the true rental value and what the difference between gross and net was in each case. The following quotation from an official letter is informing :-

"To Lord Eliot.

[^70]formed by deducting the charges of repairs, insurance, taxes, etc., from the gross value, the net value being always estimated in the first instance ; and as it is the almost invariable rule throughout Ireland for tenants to defray all the annual charges on their holdings, the rent paid by the occupier is in fact usually a net value.

" George Nicholls.

> " Poor Law Commission Offices, Dublin, 1gth February, 1842."

The townland valuation was still proceeding on minute and elaborate lines, and the difference in principle between the two systems was considered by a Select Committee in 1844. ${ }^{1}$ They dismissed an existing tithe valuation as so defective and lacking in uniformity as to be worthless, and found that the townland valuation could not be used for poor rate purposes because its unit of valuation was too large, and because it omitted properties which, though exempt from county charges, were liable to poor rates, while, its whole object being to ascertain relative ability in the county area, it failed to give a sufficiently positive or absolute result. They also found that the poor rate valuations, though sound in principle, and giving correct relative values within ach union, were not sufficiently uniform for county rates. So they proposed one valuation for all purposes, to include and to show separately all property liable to any local rate, and based on the poor relief principle, the " net annual value to let."

A Commission on the Grand Jury Laws in I842 had reported in favour of Mr. Griffith's valuation under the 1836 Act, and in an appendix he himself stated that the difference between his values and the actual letting value was about 25 per cent. " under the full or rack rent value, but very near that of many of the principal landed proprietors of the country." ${ }^{2}$

By 1846 Griffith had completed twenty-six out of thirtytwo counties. An Act was passed for a general valuation, under which a tenement valuation was completed for the six remaining counties, and the cities of Waterford, Cork,

I H. C. $513-7844$

- Memorandum, i. 5 .


## 146 BRITISH INCOMES AND PROPERTY.

Limerick, and Kilkenny were also valued. It could be extended to the other areas on application of grand juries and town councils, the 1836 valuation meanwhile remaining in force. This Act directed an additional valuation by townlands, on a price basis for lands, and letting value less one-third for houses, so that " the principle of a tenement valuation was introduced and of a revision of such valuation, but the two divergent bases of valuing for poor rates and county assessments were still retained."

In 1852 the Act which is the basis of the present system came into force, repealing the Act of $\mathbf{1 8 4 6}$, but providing for the alteration of the tenement valuations under the latter to conform to the new principles. With the amending Acts ( $\mathbf{x 8 5 4}, 1860,1864$ and 1874) it fixes one uniform tenement valuation for lands and tenements for all purposes. The valuations began in 1848 and were not complete until 1865 , the various county valuations coming into use as completed in the interval.
"Grifith's Valuation " was based, for lands, upon fixed prices of eight commodities, and as regards houses upon an estimate of the rent, the tenant bearing all charges (except " tithe rentcharge ') and repairs, so that it was a blend of the 1836 grand jury valuation and 1838 poor relief valuation.

With regard to property exempt from rating it is only necessary here to say that the seven years exemption for improvements and the non-rateability of, sporting rights, and of turf bogs and turf banks for which no valuable consideration is paid, affect income tax statistics, but the " half rated" property (public, charitable, scientific, and other purposes) does not.

The 1852 Act contemplated a possible revaluation of lands at intervals of not less than fourteen years, but did not make provision for funds, and no such general revision has in fact been made. For new and altered properties an annual revision list exists. In towns an occupier can apply to be included therein, but no considerable number of applications is made, as the early valuations are already much below the rent. There is no provision in the Acts for obtaining rent returns.

By the Local Government (Ireland) Act, 1898, in a general revaluation in county boroughs land can be valued, not on the old produce price basis, but on the same basis as houses. Belfast has completed a general revaluation, and one is in progress in Dublin.

## Une of Poor Rate Valuation for Income Tax Assommenta.

It will be obvious that the movements of the aggregate assessments down to 1868 (vide Table A4) do not necessarily reflect any true movement of values for Ireland, but such a movement was masked by the effect of transferring areas gradually from one kind of valuation to another.

The valuation corresponds to the British rateable value, which is already exclusive of repairs. Therefore, as it is adopted for the Sch. A gross assessment, the further allowance of one-sixth and one-eighth for repairs under the Finance Act, I894, from a value which has already taken such repairs into consideration involves a double allowance. In general the owners do repairs to houses in towns, so that the assessments are already one-sixth below the rent, and the allowance is not given. ${ }^{1}$ But if it is not below the rent to quite that extent, the full sixth is allowable. So a reduction in valuation may lead to an increased net Sch. A assessment. Although in rural areas the rent is frequently nowadays below the old valuations, the one-eighth allowance is always made. The owner is only responsible for an assessment on the rent, the difference between rent and valuation being the "income " of the tenant, and, speaking generally, this beneficial occupation is exempt and appears in the exemption column of the statistics. How far it is a conventional figure-the mere difference between a real rent and an ancient valuation -and how far it really approximates to the value of the tenant right are not strictly determinable questions.

## Iriah Land Act Salon.

The tenants are of course exempt in most cases, and so the assessments are exempted from the date of the purchase

[^71]agreement. But in the ordinary course the interest paid would be kept in charge, and the amount appearing in the exemption column would not represent the whole value of the land in question. Since November, 1905, however, the properties have been exempted outright ; the usual deduction of tax by the new owner from the interest he pays has not been made, but the Land Commission deducts income tax from the vendors and makes a single return for the whole of Ireland. Statistically the effect is to overstate the true exemptions, and also to overstate the Sch. D for Ireland, but the net liable income remains unaffected. ${ }^{1}$ In the case of liable tenants the payments of interest are allowed as a deduction from their assessments. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

## How closely has the Irish Poor Law Valuation (and Income Tax Ascosement) approximated to True Values?

Dealing in the first place with the past, we may refer to the opinions quoted above as to the state of the early valuations. The following information is derived from official sources:-
1842.-"The Poor Law Valuation of 1838. . . . From the altered state of the times, the consolidation of farms, the fall of prices, the increase of local taxation, a revision has been found necessary from time to time. . . . Both the original valuation and that, as now revised by local authority, will probably be found less accurate than the valuation in progress ... under Mr. Griffith." But even the poor law valuation was said by Sir George Nicholls to be better than that of England (Report on Consolidated Annuities, 1852).

In 1843, a return of the total poor law valuation was published showing, with only three estimates, the completed results for each union. In two-thirds of the reports an estimate was given of the percentage extent to which the valuation was below the "letting value." These reports were subsequently tabulated in the Appendix to the Repert on Townland Valuation, 1844, ${ }^{3}$ but no endeavour has hitherto been made to work out the net effect for all Ireland from these estimates. In the class where equality was

[^72]
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asserted this estimate has been accepted, and the mean points for the other classes have been adopted, except the " over 20 per cent." class, which has been put at a mean of 30 per cent., while the best possible estimate has been made for each union where general statements were made. The average (unweighted) percentage deficiency is ir 8 . The average has also been obtained by weighting each union according to its rateable value on the first completed uniform valuation by a single authority, ${ }^{1}$ and the result obtained is $I \times \%$. It may be taken that the unions for which no reports were obtained would give a similar result: they are well distributed, and their average rateable value is the same, so that the evidence of these early reports by the local authorities may be summarised by the estimate that the poor law valuation was 12 per cent. below the true letting value according to Irish practice. This seems to bear out Sir George Nicholls' view, and compares favourably with the valuation in England and Wales, even at a much later date, $8876-7 .^{2}$ which, extra metropolitan, was over 12 per cent. below the letting value, as indicated by the Sch. A assessments.
1844.-There is other evidence that at this date the valuation was not more seriously below the true letting value. In the 1844 Evidance on Townland Valuation it is stated that complaints of inequality were not general, that the valuation was "below, but not very much," and that it was "as good as England.": As regards the townland valuation, houses over $f 5$ were valued at two-thirds and houses under $£ 5$ were omitted, so that comparison is difficult; but Grifith states that generally one-third should be added to give the poor law valuation, and there was often as much as 70 per cent. difference.
1858.-From the report and evidence upon Consolidated Annuition it appears that the rapid decline in values after 1846 was not fully exhibited in the poor law valuation, striking as the change in the latter seems to be. In some

[^73]cases the valuation was held to be considerably above true value. ${ }^{1}$ "But there are now unfortunately too many places in Ireland where the valuation is maintained merely as affording an indication of the comparative capability of the parties to contribute to the public requirements; the actual bond fide value of the property cannot frequently be taken at half what it is represented." ${ }^{3}$

1864,-A draft Report of the Seleet Committee on the Taration of Ireland, referring to a parliamentary paper on relative capacity to bear taxation, ${ }^{2}$ said :-"Sch. A is assessed in Ireland on a valuation supposed to be somewhat under the nominal rental, where Great Britain is on the rental. But it has been proved to your Committee by many witnesses that although in some instances the rental in Ireland is higher than the valuation, yet on an average of years the actual rent received is not so." One witness put the valuation at 10 per cent. below. ${ }^{4}$
1865.-In the actual report in the following year it was stated ${ }^{5}$ :-" It has not been proved to the Committee that the Irish taxpayer enjoys any important advantage in consequence of the tax being assessed upon the net valuation instead of the gross rent, as in Great Britain."
1869.-In this year a Seloet Committee reported on Irish valuation, but dealt more with the comparative accuracy of the valuation in different parts than the absolute value of the aggregate figures. The complaints that Ulster was rated much above the rest of Ireland were shown to rest upon a mistaken definition of "rent," for if the tenant right were added to the rent paid in Ulster the valuation was considered to be as much below in that province as elsewhere." It is clear that for all true comparative purposes the tenant right should be added to the tenants' rents. At this date rents were increasing generally, ${ }^{7}$ and one witness put the valuation at one-fourth below the letting value, and another said that the valuation ( $£ 13,000,000$ ) corresponded to $£ 18,000,000$ true rental. An attempt was

[^74]made for sample or typical unions to determine the economic rental, as a difference between gross produce at current prices and expenses, to obtain a true value and to compare it with the valuation. Twenty-five unions outside Ulster showed 7 s . 9 d . average value per acre as against 8s. 9 d . valuation, and twelve Ulster unions gave i2s. $8 \frac{1}{3} d$. average value against ros. valuation. This, of course, was an attempt to prove the case against Ulster, furnishing "as a final result the remarkable fact that the general valuation of Ulster is not higher than that of other provinces of Ireland."

Another appendix to the same Report, after exhibiting the several dates at which the valuation of the counties was completed, asserted that it was evident therefrom that the valuation of the southern and western counties was made before recovery from the famine, when agriculture was neglected, with a result that the valuation in those counties " is considerably less than valuation in Ulster " made at more recent dates. It appended a statement showing " the increase per pound on the valuation which would be required in each county to make them equivalent to the valuation in Ulster."

It is possible to combine these apparently irreconcilable statements and to obtain a real estimate therefrom, taking the estimated increase required for each county and working it upon the actual valuation, as follows:-

| Actual valuation of three provinces | $\stackrel{\underset{8,989,000}{E}}{\underbrace{}_{i}}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Aggregate additions required | 1,837,000 |
| Valuation of three provinces, to equal |  |
| Ulster (net) besis . | 6,000 |
| Valuation of Ulster | 3,825,000 |
| But the Ulster valuation was, by the other evidence, at least as much below its true valuation, including tenant right. In the same proportion this would add |  |
| Total rateable value | 15,432,000 |

1870.-The Board of Inland Revenue stated ${ }^{1}$ that the valuation in Ireland was estimated to be 20 per cent. below the true letting value, which accords almost exactly with the result arrived at above.
1871.-The Report of the Solect Committee on the Law of Rating in Ireland furnished some evidence of interest. It was pointed out that so far as lands were concerned there was a greater excess of rent over valuation in town divisicns, so that the disproportion between the low rates of villages and the high rates of town divisions was less than it seemed to be. ${ }^{2}$ But the lowness of valuation was said to apply more to houses, and particularly country houses. ${ }^{3}$ Objection to low valuation was minimised because of the saving in the income tax. ${ }^{4}$ Houses in towns were said to be depreciating in value, whereas lands were going up. ${ }^{8}$ Although one witness said the valuation of lands was less than one-half the true value, others were more reliable who asserted in one case that rents were " 25 per cent. over the valuation," and in another case that the "valuation professes to be 20 per cent. under the letting value."

1878 and 1879,-The Soleet Committee on the Irish Land Act, 1870, introduced a new element into the question, the lowness of Griffith's valuation being discovered to have grave disadvantages where used as a basis for regulating loan advances! It was stated to be 25 per cent. below: Poor arable land would be equal in value to Griffith's figure, but good pasture land much above. The Board of Works would advance twenty years' purchase on Griffith's valuation, and, assuming that land was worth thirty years' purchase, "this advance would equal ten years' purchase of the rental."

1876 to 1880_-Irish Land Commission, 1880_-In evidence it was stated that the most expert opinion considered an addition of 33 per cent. to Griffith's valuation in 1876 would give the letting value, raising it from $£ 13,619,000$ to $\mathrm{f} 18,200,000$. $^{7}$ Several witnesses mentioned 25 per cent. to

[^75]30 per cent. ${ }^{1}$ Some lands were as much as 100 per cent. to 500 per cent. above, but where the north was io to 15 per cent. the south was 100 per cent. correspondingly. It was generally agreed that the valuation was no criterion of rent and had never been intended as such.
1880.-Royal Commission on Agriculturo. ${ }^{2}$-Mr. J. B. Greene, the Commissioner of Valuation, said that the valuation must be held to be a representation of the fair letting value of land between 1849 and 1852 : "it is estimated that the addition which would probably be made to the present rateable valuation, in the case of a revaluation of Ireland, would amount to an average of 33 per cent. generally, and that the agricultural value of land which is now $£ 9,100,000$ would be increased to over $£ 12,000,000$." This estimate was made without regard to the recent bad seasons. "I am of opinion that if Ireland were revalued to-morrow at a reasonable live-and-let-live rent over the whole of the kingdom, 33 per cent. over Griffith's valuation would be a moderate valuation on the average, and that would be \{2,000,000 a year under the existing rental of the country "which he stated to be $£ 20,000,000$ at least, or $£ 2,000,000$ too high. He contradicted the assertion attributed to Griffith that at the time of valuation one-third should be added to give the actual rents, but said no actual figures were available.
1887.-Land Aots (Iroland) Commission.-There was an enormous mass of evidence before this Commission, directly upon the difference between rentals and the valuation, but it was nearly all particular, and therefore, in view of the varied effects of the depression upon tillage and grass land, and the different conditions obtaining in different localities, it was often conflicting. There is no general summary for Ireland, and indeed it is difficult to see how at such a time of change one wes possible. Griffith's estimate of 25 per cent. in the seventies was frequently repeated, and the opinion was expressed that the valuation (at 1886) was

[^76]fair for tillage but deficient for grass lands. Rents had fallen rapidly even since 1882 , and in one case were said to be 10 per cent. lower than in 1839 and 171 per cent. lower than in 1877, and in another place to be 20 or 25 per cent. lower than in 1852; ${ }^{1}$ but no general conclusions can be drawn from the evidence, except that the decline in values was very rapid.
1894.-Solect Committoe on Land Acts, Ireland_-It was stated that rents fixed in 1882 as high as Griffith's valuation " would not now be too high," from which it may be inferred that in 1894 agricultural depression from 1880 had not yet operated to reduce the true letting value below the valuation.

1894-Royal Commission on Financial Rolations botween Great Britain and Ireland-Evidence was furnished to show that the judicial rents less the rates payable by landlords out of those rents were 3.2 per cent. below the valuation, ${ }^{2}$ and 23.4 per cent. below the old rents. Mr. G. F. Howe, an expert witness well qualified to give a reliable estimate, said :-" At the present time my opinion is that agricultural land is about the same value, if we could get at the letting value disclosed by the actual rents, as the amount of the valuation. I think it is assessed at about its proper value." He made it very clear that this was not equivalent to saying that the correct tax was paid in the aggregate, because the owners could pick out all cases of " rent below valuation" and pay on the rent only, whereas they never paid on more than the valuation in the converse case. ${ }^{3}$

For Dublin, on a sample, houses were in the valuation at £4, 108 , whereas the letting was $£ 7,524$, or 83 per cent. above. Attention was drawn to the double allowance given for repairs after 1894, viz., the "hidden" allowance by Griffith and the obvious allowance for income tax.

The evidence as to values given by Sir J. G. Barton was that a new valuation would give an increase of from 15 to 20 per cent., ${ }^{4}$ but he appears to have confined this to houses,

[^77]
## INCOME TAX (SCHEDULE A) IN IRELAND. 155

and to have regarded the land valuation as approximately correct on the judicial rents. This evidence, together with that of other witnesses, does not always appear to be consistent, but differences of opinion as to whether the judicial rent really as well as theoretically included the tenant right, and questions as to rates appear to complicate the issue. Perhaps one can best dispose of the matter in the words of the Report:-"A difference of opinion exists amongst the Irish witnesses as to whether the valuation in Ireland is now really below the letting value. Mr. Barton, the Commissioner of Valuation, maintains that it is, and that if a new valuation were made it would result in an increase of 20 per cent., whilst Mr. Murrough O'Brien, one of the Chief Land Commissioners, and well acquainted with the value placed by his Commission on Irish land, considers that a new valuation, if fairly carried out, would lower rather than increase the assessment." The minority reports balance the opposing views, and generally do not arrive at a precise opinion, but, by giving some countervailing considerations not here relevant, arrive at the conclusion that the total income tax paid in the two areas Ireland and Great Britain is fairly comparable.
1897.-The evidence given by the Commissioner of Valuation, Sir J. G. Barton, before the Royal Commiscion on Loeal Taxation in $1897^{2}$ is valuable as a comparatively recent statement of the position of Griffith's valuation. He stated that the valuation of land in Ireland based upon rent paid by the tenant plos the swm paid for tenasd right is comparable with valuation based on rent paid to the landlord in England, and, unless tenant right is considered, no proper comparison can be made. If a new valuation is made it should be upon the rents fixed by the Land Commission, adding the interest on the sum paid for tenant right. The valuation by Griffith was 15 to 20 per cent. below the rack rent originally. As a result of the time taken in the valuation, "whilst in the south valuation is very much below the judicial rents, in the north it is rather above it. ${ }^{50}$ In Ulster the judicial rents were $8 \mathbf{9 6}$ below the valuation,
in Leinster 4.35 above, in Connaught 2.66 above, and in Munster 12.25 above, or on the average for the whole country I•53 above, based on 288,000 cases. ${ }^{1}$

He stated in very clear terms that in his view the method of valuation by Griffith included the tenant right, ${ }^{8}$ and that valuation was really on the same basis for the whole country. A revaluation would increase the whole total both for land and for buildings, the land increase being chiefly in the south and partly due to the fact that large sums have been spent in recent years on improvements, reclamation, etc. In many cases the rent would exceed the valuation by 20 per cent. But it is very " difficult and dangerous" to compare judicial rents in Ireland with those in England, because the rent in England includes interest on all the buildings and improvements. Then, again, the exemptions from rating are more numerous in Ireland, being estimated at threcquarters of a million, exclusive of Government property.

In the valuation of new houses or houses structurally altered the letting value had to be "toned down" to conform to the general standard by a deduction varying from 5 per cent. to 30 per cent. This did not, however, bring them down absolutely to the Griffith level. In detail it was $16 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in Ulster, 24 per cent. in Leinster, $25 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in Connaught, $26 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent. in Munster, and $23 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent. for the whole of Ireland.

1898-Royal Commission on Irish Land Aets_-The Report and Evidence furnishes little save general confirmation on the question of aggregate values. An appendix ${ }^{2}$ summarises rental statistics for ten years 188 I to 189 x from the Land Commission Reports, and from these details the following table is compiled :-

Government valuation E4,158,168
Old rents . . . . . $£ 5,319,167$
New rents . . . . . $\mathfrak{£ 4 , 2 2 0 , 7 7 4}$
Percentage excess of old rents . 28
Percentage excess of new rents . I1

[^78]
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These figures confirm the foregoing estimates in a remarkable manner.
1899.-The fifth volume of Evidence bofore the Commiswion is wholly devoted to Ireland, but contains nothing of substantial importance and is supplementary to the above.
1902.-The Final Report of this Royal Commission embodies some of Sir J. G. Barton's conclusions, but adds nothing relative to aggregate valuation.
1903.-Sir J. G. Barton, writing on valuation for rating in Ireland, ${ }^{1}$ said the deductions from new valuations, " to make relative," varied from 5 per cent. to 30 per cent. in the south and west. In 1867 the completed valuation was $£ 12,975,000$, of which $£ 9,100,000$ was on land, and in 1901 land stood at $£ 9,066,000$; houses, $£ 5,163,000$; railways, etc., $£ 704,000$ : Government property, $£ 140,000$, or E $15,073,000$ in all. In 1871 the exempt property was E424,208, which bas probably doubled since. Of this £ 160,000 represented Government property, and the balance churches, chapels, schools, hospitals, asylums, literary institutions, and convents. Such property was valued exactly as other property. He anticipated the Belfast revaluation would give an increase of 20 per cent.
1903.-The Seloct Committee on Irish Valuation reported : -" We are satisfied that although probably not theoretically correct, yet practically speaking the total valuation of Irish land is not very far from just valuation, and that relatively it is approximately fair, the anomalies and inequalities which have crept into the system as applied to houses not being found in agricultural land to anything like the same extent." The valuation was admitted to be behindhand in all Irish towns, and Sir J. G. Barton reckoned a 25 per cent. increase would result in Dublin,' and ro per cent. generally

[^79]in the township on a revaluation. No addition to value had been previously made, for example, for licence value. It was stated authoritatively in evidence that 16 per cent. from the rent was taken to give rateable value generally for new houses, and one-fifth or one-fourth for old houses. ${ }^{1}$ It was estimated that the revaluation of Belfast would add $£ 300,000$. ${ }^{2}$
1913.-Before the Departmental Committee on Imperial and Local Taxation Sir J. G. Barton again gave evidence that he was in possession of the ratio of difference in each locality "up to 33 per cent." in some cases, from which a rough standard valuation might be made. He gave no general estimate for Ireland.

## Summary as to Difference betweon True Value of Land and Income Tax Statistics, 1842 to 1914.

Broadly it may be stated that the 1842 figures in Table A4 were 12 per cent. below the net value. In 1852 values had sunk so rapidly that the figures are probably adequate. By 1864 the original poor law valuations had been replaced almost entirely by Griffith's values, which were lower, and, rents having moved upwards again, the statistics are perhaps fully 10 per cent. below true values. From this date the figures are stationary save for (a) additions and new properties, (b) the Belfast revaluation, while rental values moved upwards until 1880, so that the figures were 20 per cent. below values in 1870, 25 per cent. in 1875, and 28 per cent below in 1880. After this date rents declined, and by 1897 " judicial rents" were just above the figures, so that full rental value of lands inclusive of tenant right would be still somewhat above, while houses generally having steadily risen were 23 per cent. above.

In 1903, after further depression, which tenants' improvements had tended to counteract in its influence on values, 10 per cent. seems to be a reasonable estimate, and in the opinion of many competent to judge it is now at least that proportion below, while houses have certainly increased in value.
up to the true rack reatal standard on axisting ronfs after allowing for rates and insurance.
${ }^{2} 8.963$.
89.797.
Irisa Lamd.-Real Value Compared with Valuation.


The following is a broad estimste of the present value of Irish property :-

$$
\text { Lands (thousands } £ \text { ). }
$$

Gross annual value, Sch. A, 1911-12 . . . 9,69I
This is Griffith's rateable value, and to.get the true
gross before repairs are charged add one-seventh
1,384
Total
11,075
(The actual repairs under Sch. A at one-eighth of the above $£ 9,690,506=£ 1,211,314$, the actual figure being $£ 1,199,043$.)
After the Irish Land Act, 1888, giving tenant right, great improvements were made, and these have probably more than counterbalanced the depreciated value due to agricultural depression.
But it may be assumed that for the country as a whole the value of lands is ro per cent. in excess of valuation
True value of lands . . . . . . $\overline{\mathbf{1 2 , 0 4 4}}$
Messuages and Tenements (thousands $£$ ).
Gross annual value, Sch. A . . . . . 5,323
Wherever the valuation is not more than one-sixth below the rent, one-sixth repairs is allowed in all cases. If none were more than one-sirth below, the allowance would be $£ 887,211$.

It is actually $£ 198,068$ or 22.3 per cent., and it may therefore be fairly assumed that 77.7 per cent. of the properties are more than one-sixth below the rent.
$-2 \times{ }^{-77} \times £ 5,323,266=£ 827,235$ as a minimum.
It would be safer to say that they average 20 per cent. below . . . . . . . 1,034
And the other 22.3 per cent. of the properties would average at least 10 per cent. below .

Total true rateable value (messuages) $\quad \mathbf{6 , 4 8 6}$
Add one-fifth (Grifith's deductions)
True gross value, messuages
Other property .
Grose value, total for Iroland . $\quad . \quad . \quad \cdot \frac{1,256}{7,742}$

It is obvious that although the Irish statistics are sufficiently close to the truth to be included in much larger aggregates without risk for general purposes, they should not be used for (1) periodical comparisons for Ireland itself, as a test of growth or decline ${ }^{1}$; (2) comparison with other areas where an error of 25 per cent. is likely to be material, unless a careful study is first made of the most voluminous literature of this very difficult subject, and unless the principles of valuation have been fully understood.

Giffen compares lands $1892-3$ and IgO6-7 with a footnote on the old valuation (Quarterly Review, July, 1909).

Bonar compares net assessments in decades 1854 to 1894 without recognition of these facts ("Irish Agrarian Problem," p. 20).

Additional Information.
In addition to the reports on Irish valuation already quoted, the following Parliamentary Returns contain detailed information :-
H. C. 428 - 1840 . Progress of Valuation ( 6 \& 7 Will. 4, c. 84).
H. C. 33 r -1841. Progress of valuation.
H. C. 224-1842. Progress of valuation (more extended).
H. C. 235-1843. Irish valuation in poor law unions, showing classes $\mathrm{fx}_{\mathrm{x}}$ £2, £3, etc., and total rate in each union completed. No grand total for the 108 unions given.
H. C. 334-1843. Progress of valuation:-H. C. 2121844 : H. С. $216-1846$ : H. C. $701-1847$; H. C. $446-$ 1848; H. С. 407-1849; H. С. 346-1850; H. C. 553-1852. H. C. 191-r844. Costs of valuation.
H. C. 159-1847. Poor law valuation, 1841, with popu-lation-all unions in detail. Aggregate, $113,187,42 \mathrm{I}$.
H. C. 889-1847. Values in four unions classified to complete the general Return of I844.
H. C. 70-1849. Valuation of tenements in counties and boroughs in classes up to $£ 8$.
H. C. 200-1850. Valuation of tenements, 1846 and 1850, compared, in classes up to $£ 3$, for counties and boroughs

1 Wakefield estimated that $12,750,000$ acres in 1817 yielded $f 17,250,000$ rental. and it has been estamated that the reductions after 1898 have reduced the value to one-third of that vilue (Journal of Statistical and Social Enquiry Society of Ireland, August, 1899).
$\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{C} .4-\mathrm{I} 85 \mathrm{I}$. An interesting letter upon the position of valuation and its relation to rental. A discussion of the desirability of reverting from valuation on rent of tenements to the townland as a basis.
H. C. 268-I85I. Return of costs of valuation-both kinds.
H. C. 403-185I. Tipperary valuation.
H. C. 128-1860. Counties and boroughs : area, population, and income tax. Classification of occupiers rated at various amounts, " over $£ 50$ " down to $£ 8$.
H. C. 226-1865. Valuation of Government and other property exempt from rating (given by counties) (vide p. 157).
H. C. 300-1866. Cost of first townland ordnance valuation and the tenement valuation and annual revisions.
H. C. 144-1867. Agricultural holdings, with tenements in each, classified according to amounts (vide p. 74).
H. C. 96-1872. Area and population. Valuation by townships.
H.C. 122-1872. Value of property belonging to various corporate bodies.
H. C. 422-1872. Parliamentary electors. Classification of tenements in values.
H. C. 45-1874. Constituencies in Ireland. Details of ratings by boroughs, etc.
H. C. 159-1874. Value of houses in boroughs classified.
H. C. 424-1875. Tenement valuation.-Number of various classes.
H. C. 422-1876. Owners of Land, County details, with acreages.
H. C. 104-1883. Poor rate valuation, 1873-4 to $188 \mathrm{x}-2$.
H. C. 17-1884. Number of tenements valued $£ 4$ in boroughs.
H. C. 22-1887. Valuation in electoral divisions.
H. C. 27-1887. Valuation in Electoral Divisions for each division, giving in detail value per acre, population, rateable value per head, average poor rate; and the average county cess in each county.
H. L. 24-1900. Rateable value for each district, union, county, etc.

## CHAPTER V.

## Schedule C. Income from Government Securities.

## DEFINITION AND SCOPE.

" For and in respect of all profits arising from interest, annuities, dividends, and shares of annuities payable to any person, body politic or corporate, company or society, whether corporate or not corporate, out of any public revonua. ${ }^{11}$
"Dividends" in this connection originated in the public finance of the eighteenth century : it was the " share of the annuity created by the Legislature when the annuities represented by the 'funds' as we now use the term were made payable half-yearly." The term "public revenue" means not only the revenue of the United Kingdom, but also that of any foreign or colonial Government. Under this schedule of the tax no returns from individuals are called for, but the Bank of England, the National Debt Commissioners, and agents entrusted with payments deduct the tax and pay it over to the Revenue.

The stocks of friendly societies, industrial and provident societies, and, in certain cases, savings banks and charities are exempt from the tax, and also stock which is devoted under trust to the repairs of any place used for Divine worship. Stock belonging to His Majesty, or to an accredited minister of a foregin State, resident in the United Kingdom, and stock standing in the name of the Treasury and National Debt Commissioners are also exempt:

[^80]
## Present Statistics Furnished.

The details are now given annually in the following form :-

Income Assessed. (f thousands) 1913-14. Gross Income:-
Funded debt and terminable annuitics, including ..... $E$
life annuities ..... II,194
Unfunded debt ..... 640
Guaranteed 23 per cent. land stock, 24 and 3 per cent. stocks, and local loans stock ..... 1,86I
India Government stocks and loans ..... 5,182
Indian Guaranteed railways ..... 4,525
Colonial Government funds ..... 16,107
Foreign Government funds ..... 11,660
Total gross income ..... 51,168
Deductions:-
Income not exceeding $£ 66$ ..... 1,256
Charities, friendly socicties, etc. ..... 901
Foreign dividends belonging to foreign residents ..... 1,235
Other allowances, reductions, and discharges ..... I
Abatements, $£ \mathbf{x 6 0}, £ 150$, and $£ 70$ ..... 2,262
Life insurance premiums ..... 82
Relief in respect of children ..... 23
Total deductions ..... 5,759
Income on which tax was recoived ..... 45,409

The gross income assessed represents the sums actually charged in the first instance with the tax. The interest of Government holdings, and of certain official charitable funds, etc., which amounted to about $£ 15,800,000$ in 1911-12, is not included, being specifically exempt from charge. ${ }^{1}$ This

[^81]amount represents the rough difference between the gross sum charged and the gross interest paid under the various heads. Small dividends under $£ 5$ per annum are paid in full, and are not assessed under this schedule at all. Any such sums payable to persons who are liable to tax should be returned by them for assessment as "untaxed interest" under Sch. D. ${ }^{1}$ Then, in many cases where the recipients are exempt and have proved their title, record is made by the payers and the payments are made in full without assessment under Sch. C. ${ }^{2}$ The gross assessment is partly net, after excluding both these classes of payment. By no means all exemptions are excluded, however, and under the "deductions" appear those items upon which repayment is claimed. It is clear, therefore, that the " gross income assessed " is an artificial, or administrative, figure, without any statistical significance ; it is necessary to subtract the four first-named deductions to obtain a figure that has any real value. The only thing to be said about it is that the sub-classifications in the succeeding tables all analyse this total, so that it cannot be wholly disregarded if these details are being studied.

Deductions.-(a) Income not oxcoeding 5160 .-This, as already explained, covers the income in respect of which repayment is claimed. It forms only a part of the whole class of such income for Sch. C.
(b) Charitios, Friondly Socioties, ato.-This also forms only a part of the whole of Sch. C income belonging to charitable bodies, some of it not being charged at all, and excluded from "gross income."

[^82]

Details of holders of the public debt, arranged in ten classeg, for 1831 and 1848, may be found in S. J. 185 I, P. 195.
(c) Foreign Dividends bolonging to Foraign Residents_This appears separately for rgir-12; formerly it was included in " Other Deductions.". It represents income from abroad which is paid vid London to foreigners living abroad, and which is therefore only accidentally or nominally brought within the purview of the tax, and such "reexports" are equitably entitled to exclusion from charge.
(d) Other Allowances, Reductions and Discharges_Upon the elimination of (c) this item is insignificant.
(e), (f), (g) Abatements, Life Insurance Promiums, and Relief in respect of Childron,-These personal deductions need no comment. ${ }^{\text {( }}$ They are made upon repayment claims.

## Division of Gross Income inte Countrien of Origin.

Since 1872 a table has been given showing the amounts of dividends and annuities charged in respect of the several countries to which they relate. This is useful as showing the relative importance of different countries of investment, although it must be remembered that $\mathrm{Sch} . \mathrm{C}$ is by no means exhaustive and overlaps to some extent with "coupons" and foreign securities assessed under Sch. D. ${ }^{2}$ Still, these details of Sch. C do represent with fair accuracy the relative importance of Government securities in British foreign investment.

A further table shows in a condensed form these particulars over a series of years. British funds (owing to reductions in the National Debt, etc.) show a considerable diminution. Indian, European, African, and American securities have changed to a slight extent only, but colonial and Asiatic investments have greatly increased.

These particulars, excluding the British figures, form part of the details discussed under "Income from Abroad so far as it is Identified." ${ }^{3}$

## The Sequence of Statistics under Sch. C.

The disturbances have been relatively slight. For many
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years, down to 1899 in fact, the figures were presented separately for England, Scotland, and Ireland, Scotland being " nil" on every occasion. This division represented administrative methods of assessment, and had no other significance whatever. It simply meant that all the Scottish payments were assessed in London, and a few Irish payments, through the Bank of Ireland, were assessed in Dublin.
> " Danger of relying on the mere figures in income tax returns ... a striking instance afforded in a return printed by the House of Commons in June, 1868 . . . which purports to show the proportion of taxation to the wealth of the country in England and Ireland respectively, the amount assessed to income tax is taken as a measure of wealth in both cases. . . .
> " On Sch. C, when we come to consider it, still less reliance can be placed as a common measure of value. . . . For it represents the dividends at Banks of England and Ireland respectively, and the dividends payable in the United Kingdom out of all foreign and colonial revenues. The amount assessed in England is $£ 32,500,000$, in Ireland $\notin \mathrm{I}, 115,000$. Not only; therefore, is there placed to the account of England alone all the investments of Scotland, Ireland, the colonies, and foreigners in our own public funds, but also all the investments of the Irish, among others, in such securities as Indian stock, Canadian bonds, French rentes, Danish, Dutch, Russian, Turkish and other stocks of all foreign Governments " ( 12 th Report, p. 25).

1848-8 to 1858-8 (see 13th Report).-A slight difference appears between "gross" and "net": it is the latter which must be noticed, and which corresponds with the present "gross income." The amount of duty " charged " is of course in excess of the true net revenue, because repayments upon exemptions and other deductions have to be allowed for. The annual parliamentary returns gave duty collected.

1858-4 onwards-Ireland is included in the grand total. ${ }^{1}$

[^84]1855-6.-The parliamentary returns come exactly into line with the 13th Report, and agree thereafter.

1872-3-Classified tables of origin in the present form were first rendered (and shown for 1872-3, 1876-7, 1880-1, and 1883-4 in the 28th Report, which reprints and revises several parliamentary returns).

It should be noted that Sch. C at these dates includes Metropolitan Consolidated stocks and Corporation stocks ${ }^{1}$ :-


1876-7.-The exemption limit was raised from $£ 100$ to $\mathrm{f}_{150}$ in this year. "The falling off may be attributed partly to diminished payments on account of dividends of foreign funds, and partly to the extension of exemptions and abatements ; . . . we are without any knowledge of how much of the general decrease is attributable to the latter cause alone" (20th Report, p. 51).

The official description of the statistics in 1878-9 was:"The figures represent neither a true gross nor true net, but are more the latter than the former. The sums returned by the Bank of England and by other paying agents do not include dividends not amounting to 50s. half-yearly, or dividends which are not assessed on account of belonging to charities or to persons who are entitled to exemption; neither do they include investments by the National Debt
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Commissioners on account of savings bank moneys" (ibid., p. 35).

1885-6.-There was a slight decrease in the sums assigned to this schedule owing to the fact that all tax recovered from coupons was classed under Sch. D from that year.

1887-8, 1888-9 and 1889-1890.-The figures for the funded debt were distributed owing to the reduction of the rate of interest. A fifth quarterly dividend was paid in 1887-8.

1903-4.-The reduction in the rate of inter est onConsols and the decisions in the case of Scoile and Others v. The Secretary of State for India had a marked effect upon the assessments.

Mr. W. R. Lawson quotes the gross and net for 1900-r in comparison with 1891-2, and says "clearly the British investor is not extending his operations very rapidly in foreign or colonial securities" ("Two Record Budgets, 1860 and 1903." in Fortnighlly Reviaw, May, 1903).

Parliamentary Returns contanning Additional Details.
H. C. 253-1842. Sch. C: total dividends from which tax was deducted, and the number of accounts.
H. C. 170-1847. Bank of Ireland annuities to persons not resident in Ireland : five years, 1842-3 to $\mathbf{1 8 4 6 - 7 .}$
H. C. 209-1874. Details by counties : total $£ 40,373,696$. (Similar returns at intervals subsequently.)

## CHAPTER VI.

## Schedule D. Profits of Business, etc.

## DEFINITION AND SCOPE.

Tre assessments under Sch. D cover incomes from (1) business-" trade, manufacture, adventure, or concern "; (2) professions, employments, and vocations; (3) miscellaneous profits, small sums of interest not taxed by deduction under Sch. C, profits of cattle dealers and milksellers; (4) foreign and colonial securities, except those charged under Sch. C ; (5) foreign and colonial possessions ; (6) any annual profits or gains not falling under any other rule or schedule.
These six " cases" of Sch. D are charged under different rules and with different bases, which must be briefly referred to. ${ }^{1}$
I. Ordinary trades are assessable upon the three preceding years' average, new businesses being taken upon the period of trading available. Until 1907 the average was subject to adjustment upon ascertained results of the year of assessment if the profits had been reduced. The Income Tax Committee of 1905 reported against this very one-sided provision, but it has recently been revived as a method for giving relief where profits have been reduced owing to the war. ${ }^{2}$ There are special provisions for adjusting the assessments on businesses which have recently started or which have come to an end, so that the actual profits of each year may be taxed.
Mines, gasworks, etc., originally charged under Sch. A, No. III., retained their respective bases when transferred to the rales of Sch. D. ${ }^{3}$

[^86]The sum assessable is the "full amount of the balance of profits or gains." Where profit is made it is immaterial what is the destination of that profit, ${ }^{1}$ charitable or otherwise. If the receipts of a company include dividends and interest taxed by deduction, in excess of the " balance of profits," the former represents the minimum liability, so that although there may be no direct assessment upon investment companies or insurance companies, they are really taxed in excess of their "profit," in the commercia. sense. In cases where it is the business of companies to deal in securities, stocks and shares, the profit on such transactions is assessable, but for ordinary concerns such dealings are "capital" transactions and not chargeable. Speaking generally, isolated transactions, in sales of shares or property, are not "annual" profits and are therefore not chargeable.

With regard to trade carried on abroad by British residents and companies, the following general rules apply, although there are many difficult legal points involved. Where a person resident in the United Kingdom has profits from a trade carried on entirely elsewhere they are not assessable until received here by the person entitled to them, and are then charged as foreign possessions (fifth case). ${ }^{3}$ A company registered here and having operations and branches abroad is chargeable on the whole of its profits under case I if the head and seat of the direction and control are situated in the United Kingdom, ${ }^{4}$ and it is clear that many cases of what are regarded as investment of money abroad, in foreign mines, American breweries, etc., are fully assessed under this case, although they do not appeary as foreign businesses in the statistics.' But where a British company halds shares in a company abroad, even to a preponderating

[^87]extent, the control is not always adequate to make the British company liable on the whole of the profits of the foreign company. ${ }^{1}$

As regards trade carried on in the United Kingdom by foreign residents and companies, there is also an imposing case law. Generally speaking, " branches" here are chargeable on the profits made here, and where orders are given to agents here, and payment or delivery is made here, the trade is held to be exercised ${ }^{2}$; but if contracts are made abroad and deliveries take place abroad, it is not. ${ }^{3}$

Any person resident in the United Kingdom is chargeable for income under all six cases, but non-residents are chargeable only for property in the United Kingdom, or for trade profits made in the United Kingdom. "Domicile" has little to do with the residence test, which is often a nice legal question. Generally a company registered here is also resident.

In estimating the balance of profits certain deductions are specified as not allowable, viz. :-
(1) Cost of repairs in excess of the usual expenditure according to the average;
(2) Losses not connected with or arising out of the trade;
(3) Capital withdrawn, or capital invested, or employed in improvements ;
(4) Interest charges on the owners' capital ;
(5) Average losses beyond the actual loss after adjustment:
(6) Annual interest, annuities, patent and other royalties.

Deduction is allowed for:-
(I) Any income subject to deduction of tax on receipt;
(2) The value of premises owned by the trader and assessed under Sch. A, the deduction being the amount of the net Sch. A assessment if the building is wholly devoted to the trade ; if it is also a residence for the trader, a proportion up to two-thirds is allowable;

[^88]
## SCHEDULE D. PROFITS OF BUSINESS, ETC. 173

(3) Depreciation or "wear and tear" is not allowed as a deduction but is given as an allowance from the assessment ;
(4) Bad debts, and doubtful debts upon a valuation.

Until recently no deductions were allowed from the profits of brewers for expenses connected with tied houses. No deduction is allowed for depreciation of leases or goodwill, cost of pit-sinking, preliminary expenses, or expenses of issuing debentures.
II. Profossions, employments, and vocations were at first chargeable on the profits of the preceding year, but in 1853 the three years' average was substituted, and the rules generally are similar to those in the first case.
III. Profits of an uncertain annual value, on the basis of the preceding year: profits of cattle dealers and sellers of milk (where the occupation of lands does not suffice for the keep and sustenance of the cattle), on the average of three years.
IV. Interest on foroign and colonial securities is chargeable on the full amount received in the year of assessment.
V. Foroign and oolonial possossions are chargoable on the amount received or imported on the average of three years.
There has been much litigation on the subject of "constructive " remittances, where the interest has not been received in forma specifica, and also as to whether in particular cases the business was controlled from the United Kingdom and assessable under case I. on the whole profits regardless of remittance, or whether it should be regarded as a foreign possession. In general it may be said that income allowed to "pile up abroad " has legally evaded taxation. The Finance Act, 1914, however, has altered the basis of charge in the case of stocks, shares, and rents from actual remittances to the amount arising abroad, but the altered liability has not yet affected the statistics.
VI. This is the "sweeping " case, designed to gather up any annual profits or gains not clearly charged by virtue of other clauses. Any convenient average may be adopted. Such items as profits from letting apartments or furnished houses may be brought under this head.
Other "charging " sections relate to interest payable on the security of the rates, and interest. not payable out of
profits and gains (e.g., during a period of railway construction) ; both these are liable as and when paid.

## The Relation between Assessed Profit and Commercial Profit.

The uniform assessment of trade profits is only possible with a set of well-defined rules of strictly formal character, for any attempt to leave assessment to individual judgment as to what is fair and just would lead to great differences of practice from time to time and from place to place, and might also favour this class of income in comparison with the classes assessed under other schedules of the tax. ${ }^{1}$ The present statutory rules of Sch. D are not exactly what would commend themselves to a modern business community engaged in framing an income tax upon profits. In part they are relics of 1799 and 1806, when many branches of modern commerce were in their infancy, or unknown; such, for example, are the strange differences in averages of years for the basis of assessment. In part they are due to the introduction of the tax in 1842 as a temporary impost and its maintenance for so long on a temporary footing: such are its deficiencies in the "long view" of what constitutes profit, and its failure to deal adequately with the depreciation of durable assets. It came before the real development of accountancy, life insurance, and limited liability companies: hence its failure to deal specifically with necessary reserves for unexpired risks, or to allow for " preliminary expenses." The changes in industry combined with the establishment of the tax upon a permanent footing have alone sufficed to throw its statutory regulations out of line with commercial facts. The treatment of the "tied house expenses " of brewers is an instance of the former, ${ }^{2}$
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and the taxation of terminable annuities illustrates the latter. ${ }^{1}$
In some cases remedy or improvement is obvious, but the disturbing effects incidental to any change are a real obstacle, as in the proposed abolition of the three years' average. ${ }^{\text {a }}$
Some of these statutory limitations tend to make assessed profits exceed true profits, while others tend to make them less. In the same way differences might arise through the inevitable inability of the administrative or human factor to attain on all occasions to the letter of the law; any administrative inadequacy would tend to make assessed profits less than true profits, while the ignorance or apathy of the public in regard to its right of claim for deductions and allowances that would be readily granted if brought to the notice of the officials concerned would tend to make assessed profits exceed true profits. These various considerations must receive separate and detailed treatment. Few reasoned attempts have been made to gauge their net effect for statistical purposes. Perhaps the most important is that by F. Ireson, ${ }^{2}$ and he concludes with the just remarks :-
"Some writers on economics, evidently with no practical knowledge of accountancy, have assumed as a matter of course that the official statistics form a true record, in no way exaggerated, of the income actually received by payers of income tax. This assumption has been shown to be incorrect. It will be understood, of course, that what is challenged is not the textual accuracy of these statistics, but the popular use of them for a parpose for which they were never intended. They do not agree, and were never meant to agree, with ordinary accountancy results, and in certain respects it is quite proper that they should not so agree." 4

Ireson and other writers, by a superficial enumeration of apparent differences, present a formidable case against the "assessed profits" as a correct representation of "real
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profits." Upon a careful examination the greater part of the supposed difference, for statistical uses, will be found to disappear, and it is desirable to ascertain, with greater exactness than has hitherto been attempted, the true measure or limits of the discrepancy between the respective aggregates. The comments made in this inquiry refer in no way to the propricty of making allowances, which shall adjust burdens as between individuals, or adjust profits differently over a period of years : they relate solely to the question of the statistical equality of the troo kinds of aggregates.

## Statutory Differences.

1. The Time Element.-Except in the case of profits arising from businesses set up during the year of assessment, of certain interest secured on rates or paid out of capital, and of interest arising from securities abroad, all sources of income charged under Sch. D are based on results preceding the year of assessment. Hence the assessments for any year have no claim to represent the profits of that year.

The average of the three preceding years predominates, but mines are assessed on a five years' average, while railways, waterworks, gasworks, and similar concerns are assessed on the preceding year's profits. ${ }^{1}$ The average has a very steadying influence, and helps to mask the actual fluctuations of industry. In view of the general tendency to increase, however, it clearly is for the most part in favour of the taxpayer, and causes the assessed profits to lag behind the true profits. To what extent? If $a, b, c$, and $d$ represent four successive years' profits, steadily increasing, then the assessed profits for year $D$ are $\frac{a+b+c}{3}$, and for the next year $E$ are $\frac{b+c+d}{3}$, from which the difference between D and E, a known amount which may be termed $Y$, is $\frac{d-a}{3}$
If $x$ is the annual increase, $d=a+3 x$, and $Y=\frac{a+3 x-a}{3}=x$,
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i.e., the difference between actual years is on the average the same as the difference between assessments each year, or rather more in prosperous times, and rather less in times of depression. This result is of course obvious after a little consideration. The profits for 1908-9, for example, are made up of actual results as follows:-Mines, five years' average, years 1903 to 1907 (middle year 1905) ; railways, quarries, gasworks, etc., year 1907; general business, three years' average, 1905, 1906, and 1907 (middle year 1906) ; while some interest and much income from abroad is assessed on the amount in 1908-9 itself. On a steadily progressing assessment a uniform three years' average would mean that the assessed profits of $1908-9$ were the same as the actual profits of rgo6-7, but these differences in averages advance the period of actual profits by about four months, i.e., the assessment of profits for the year ending 5th April, 1909, might be taken to be actual profits for the year to the middle of August, 1907. ${ }^{1}$ (On steadily decreasing income there would be a corresponding retardation, and they would equal the actual profits for the year to the middle of December, 1906.) But here there is the assumption that the " preceding year," etc., for every concern is up to 3 rst March, whereas in fact the majority of businesses make up their accounts to other dates. Rather less than one-half make up accounts to 3Ist December, perhaps three-tenths to 3Ist March, and the remainder to various dates preceding December, averaging about 30th August, the net effect being to put back the terms " preceding year," etc., by about one-fifth of a year. ${ }^{2}$ This correction, for the purpose in hand, means that
1 If the assessed profits for the year $=x$, and the annual increase is $a$, the actual profits of the preceding year $=x+a$, two years preceding $=x$, and three years preceding $=x-a$. On the $1908-9$ proportions:-

Previous year's concerns are $\frac{69}{586}$ of whole, and $=(x+a) \frac{69}{586}$;
Actual year's concerns are $\frac{{ }^{69}}{588}$ of whole, and $=(x+2 a) \frac{69}{868}$;
Three-year concerns are $\frac{4}{5} \frac{7}{6} \frac{1}{6}$ of whole, and $=x \times \frac{4}{5} \frac{1}{6} \frac{1}{6}$;
and the whole assessed profits for the year $=x+\frac{1}{8} 9{ }_{8}^{\prime}{ }_{8} a$, or a third of a year after the middle year.
${ }_{2}$ These proportions have been adopted as the result of a number of samples taken from different parts of England. Introducing the fraction into the foregoing computation, we get the result that the
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" The amount stated for the year 1911-12 corresponds to the actual total of 1910 or 1909."-Dr. Bowley, Quarterly Journal of Economics, February, 1914.

By the above computation it may be stated more precisely as the year to June, 1910.
2. "Wear and Tear" or Depreciation of Machinery and Plant.-It is entirely owing to the peculiar legal origin of this allowance that it has so distinctive, and sometimes misleading, a position in the statistics. In 1876 the Glasgow Chamber of Commerce approached the Treasury upon the subject, and were for the moment satisfied with the explanations then given " as to the case being met by the allowances made for the actual outlay on account of repairs and renewals" upon the average. ${ }^{1}$ In 1877 an amendmerit in the House of Commons to allow a deduction for "depreciation of implements" was negatived on a division. After further representations had been made the Board of Inland Requenue issued a circular to the District Commissioners premising that " the suggestion for altering the law must have arisen from the provisions of the Tax Acts not being clearly understood," and stating that the words of the 1842 Act, " any sum expended for the repairs of premises and the supply or repair or alterations of any implements, utensils, or articles for the purpose of any trade, etc.," should be construed liberally, so as to comprehend the full amounts actually expended, not for repairs only, but also for renewals or replacements of plant and machinery; " and . . . if, in addition, depreciation were allowed by a percentage, there would in that case obviously be a double allowance."

In the following year, however, the deduction for wear and tear was sanctioned by law. ${ }^{2}$ It was to be an allowance, not

[^91]upon the three years' average like an ordinary business expense charged in the accounts, but for the wear and tear during the year of assessment itself specially claimed for and allowed by the Commissioners. It was therefore an allowance after the gross assessment had been arrived at, and appears as such in all the statistics. It must not be imagined, however, that it was an entirely additional allowance, for where " depreciation" is allowed upon any given machinery and plant no renewals are allowed as a trade expense; they are treated as added to capital. In the long run, therefore, in sustained business, there is no great difference between the total sums allowed, and it is roughly true that the "gross assessment minus wear and tear allowance " after 1878 corresponds with the "gross assessment" before 1878, since deductions for renewals were made before arriving at the gross assessment in the latter case. Although the practice of treating this matter by way of depreciation has grown very much of late years, there are still considerable areas of industry in which the case is best met by allowing " renewals and repairs."
"Cost of upkeep. . . . In the year 1910 the allowarices amounted to $i 67,000,000$. . . The various forms of capital requiring such expenditure for their maintenance are, in the Census of Production, dealt with one by one, and the actual cost of upkeep. including renewals, is given as exceeding the allowances by at least $£ 100,000,000$. This excess must therefore be added to the official deductions, and the true net total of incomes subject to income tax will have been in the year rgro, not \&820,000,000, but about $£ 720,000,000 .{ }^{\prime \prime}$ - W. H. MALLOCE, "Social Reform," p. rao, and in greater detail. p. 155.

Here the writer is evidently unaware of the fact that repairs, renewals, and replacements are charged as business expenses before the assessments are computed (vide review in S. J., May, 1914), and he also ignores the fact that the census figures include the concerns which are exempt from income tax.

Two methods of obtaining a comparable series of figures are available-first, to deduct the sums allowed each year since 1878 from the gross assessment; second and conversely, to add to the gross figures for years prior to 1878 an
estimate of the corresponding depreciation allowances. The former at first sight appears preferable, because it avoids the use of estimates. But the legislation of 1907 has introduced such changes that the balance of advantage is now with the second method. For the allowances to which full effect cannot be given in lean years, when gross assessments are low, may be accumulated and carried forward, to be given effect when profits are high. This is especially important in the textile and shipping industries. ${ }^{1}$ The effect is that the amount shown for "wear and tear"' in any year may be far less than, or far more than, the true wear and tear for that year, and a system of deducting it from the gross assessment would not give a true view of gross profits, for the aggregate in good years would be unduly depressed by a large deduction and the aggregate in poor years would come out too high in proportion. So the best comparative series is obtained by using the existing gross assessments from 1879 to date (unaltered by the change in 1907) and adding to the figures prior to 1878 an estimate of the "wear and tear" that would have been applicable in that period. The 25th Report (p. 68) said :-" For purposes of comparison about $£_{450,000}$ should be added to Sch. D, $\mathbf{1 8 7 9 - 8 0}$, in respect of sums allowed for wear and tear of machinery, prior to the amount of gross assessments being ascertained." The actual sum appearing in the $1879-80$ tables was $£ 499,138$-making £950,000 in all for that year. The proportion $£ 950,000$ bears to the gross assessment minus $£ 499,138$, i.e., to $£ 248,990,000$, is taken for computing the sum to be added to the Sch. D gross assessments in previous years (Table Dr). It is considered that this is more in accordance with the actual facts of the case than to take the higher proportions of later years. The net assessments remain unchanged by the factor of wear and tear throughout.
It is obvious that the full wear and tear allowances should be deducted from the gross assessments in order to get profits which are comparable with commercial figures. The

[^92]
## SCHEDULE D. PROFITS OF BUSINESS, ETC. 18 I

question of inadequats allowances for wear and tear is referred to later.
3. Treatment of Losses-Capital and Revenue.It is commonly stated that the Sch. D figures are greatly in excess of true profits, because an adequate allowance is not made for losses. There is considerable truth in this, but also much confusion of thought. It is necessary first to distinguish between " trading losses" in the year and " capital losses " :
" . . . Official statistics are . . . misleading, because they do not recognise any loss of capital which has been suffered by the taxpayer. Losses from bad investment, or from unsuccessful trading, in so far as they result in the exhaustion of capital, are also ignored. Assume, for example, that I invest the sum of £ 1,000 equally in ten different companies. In the first year nine of these pay me dividends at the rate of 5 per cent., while the tenth company goes so hopelessly wrong that my investment in it must be treated as totally lost. Thus for the year I receive £ 45 in dividends, and lose froo of capital, the actual result to me being a loss of $£ 55$. Nevertheless, income tax on $£ 45$ has to be paid, and in the official figures I appear as having made in that year an income, i.e., a profit of $\mathbf{6 4 5}$. It is no exaggeration to say that the example just given is representative of thousands of others occurring every year. All around us, in every trade, capital is being destroyed in various unsuccessful ventures, yet no notice whatever of such destruction is taken by the Revenue authorities and there is absolutely no record of it kept by them. When there is a profit it is sought out, assessed, and taxed, but when there is a loss of capital the income tax officials pass it by as if it had never occurred. No one would accept as reliable the statistics of a general who published the achievements of those of his soldiers who survived, but suppressed all mention of those who were killed. Every one would agree that such a record was misleading. For a precisely similar reason the income tax returns are misleading, for they include only the profit of successful ventures, and suppress all mention of those which destroy capital when they fail or die."-Ireson, "The People's Progress, pp. 54-55.

There is much truth in the contention, but it is perhaps not a very exact method of stating it. The "income" of the year should stand apart, surely, from capital losses. No one would say of a man who had f500 a year from
property, and who lost a house worth $£ 1,000$ by fire, that in that year he had no "income." Now, nearly all sudden losses of this kind are insurable, and since insurance premiums of all kinds are allowed as expenses in trading accounts, the aggregate of such losses is allowed for in the tax statistics. Losses which are not sudden, however, are spread over a series of years and become capital losses, as an aggregation of trading losses in successive years. For example, a trader has premises worth $£ 1,000$ and floating capital also $£ 1,000$; he loses froo per annum in trading for ten years, and eventually his assets pass into the hands of another. (But of course, the non-success of the premises may have lowered their letting and selling value.) Even if he retains the $£ 1,000$ for fixed capital he has " lost" the second $£ 1,000$, but it may have been fully allowed for in income tax assessments.

It remains to examine, therefore, how far trading losses fail to be represented in assessed profits. Losses are allowed as follows:-
(1) Where two businesses, etc., belong to one person, the losses in one can be set off against the profits of the other. ${ }^{1}$
(2) Where losses alternate with profits for the same business, they are to a considerable extent worked off by the system of averages for assessment.
(3) Duty on losses may be repaid to the extent that duty has been borne on other sources of income. For example, a man having $£ 1,000$ from investments and losing $£ 400$ ir business can be repaid upon $£ 400$, so that, in the year, he pays tax actually on $£ 600$, his net income. ${ }^{2}$
(4) Losses in speculation by ordinary individuals may in a large measure be ignored, because gains are to an equal extent omitted from assessed profits. They are usually assessed only where speculation is a busimess. Similarly, company promoting is a profession assessable on the balance of profits and gains.

Company Promoters.-" Take two men, A. and B., each possessing capital to the amount of $£ 40,000$ and incomes of $£ 2,000$. The
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tax payable on this amount would, at is. in the $£$, be $£ 200$. Let us suppose that A. loses in one year $£ 5,000$, which B. gains, an incident quite possible under the tricks of latter-day company law. The income of A. will thus become reduced by, say, 5 per cent. on $£ 5,000$, which will make it $£ 1,750$, on which the tax would be £87 10s. B.'s income will be $£ 2,000$ plus $£ 5,000$, making a total of $£ 7,000$ : tax, $£ 350$. Thus it is evident income tax is being paid on capital . . . and in so doing has swelled the income tax." -G. Byng, " Protection," 1901, p. IO8.

This assertion has only a limited measure of truth; it assumes that the operation which is assessable as profit is not equally, on the converse, allowable by way of set-off as a loss, under (1), (2), or (3), above.
(5) Depreciation and appreciation of securities are ignored for all businesses which are merely investing, and not trading, in stocks. Where one is taken into account, so equally is the other.

But when all allowances are made it is true that continuous trading losses are often not represented at all in the aggregated tax assessments, and it depends upon the use that is being made of the figures how far this is really significant. If the income saved in a year over and above expenditure is being added to the existing stock of capital, it is obviously necessary to deduct the capital values which have vanished before the new sum total of capital can be given. But the deduction should rather be against the old stock of capital brought forward than the new addition. In the illustration given above, ${ }^{1}$ if the man in question had been putting by © 100 per annum we should rather deduct this $£ 1,000$ loss from his old capital than say he had ceased to put by and had exceeded his income by $£ 9001$ So that when the total income for the year is stated it is not necessary to deduct the full capital that has disappeared in the year; this may rather be set against past income saved, as unsuccessful eaving. Nevertheless, in a long view of the matter, for some considerations, it may be well to ascertain the average annual disappearance of capital and deduct it from average annual income, but only in so far as the component annual

[^94]trading losses have not been allowed already against income as indicated above.
" Obviously it is impossible to compute with any accuracy what capital is destroyed each year, but some idea as to its magnitude may be obtained from the following figures (Stock Exchange Official Intelligence, 1907, p. 1,853):-
"The number of companies registered in the United Kingdom from 1862 to 1906 was 101,019, with an aggregate nominal capital of $£ 6,779,998,495$.

Taking these to be the same on an average as those now existing, the paid-up capital has amounted to
The number of companies existing in the United Kingdom in 1906 was 40,995 , with a paid-up capital averaging $£ 48,869$ and aggregating :
$2,003,392,001$
A deduction of the latter figures from the former shows that in the years between 1862 and 1906 no less than 60,024 companies were Hquidated or removed from the register, their paid-up capital being. . . . . 2,933,305,510
" If one-third of the last-named amount be deducted as representing vendors' shares issued as fully paid, and if the capital returned to the shareholders be set against the losses sustained by creditors, it follows that since 1862 the loss sustained by British investors by the extinction of these 60,024 companies had averaged over $£ 44,000,000$ per annum."-Ireson, op. cif., p. 55.

Sir L. Chiozza Money uses similar figures, but subtracts the $£ \mathbf{2 , 0 0 3}, 000,000$ of existing paid-up capital from the $£ 6,780,000,000$ of nominal capital, and finds, therefore, that 60,020 companies with $£ 4,778,000,000$ capital have "disappeared" in forty-four years (Cassell's Magazine. February, 1909 ; also Socialist Reoiew, "The Waste of Capital," July, 1908). In" The Nation's Wealth" the " loss" from 1862 to 1911 is shown as $\mathbb{5}, 200,000,000$. " We cannot tell what part of the $£ 7,500,000,000$ was the expression of real saving and not the mere creation of paper, but when every allowance is made for nominal registration the disappearance of over two-thirds of the sum registered most stand for an enormous wastage " (p. 143).

Mr. W. H. Mallock also adopts a similar plan.
This method makes no allowance for reconstruction. The same concern may be registered and re-registered, appearing
several times in the top line, and only once in the sum subtracted. Such absorptions and reconstructions would amount in the aggregate to a large figure, while many of the losses have been accumulated losses in bond fide trade which have to some extent been set off (in income tax statistics) against other profits. Many losses, moreover, do not deserve to rank as deductions from trade profits at all; they have never entered the category of trading, for the savings might just as usefully have been dropped into the sea. They could with equal justice be called bad spending.

If A., with more money than sense, spends $£ 2,000$ of his income in building a yacht to yield him a pleasure income, and does it so badly that he gets no such pleasure income, and the yacht is useless, it figures nowhere as a loss of capital; it is badly pent income. But if B. similarly builds a fishing vessel to bring him in an income from fish, and does it so badly that it altogether fails of its purpose, it is at once called a " loss of capital," although it is barely distinguishable from the other case. There is no doubt, however, that it is generally convenient to regard as a loss of "capital" expenditure on capital goods destined for further production, which have to be abandoned as useless, for specific labour and material embodied therein have been cancelled. But it is otherwise with "capital" spent for immaterial goods. Suppose that a business exists for ten years, making £500 per annum for the first five years, and nothing each year thereafter, being finally abandoned. The income represented in the national total would be $£ 2,500$ over the whole period. Now suppose that at the end of the fifth year the proprietor, A., had sold it at five years' purchase for £2,500, B., as a limited company, taking the money out of the bank and A. immediately redepositing it. For simplicity it is assumed there is no fixed capital in a physical sense. At the end of the tenth year the capital is gone and the company is wound up. The suggestion is made that we ought to deduct from the realised profits this loss of capital, in which case the total appearing in the national aggregate would be "mil," which is contrary to the facts. The fallacy lies in regarding as "capital," for this question, any payments
made for mere rights in future profits. Obviously a very large part of the subscribed capital of companies is of this character, and, the recipient of the purchase-money not having been assessed to income tax on the payment, the deduction of the " loss" of the thing purchased from income tax profits leads logically to quite absurd results when the national aggregate of profit over a period of years is under consideration.

On the general question of the value of these figures as showing the real amount of capital lost the evidence of Sir J. S. Purcell, Registrar of Joint Stock Companies, before the R. C. on Depression of Trade and Industry, 1886, is notable. In 1883, out of 1,440 companies registered in London with a nominal share capital of $£ 143,000,000$, 430 did not proceed beyond mere registration, pointing to the fact that the capital was never subscribed. A paidup capital of $£ 32,000,000$ survived. By the subtraction method, 1856 to 1886,64 per cent. seemed unsuccessful, but many defunct companies were re-registered, and the true proportion would be nearer 50 per cent. (Q. 67r).
" The capital owned privately is far greater than that owned by companies, but there are no statistics to show how much of it is lost annually. Some idea of this loss may, however, be obtained from the fact that 7,599 people were registered as having failed in 1907, thereby causing to their creditors a loss of $£ 8,380,000$, and to themselves probably several times that amount. . . . The total amount of capital destroyed, whereof no record whatever appears in our income tax statistics, can hardly be less than 100 millions annually. . . . Probably the true amount of capital annually lost is considerably more than 100 millions."-Iresos, op. cit., p. 56.

This estimate is, in my judgment, much too high, and I should hesitate to put the amount for which no allowance is made in the statistics which can properly be deducted from the aggregate assessments at higher than $£ 16,000,000$ on an average.

[^95]
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Thus a company employing only part of its capital, which makes a trading loss of $£ 1,200$ by its operations for one year, and a profit of $£ 1,000$ as interest for that year on its invested funds, would in fact have made a net loss of $£ 200$, and its profit and loss account would only report that fact to the shareholders. Nevertheless, income tax on $f x, 000$ would have to be paid, and the interest received by this company which it has more than lost would be recorded amongst the Inland Revenue figures as taxed profit. This system of taxing interest ' at the source,' as the phrase runs, is severely enforced, and is responsible for much official invention of profits which do not exist."-Ireson, op. cit., p. 52.

Here the operation of the Act of 1890 has again been lost sight of. Taxed dividends are deductible from receipts in arriving at income tax liability, so that the loss would be $£ 1,200$, and the whole of the tax on $£ 1,000$ dividends can be repaid for the year. Or alternatively the loss of $£ \mathrm{I}, \mathbf{2 0 0}$ would be carried forward into future averages, and thus the effect would be worked off in the long run. Mr. Ireson's example is badly chosen, but it is only right to say that there are circumstances in which the effect he contends for may arise, although it is not really important statistically. The chief case is that of insurance companies, whose taxed investments often considerably exceed their "profits," but in this case it has to be remembered that considerable payments are made to policy-holders which are charged as expenses in arriving at these profits. The policy-holders are allowed the whole premium paid as a deduction from income, although it may be much in excess of the sum actuarily required to cover the death risk, the excess representing pure investment by the company on behalf of the policy-holder. When the repayment of the whole investment is made it is not directly charged to tax, so that the accumulated interest may be regarded as pro tanio reduced by the "excess" income tax paid by the company. It does not seem, therefore, that this apparently good example has really much force in the ultimate issue.
5. Depreciation of Leaseholds.-The fact that large sums are charged in business and trading accounts for the depreciating value of leases (i.e., the exhaustion of capital invested in them), and that such sums are not allowed as
expenses for income tax purposes, appears to swell the assessments beyond the commercial profits.
" If A., for example, buys for $£ 700$ the last ten years of the lease of a house let at $£ 100$ per annum, he puts by $£ 70$ each year to replace his capital, and reckons his annual profit at only $£ 30$. But the Inland Revenue authorities allow of no such deduction for depreciation, and for each of the ten years make him pay an income tax based upon the full rent of $£ 100$ (Cd. 2576, p. 11). Thus, in the official figures his income from this house appears at more than three times the true income he obtains from it ! In view of the fact that the houses, factories, etc., in the United Kingdom and their lands are estimated to be worth $£ 2,860,000,000$, and that the majority of them are held on lease, it may well be believed that the true income received . . . is much less, in the aggregate, than the total appearing in the official income tax statistics."-Ireson, op. cit., p. 53.

The whole contention, however true of individual trading concerns, is quite erroneous when applied to the aggregated assessments. The subject is not nearly so simple as appears at first sight, and this is hardly the place to dwell upon the question of incidence. ${ }^{1}$ Suffice it to say that, so far as Sch. A is concerned, two premises of equal rack rent value are assessed equally, although one may be let on lease at a small annual rent, and the other be freehold or at the full rack rent. But under Sch. D, if the trader (and leaseholder) gave, say, $£ 10,000$ for the lease for twenty years, and pays a small annual rent, he recovers tax from that small rent only. At the same time, however, he is entitled to the full annual value Sch. A as a deduction from profits, like the freeholder or rack renter, and the difference in the statistics is nil. His real hardship is quite another matter. It is that he cannot get back the balance of Sch. A tax (above the rent) by deduction, neither can he write off against profits the year's proportion of his vanishing $f$ ro,000 capital invested. But if the income tax does not allow this $£ 10,000$ as a loss to him, neither does it treat it as a profit to the recipiont, and the statistics are therefore again unaffected. ${ }^{2}$

[^96]
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6. Terminable Annuities.-This is very difficult ground, and the question has been discussed on several occasions and by various committees. It is only necessary to say that the most recent committee found no reason to recommend on grounds of equity that the "capital element" should be disengaged and exempted from tax. Nevertheless, from a statistical point of view, the full taxation of annuities represents the inclusion of something which is not in the ordinary sense income, as an addition to the existing stock of capital, and something which is an artificial manipulation of income after it has been produced by industry, and which could be indefinitely multiplied. Any individual can so arrange and draw upon his investments as to create the same " income " effect as an annuity; it simply means he consumes what he has previously saved. But under the annuity method he has ultimately borne tax on a sum greater than his aggregate income, because "savings" are not allowed as a deduction from income.

As a matter of practical statistical importance it is decreasingly significant. Irish rentcharge annuities were divided into capital and interest by statute. By case decision " any annuity which, by the nature of its origin and by the terms of the contract creating it, is manifestly and essentially a method of discharging by instalments, with interest, a debt created by loan or by purchase is also divisible." ${ }^{1}$ In a recent case ${ }^{2}$ a long annuity in discharge of an ascertained capital sum which was the agreed purchase price of a railway was divided. The following statement is, however, far too sweeping :-
"The system is not wholly unjust which exempts from taxation that part of his income which stands for impairment of capital, and assesses taxes on that part which swells capital or savings. The system would be entirely just if the impairment of one capital were elways offset by the equal increase of some other capital, i.e., if the taxpayer's total capital value were kept at the same level. In general large receipts are usually re-invested. and should therefore not be subject to the income tax at all. If we could assume such re-investment to be the invariable rule, we

[^97]could approve of the system by which, in England, a cerminable annuity is not taxed as income at its full value, but is taxed only on that part of it which constitutes 'interest.' The other part, which constitutes impairment of principal, is not taxed. To illustrate the English exemption of impairment of capital . . . the following will be the schedule."-Irving Fisher, "Capital and Income," 1906, Pp. 401 and 402 ; also p. 253.
Purchased annuities for terms of years, also those for life, are still retained in full for taxation. The Government terminable annuities have sunk to little more than £3,500,000, and the life assurance companies pay some £ $3,000,000$, while the National Debt Office and Post Office together pay about $£ 750,000$, so that the total is hardly $£ 8,000,000$. A very large part would be paid to persons exempt from tax, say one-third, and this leaves $£ 5,000,000$ paid to liable persons. In the average proportion of twothirds capital the statistical effect is to swell the assessments by about $£ 3,000,000$ annually.
7. Expiry of Copyrigits and Patent Rigits.-" These expenses are all treated commercially as losses, but their deduction from gross profits is not permitted by the Inland Revenue." -Ireson, op. cit., p. 53.

The manner in which these assets are treated is fully described in Appendix II. to the Report of the Income Tax Committee, 1905, and in the Report, ss .43 to 55 . In the case of copyrights the author is charged on his receipts, while the publisher is allowed to charge the cost of ephemeral productions as an expense, and to treat the " copyright of works of a permanent character as stock in trade, of which a valuation must be made at the beginning and end of each year before arriving at the balance of profit for the year." The Committee found that substantial justice was done. It should be clear that no swelling of statistics arises in the case of copyrights.

As regards patent rights the case is rather different. " Royalty " payments obviously cannot wrongly affect the statistics. "Where the user of a patent purchases it outright, the transaction is treated as a capital transaction on botk sides, and no assessment is made on the original
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patentee in respect of the lump sum received by him." If, therefore, an allowance were made in respect of the exhaustion of the patent right, the work of the inventor and the value created by him would not be represented at all in the total. Once again the alleged grievance in individual cases has been wrongly supposed to affect the statistics.
8. Bad and Doubtrul Debts.-"" Further, no general reserve may be made for doubtful debts, a step invariably taken in proper commercial practice, only such proportion of each one of them as is estimated to be really bad being allowed, for income tax purposes, to be deducted from gross profits."-Ireson, op. cil., p. 53.

Statutory provision exists for allowing an estimate for doubtful debts, and of course all actual bad debts are allowed. Whatever may be the effect on a single assessment in a single year, it is quite a mistake to imagine that the method of dealing with doubtful debts has any effect upon the aggregate assessments in the long run. For in the long run no more and no less than the actual bad debts can really be allowed, and the statistics are certainly not excessive for this reason. In any year, if the figures should be reduced by reason of a commercial reserve for doubtiul debts arising in the year, they should pro tanto be increased because the actual debts incurred in previous years and allowed as bad in the year in question for tax purposes had been partly anticipated on the commercial plan in previous years.
9. Income Tax.-It is sometimes stated that this should be deducted in computing taxable income. It is not included in the legal deductions, and is to be regarded as a personal, and not a business, charge. It is not seen how any argument can be urged for deducting income tax in determining national income which would not equally apply to local rates or indirect taxation paid out of personal income on personal consumption (as distinguished from the expenses of oblaining an income). If businesses were allowed this deduction, salaries would equally have to be

[^98]assessed on the net income left after paying the tax on the assessment! At is. in the $£$ an income of $£ 500$ would bz assessed on $£ 476$ 3s.
10. Expenses incurred by Limited Companies, not allowed for Income Tax Purposes.-These include formation or preliminary expenses, loan issue expenses, premiums on the redemption of debentures, and generally all the expenses of engineering the capital of companies. They may be regarded in two lights-( I ) as a reduction of the yield or interest upon the shares of all or some of the shareholders ; (2) as an increase in the capital cost of the investments (over and above the nominal sum invested), the difference being deducted from subsequent dividends.
From the first point of view the "taxed income" is undoubtedly in excess of true income. From the second each shareholder suffers a small depreciation in the value of his securities, since they are worth less than he has paid for them. I incline to the first view, and regard the assessments as in excess of true income to this extent.
An estimate of these sums is a difficult matter. Probably £ $1,000,000$ per annum is an outside figure.
if. Goodwill-Depreciation or Reduction. ${ }^{1}$ - No charges for depreciation of goodwill are allowable for income tax purposes. Goodwill is not necessarily written down because it has disappeared; it may continue to exist in full measure, but many financial experts and accountants regard it as " good policy" or prudent to write off all non-tangible or non-physical assets. ${ }^{2}$ My own view is that if a purchaser gives a certain sum for goodwill, and he is quite clear that at any time he can sell the business and obtain the same amount for the new or sustained goodwill, he can spend all his profits with an easy conscience. But the statistical point as to excessive assessments is really a simple one. Suppose that a business yields $£ 1,000$ per annum trading profit over ten years and its proprietor A. pays tax on the income so enjoyed, representing $£ 500$ interest on his capital and $£ 500$

[^99]profit and earnings of management. B. has a similar business, and at the end of the third year sells it to C., who gives him the capital value plus $£ 2,500$ for goodwill. The suggestion is that C . should be allowed to write off this payment against profit, with the result that although identical profit had been made, one business would pay on $£ 10,000$ in ten years and the other on $£ 7,500$. The reason is of course that B. is not liable to income tax on his $\{2,500$ sale, and until he is actually assessable no allowance can logically be made to C. ${ }^{2}$ Whatever may be the logic or equity of the case as between individuals, when income is taken in the aggregate they are properly represented by assessments which make no allowance for goodwill. Just as in the case of depreciation, what may be true of a single year is not true of a number of years for any given concern, so in this case what is true of a single "income" is not true of all incomes taken together.
12. Wasting Assets of a Physical Character.(a) Minaral Proporlios, Guano Deposits, eto.-It is not necessary to discuss here the difficult question of incidence of taxation in these cases, and the claim that is being repeatedly made for the total exemption of corpus value from tax. I have shown elsewhere ${ }^{2}$ that, so far as mineral properties situated in the United Kingdom are concerned, the apparent incidence is not the true incidence, and that the wasting assets allowance should only be given if and when the capital sale of mineral properties outright is chargeable to tax. Unless we are prepared to state as a fundamental principle that royalties should not be taxed because they are payments for the corpus of the property, we must regard all payments

[^100]for worked-out minerals as part of the " national income." There is therefore no undue swelling of the income tax statistics because of the inclusion of payments for coal, etc. As to the amount that is so included, we have no better guide than the Mineral Rights Duty, which charges not only royalties paid, but also the " annual value" of minerals worked by the owner, on a royalty basis, and from this information the amount appears to be $£ 7,000,000$, to which some addition should be made for foreign mineral properties, etc.
(b) Cost of Pit-sinking, ote.-The capital expended in sinking and equipping shafts is of course of no value when the mine is worked out. No allowance is made for income tax purposes to represent the exhausted value during each year, and therefore the assessed profits may be regarded as excessive compared with commercial profits to this extent. An estimate based upon the probable number of shafts in the country, as deduced from official returns, an average diameter and depth obtained by numerous samples from geological sections, etc., and at a cost derived from numerous technical books on mining engineering, yields a result not greatly different from a tonnage allowance on output which is known to be adopted by some coal mining companies in computing the annual allowance. It indicates that the sum to be deducted from profits under this head annually is about $£ 2,000,000$.

This should be supplemented to include pit-head buildings and machinery which are also useless, and for which inadequate allowances might frequently have been made.
(c) Buildings-Depreciation and Obsolescence-"". . . no allowance is made for sums necessary to replace capital lost by depreciation of buildings. Now the houses, etc., in this country, apart from their lands, are worth about $\{2,300,000,000$, and if they be supposed to last on an average for 100 years, then there is a loss of $£ 23,000,000$ of capital each year, due simply to these buildings growing old, which is entirely ignored by the income tax authorities."-Ireson, op. cit., p. 54
"A further legislative step in the direction of making allowance for depreciation was taken in 5894, when by the Finance Act of
that year a deduction of one-sixth from the rack rent value of buildings was authorised as an allowance to cover maintenance and repairs. Although nothing was specifically said on the point, it may be inferred that the allowance was intended to cover also eventual replacement of buildings. For Sir W. Harcourt stated in the House of Commons that the rate of allowance was taken at one-sixth pursuant to Mr. Hubbard's recommendation of 186 x , and a reference to Mr. Hubbard's arguments shows that he adopted the figure of one-sixth of gross value as calculated to cover 'the ultimate renewal of the fabric when decayed by age' as well as current repairs" (Report of the Income Tax Committee, 1905, para. 74).

Even if the above quoted opinion of the Select Committee is a sufficient answer to the contention that wear and tear of buildings is not allowed, it hardly touches the question of obsolescence, which perhaps is often the more important factor. Premises become out of date, or unsuitable for their particular use, and have perhaps to be pulled down long before there is any necessity for treating them as " worn out." But this factor is so elusive and variable that no period of time can be set down as applicable to buildings as a whole, and of course many are in use long after the expiration of the time which might reasonably be adopted as usual. If the allowance of one-sixth suffices to cover the gradual decay of buildings, probably a small additional allowance as a sinking fund would provide for the risk of obsolescence before the "breaking-up" point is reached.

But in the case of trade buildings, occupied by their owners and used for getting income, and not for residence, the difficulty is not met by the one-sixth allowance, even to the extent of structural decay. For the deduction allowed from Sch. D is confined to the wed Sch. A, so that full duty is paid on the whole profits (under the two schedules) without any allowances for repairs, etc., except such actual outlay as may be charged in the revenue accounts. This method effectively rules out any " decay " allowance. The Income Tax Committee, 1905, suggested that the full Sch. A might be allowed as a rental deduction from profits (ibid., par. 75).

Trade buildings in Great Britain (1911) were worth £55,000,000. Adding two-thirds of residential shops, £ro,000,000, we have $£ 65,000,000$ as the full annual value which may be claimed as an expense against profits. Fully one-third would be applicable to non-liable profits, and of the remainder not more than one-third would be occupied by the owner. This makes a maximum figure of $£ 14,000,000$ as the gross value of premises which suffers by the method of allowance in question. All actual repairs are charged in arriving at Sch. D liability, so that the "gradual decay" allowance would be but a small part of the one-sixth, say one-sixth part again (i.e., on $£ 36$ rental value the allowance is $£ 6$ per annum, and of this sum $£ 1$ per annum would suffice to provide for the gradual decay: even at 3 per cent. it would amount to the full capital value in less than one hundred years), $£ 300,000$ per annum, would be a sufficient deduction from profits for this purpose for the United Kingdom.

It remains to compute the " obsolescence" figure for all buildings, $£ 224,000,000$. This has to cover only the extra risk of uselessness before decay, and is not wholly to be set off against Sch. D. We may assume that the sinking fund for structural decay would provide for one hundred years, so that it is unnecessary to allocate more than the difference between the hundred-year sinking fund provided in the one-sixth allowance and a seventy-year sinking fund which would rebuild all the premises. This might amount to $£ 4,000,000$, on the assumption of seventy years' profitable life, while a much smaller amount would be adequate if the life is well over seventy years. It represents all that need be deducted from the income tax income to reduce it to a "commercial" basis.
(d) Inadequate Allowance for Wear and Tear of Machinery: Obsolescenco-It is sometimes stated that the tax statistics are swollen because the allowances for depreciation are inadequate. ${ }^{1}$ The question was reported upon by the Income

[^101]Tax Committee, r905, and it may be said that within recent years the allowances have been standardised to a much greater extent than formerly, and a greater rangeof machinery and plant is now brought within this method and taken from the range dealt with by renewals and repairs. The distinction, and the confusion arising from failure to appreciate it, have been explained in the section dealing with the subject in general. ${ }^{2}$ It is only necessary here to say that, once again, what is true of the parts is not necessarily true of the whole. All the points connected with renewals and a proper rate of depreciation are doubtless vital when dealing with the correctness of profits in an individual case in a particular year, but they cease to have importance when the statistics are taken in the aggregate. For example, if we assume that no wear and tear allowance is given for gasholders, and that they usually last forty years, it is clear that the taxed "profits" will be in excess of true profits for thirtynine years, but greatly below true profits in the fortieth year, when a very large charge for renewal is deducted as an expense But if we also assume, as we may fairly do, that gasholders generally are being renewed evenly over the whole period of forty years, the aggregate is made up of separate items, of which for every forty that are excessive each to the extent of one-fortieth of a gasholder ( = plus one gasholder) there is one item that is deficient by the value of one gasholder, and the aggregation of the items cancels the differences. So much for the effect of the rival methods on the aggregrate.

But let us assume that we are dealing solely with depreciation and, for the moment, that the rates are inadequate. It must be remembered that the concession of an allowance for obsolescence operates so that when a machine is scrapped and replaced by a new one a deduction is allowed of so much of the cost of replacement as is represented by the writtendown value of the old machinery (less any scrap value). Let us take a simple instance where 4 per cent. from cost has been allowed and where really it should have been 5 per cent.
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It lasts eighteen years, and its scrap value is therefore $£$ Io. For every original $£$ roo we get :-

| Proper Allowance. | Improper Allowance. | Difference. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| £5 per annum for 18 years ${ }_{90}^{\boldsymbol{t}}$ | 64 per annum for 18 years till scrapped | 6 -18 |
| Allowed on replacement. <br> Written-down value, $t r i\}$ nil <br> - 10 scrap value. | $\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { Allowed on replacement } \\ \text { Written-down value, } \notin 28 \\ -10 \text { scrap value. }\end{array}\right\}: 8$ | + 18 |
| Total allowance - 90 | Total allowance - $\overline{90}$ | nil |

When an insufficient rate is given, the injustices of a long period are thus compensated in a single year. We may fairly assume that these compensations, in the aggregate, are not all made in the same year, but are spread evenly over the period, so that the statistical total is really quite undisturbed. The obsolescence allowance acts as a kind of compensatory balance, and there is no net loss or gain on the whole industry.

The only real failure is in the case where the obsolescence allowance is inoperative owing to machinery not being, in actual fact, renewed. The loss in this case is the difference between the actual written-down value and the true writtendown value, though there may appear to be additional loss through compulsory realisation of assets at something less than their running value. But in the latter case, if the purchaser gets a " bargain," an asset which is really worth more than appears in his balance-sheet, there is a secret reserve which has not borne tax to balance the apparent loss of the seller in the aggregated statistics. And even with regard to the former, the true loss, it usually occurs in the case of " dying " concerns and forms part of the capital gone out of existence to which reference has already been made. Altogether I am of opinion that 3 per cent. of the total wear and tear allowance, or about $£ 850,000$, is an ample allowance under this head.
(c) Allowances for Depreciation of Fixturen, Fittings, and

Furniture.-Allowances made by way of actual renewals only are obviously inadequate when furniture, etc., is not actually renewed, but allowed to wear out. Otherwise, although the method may not be satisfactory in individual cases in particular years, it is statistically correct over the whole field, and in the long run. It is not easy to estimate the value of unrenewed fittings (as distinct from the capital " losses" for defunct firms, etc., which have already been under consideration), but it is unlikely to exceed $£ 500,000$. For the future, however, it appears ${ }^{2}$ that, by concession, allowances for depreciation are to be extended to this class of assets, so that the necessity for any such statistical deduction under this head should almost disappear.
13. Brewers' Expenses for Tied Houses.-These expenses are undoubtedly proper charges from a commercial point of view. From an income tax point of view, until quite recently, the legal position was that they were not expenses of the brewer, qua trader making profits, but expenses of the brewer qua landlord holding property. Under recent judicial decisions practically all the brewers' expenses for repairs, costs of licences, insurances, etc., relating to tied houses are to be recognised as trading expenses and allowed. Their statistical effect has not been published, but a consideration of published accounts as a sample, and of the whole capital involved, suggests that they could not have exceeded $£ 2,000,000$ annually.
14. Reserves.-It is commonly stated that because "reserves" are not allowed as deductions in computing liability for income tax the assessments must be much greater than "incomes" in the ordinary sense of "spendable" incomes. When the tabulated summaries of the trading results of industrial companies as given in the Economist from time to time are examined and it is seen that from 23 to 27 per cent. of the "profit" is allocated to " reserves, etc." the question seems to assume considerable importance.

[^102]Part of the misconception on the subject is due to ignorance ${ }^{3}$ the true significance of terms in accountancy. There are some expenses which may be charged against gross profits either at the actual time and in the actual amounts incurred, or by setting aside a fund or reserve by regular contribution out of profits, from which the expenditure is met as it arises. The method adopted, even for the same class of expenditure, varies often with the nature of the business, but the ulimate result is the same, and the profits over a series of years are depleted to the same extent. For income tax purposes in the case of reserves for ordinary expenses, bad debts, etc., although the amount reserved in the profit and loss account is not allowed as a deduction, the actual expenditure charged against the capital or reserve account is allowed, and there is no difference in the long run.
Reserves may be made for (1) expenses ; (2) wastage of capital; (3) equalisation of dividends; (4) capital extensions.
(x) In the case of expenses, where the expense is itself chargeable against profit for income tax purposes, the position is not really altered by the "reserve" method. Where it is not so chargeable, the remarks already made under such heads as " preliminary expenses," " expenses of raising new capital, etc.," are equally applicable to reserves.
(2) Wastage of capital has been referred to under "wear and tear," " obsolescence," " cost of pit-sinking, etc.," and whether the charges are made by wriling down the assets out of profits, or creating specific or general reserves against those assets, the result is the same in the end. One colliery charges $£ 10,000$ in its profit and loss account for depreciation, and reduces the capital value of its assets in the balancesheet by that sum, while another devotes $£ 00,000$ of its profit to " reserve," does not reduce the value of its assets, but creates a counterweight or reserve on the other side of its balance sheet. One of the stumbling blocks of the tyro in book-keeping is the treatment of a "reserve," which he naturally regards as a distinct "asset," as a " liability" in this account. It has already been pointed out that allowance for goodwill, whatever may be the position as regards the individual cases affected, is indefen-
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sible in a consideration of income or profit as a whole, from an aggregate or national point of view.
(3) Equalisation of dividends by way of reserves made in prosperous times does not need prolonged consideration. It has the effect of steadying the increase in available or " spendable" income as compared with the income shown by assessments. Obviously no deduction should be made from the official statistics on this account.
(4) Capital axtensions are frequently made by way of continual reserves. These are of the nature of compulsory savings or investment out of income which is not handled by the owner. This investment stands as a solid backing for the shareholder's share, which is priced not only upon its dividend yield, but also upon the reserves attaching to it. Nevertheless, if two companies were identical in share capital and profits, but one paid its whole profit away in dividends and the other made considerable reserves, it is improbable that the difference between the market value of the shares would be fully equal to the reserves. But this is only to say that market values are dominated by an individual outlook that appreciates the dividend handled and discounts a compulsory investment not fully understood or controlled. It does not alter the fact that the profits made ars identical, and the sale value of the two concerns is the same, and it does not justify a considerable and fortuitous deduction from aggregate profits to arrive at aggregate personal incomes, unless the latter are under consideration for certain limited purposes as incomes immediately " spendable."

A striking modern method which was increasingly favoured in the last trade boom is the issue of "bonus" shares, on an increase in the capital of the company, by which the shareholder becomes possessed of his compulsory savings in a tangible form as new "capital." These profits do not evade income tax at the time they are made, but whether on emerging as income to the individual they have to be included, like a dividend, as "income" on a claim for abatement or relief or on a super-tax return may depand upan some fine legal points connected with the
form of issue. In this sense aggregated individual incomes may be considerably less than aggregated assessments on profits, and the point is of particular importance in any attempt to distribute " income-tax" income over separate classes whose aggregates are measured by super-tax assessments, relief claims, etc. The failure of considerable amounts of profit assessed upon companies to appear as income upon individual statements would lessen the amount of income and number of persons assessable to super-tax. It would also increase the number of persons entitled to reliefs and abatements and therefore the income assigned to the respective grades. Whether or not any deduction from gross assessments is necessary on account of this class of reserves depends upon the particular aspects of income under consideration, but some recent conspicuous instances of enrichment of shareholders by this method make one hesitate to modify a clearly understood conception of profit income on account of such easily manipulated methods of disposing of profits.

## Summary.

It will have been seen that of the considerable number of adjustments commonly alleged to be necessary in order to reduce " assessed profits" to " commercial profits" only a few have any actual validity. It cannot be asserted with too great emphasis, however, that this conclusion has no relation whatever to the propriety of allowance from the point of view of taxation, upon which no judgment has been passed, but refers entirely to the connection between statistics of aggregated tax assessments and the statistics of aggregated commercial profits. Misapprehensions arise under three heads:-
(I) As to the actual character and method of making allowances (e.g., bad debts);
(2) The particularist fallacy, that what may be true of some or all the parts separately, is necessarily true of the aggregate (e.g., goodwill) ;
(3) The fact that differences of treatment in point if
tims are not at the same stage in every case, and that in the aggregate the differences disappear (e.g., renewals of gasholders).
Some of the points have been made good, however, and the statistical effect may be summarised :-
(3) True losses not given full effect in income tax statistics . . $16,000,000$
(6) Annuities . . . . . 3,000,000
(10) Expenses for limited companies . 1,000,000
(I2) (b) Pit-sinking costs . . . 2,200,000
(I2) (c) and (d) Building obsolescence and machinery obsolescence - 5,000,000
(I2) (e) Fixtures and fittings . . 500,000
(I3) Tied house expenses . . . 2,000,000
Total in round figures . . $30,000,000$
The last two items will disappear for the future. It will be observed that (12) (c) relates mainly to Sch. A and (6) mainly to Sch. C, so that the excess under Sch. D represents about 41 per cent. on the gross assessment in the past and about 4 per cent. in future. This estimate is admittedly conditioned mainly by the accuracy of the first item, which is not susceptible of any exact measurement, and in which a general impression gained on a wide experience of the actual problem is the only guide.

## Co-operative Trading.

The so-called "profits" of trading by industrial cooperative societies are not assessed to income tax. The reasons will be found fully discussed before the D. C. on Income Tax, 1905. ${ }^{1}$ It is of the essence of the argument that the amount of these "profits" is arbitrary, and that as the whole object of the societies is to supply their members at cost price, it is immaterial whether the trading is done on such terms as to admit of no dividend being paid or of a large

[^103]dividend being returned to the members : no real profit in the ordinary sense exists. At any rate, even if a personal profit attaches to the recipient, equal to what, in the ordinary way, would have belonged to the grocer, etc., the recipient is nearly always exempt from income tax and the sum per head is very small. ${ }^{1}$ Most societies find that the "divi." has a glamour of its own, and actual trading at cost is not commonly found. On the assumption that the "divi." represents the difference between cost price and ordinary prices, it may be convenient for some statistical purposes to regard it as a trading profit. It has been given at $£ 7,000,000$ in $1903^{2}$ and $£ 9,000,000$ by the Board of Trade, rising to £14,000,000 for 1913. ${ }^{2}$

## GROSS SCH. D ASSESSMENTS-SEQUENCE OF STATISTICS: TIME COMPARISON.

The following are the chief breaks in the series ${ }^{4}$ :-
(x) The Omission of Ircland, 1842 to 1852.

Although the fact is well known, it is sometimes forgotten when comparisons are being made.
An estimate of what the assessments would have been in this period has been made in Appendix III. for the purpose of the complete Table $\mathbf{D}$.

## (2) False "Gross Assessmente P (Schs, D and E) in the Years 1842 to 1867: Exemptions.

The "gross assessments" shown in the 1oth, 13th, and later Reports for this series of years differ completely in character from those shown for years subsequent to 1867 , although they are given in an uninterrupted series and are consequently used by all statisticians in direct comparison

[^104]with the later years. The key to the difference will be found in the analysis of the assessments in the Ist Report, and a footnote on p. 194 in the 13th Report. The first Report shows that in 1854-5 the amount given as gross assessment, Sch. D ( $£ 91,280,13 \mathrm{I}$ ), included $£ 11,591,324$ described as " amount of profits under $£$ roo exempted," while Sch. E ( $£ 4,554,855$ ) included $£ 234,795$ similarly exempt. The summary tables in the 13th Report for the years 1842 to 1867 have a note :-" In the year ended 5th April, 1868, the gross amount of property and profits assessed does not include, as in preceding years, incomes under $£ 100$ and exempt from tax." Unlike the exemptions under Schs. A and $B$, which together with the liable assessments cover the entire field, and complete the record for the whole country, these exemptions under Schs. D and E were a purely arbitrary figure, diminishing annually in amount as the non-liable cases surveyed by the Commissioners were gradually " weeded out " of the assessments. Obviously they do not represent the income of the non-liable class, but only a section of it that happened to be considered, lying subjacent to the limit of liability. From 1842-3 to 1862-3 the difference between "gross" and "net" is wholly attributable to this feature, and the " net assessments" therefore correspond with the present conception of "gross" (save for " insurance" and " expenses " allowances dealt with hereafter ${ }^{1}$ ), and have been substituted in Table Dr. From 1863-4 there were abatements which formed part of the difference between the "gross" and the " net" assessments (vide p. 498). After the elimination of the exemptions from the gross figures in 1867-8 a small sum still lingered on annually until 1874-5 in that section of Sch. D then described as "Public Companies, etc.," viz., the concerns under Sch. A, No. III., transferred to Sch. D in 1866-7, and referred to in the 28th Report, p. 294 (footnote). In 1868-9 it could only have been Er $^{2}, 000$, for in that year the difference between "gross" and " net" was $\{112,460,077$, of which abatements account for $£ 11,440,985$, and as it diminished it may safely be ignored eltogether. The actual sums included in the statistics,

[^105]which, by present standards, should be excluded as meaningless and misleading, are given in the following table ( $£$ thousands omitted) :-

| Year. | D. | E. | Year, | D. | E. | Year. | Total Difference, Sch. $D$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Exempt } \\ \text { anil } \end{gathered}$ Abated. | Total <br> Differ sch. E | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Exempt } \\ & \text { abvile } \\ & \text { Abated. } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Creat Britain oonly, |  |  | Urited Kingdom. |  |  | 1863 | $\underset{12,029}{e}$ | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} 8.520 \\ 7.600 \\ 5.1: 0 \end{array}\right.$ | $2$ | $\int_{289}^{2}$ |
| 1842 | \% 667 | ${ }_{18 x}^{8}$ |  | $\stackrel{8}{23.46}$ | 208 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1843 | 13.867 10,804 | ${ }_{80} 8$ | 1834 | 23,456 | 235 |  |  |  | 8,419 | 11,150 |
| 1844 | 80,966 | 113 | 1855 | 9.314 | 318 | 2864 |  |  | 1.680 | 260 |
| 8845 | 12,004 | 837 | 1856 | 8,952 | 274 | 1204 | 13.970 | ) 8,820 | 1,000 | 12430 |
| ${ }_{2846}$ | 10,469 | 164 | ${ }^{1857}$ | 6,115 | 222 | 1863 | 14,292 | [4,702 | 2,288 | 11.888 |
| 1847 | 10,680 | 120 307 | 1858 | 5.554 | 233 | res | 14,292 | ) $\begin{aligned} & 1.500 \\ & 4.670\end{aligned}$ |  | 12.980 |
| 1848 $\mathbf{1 8 4 9}$ | 13,078 15,504 | 207 165 | 1839 1860 | 6,438 5.135 | 243 | 1866 | 14,685 | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}4,870 \\ 10,210\end{array}\right.$ | 2049 | (1,800 |
| 1850 | 115,191 | 305 | 1861 | 5,632 | 228 |  |  | f 1089 |  |  |
| 2858 1858 | 12,201 $\mathbf{x 1}, 393$ | 167 300 | 186z | 5,124 | 265 | 1867 | 10,069 | 110.830 |  |  |

In the earlier years it will be seen that it amounted, under Sch. D, to 25 per cent. of the whole. It follows that to this extent all the comparisons made in numerous statistical writings are incorrect, because the full significance of the difference was not understood. It would be tedious to give examples of what was universal. The divisions estimated from 1863-4 to $1867-8$ have to agree with the requirements of the table on p. 3 r2.

Even with these corrections the assessments are not exactly comparable with later years, because from 1853-4 to 1873-4 they are exclusive of life assurance allowances under Sch. D, and of life assurance and expenses allowances under Sch. E.
(Of course, at the present time the gross assessments under Schs. $D$ and $E$ include a certain amount of "exempt income," but it consists mainly of repayments upon dividends, etc., received from companies, etc., assessed in full, or income upon which the title to exemption was proved after the assessments were completed. ${ }^{1}$ )

## (3) Allowances for Lifo Assurance (Schs. D and E) and Expenses (Sch. E), Xears 1853-4 to 1874-5.

These allowances were first granted by law in 1853-4; they do not appear in the statistics until $1874-5$. The ngth Report gives a tabulated statement of life insurance, " the particulars of which have not hitherto been given by our statistical accounts." ${ }^{1}$ It would have been thought that they must certainly be included in the above-detailed " gross assessments," and form part of the difference between the "gross" and " net " in the table given. It seemed so unlikely that, while the meaningless figures of "exemptions " were carefully included in the statistics, these allowances should be as carefully deducted before the figures were classified, that the conclusion has been accepted only after careful consideration of the evidence. ${ }^{\text {a }}$
(4) Composition for the Assossmont (Sch. D), 1842 to 1859.

The tax was first levied for three years from I842, again for three years from 1845, and again from 1848 . In 1851 and 1852 it was renewed annually, but in 1853 it was proposed to continue it definitely for four years. In the first Act provision was made for "compounding" under Sch. D: by an extre payment of 5 per cent. upon the duty each year the assessment as computed for the first year was repeated each year. There is very little direct information available as to the extent to which this provision was used, except

[^106]that contained in the minutes of evidence before the Income
Tax Committee, $1852^{1}$ :-

| Year. | Number of Persons. | Duty Paid. | Assessments. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1842-3 | 2,262 | $\underset{110,332}{f}$ | $\stackrel{f}{3,603,000}$ |
| 1843-4 | 2,258 | 110,175 | 3,598,000 |
| 1844-5 | 2,250 | 109,990 | 3,593,000 |
| 1845-6 | 2,561 | 145,444 | 4,749,000 |
| 1846-7 | 2.557 | 145.362 | 4,747,000 |
| 1847-8 | 2,541 | 144,808 | 4,729,000 |
| 1848-9 | 1,62I | 93,249 | 3,045,000 |
| 1849-50 | 1,62I | 93,249 | 3,045,000 |

The amount of the assessments in the last column has been computed from column 3. One twenty-first part of the total duty is deducted as the 5 per cent. composition, and the balance computed in terms of assessment at $7 d$. in the $\mathcal{f}$.

It was obviously to the advantage of all concerns whose profits were rising rapidly, if the results could be sufficiently foreseen, to compound. But in any case the risk was small; for if the year 1839 to be dropped out of the average for the 1843-4 assessment showed a poor result, it would be fairly certain that the normal new average would rise considerably: a rise of 15 per cent. for the two years 1843-4 and 1844-5 together would have justified composition. If, therefore, the most " promising " cases were retarded by composition in the second and third years (on each imposition), the aggregate would be depressed below the true figure in those years and jump suddenly upon the new assessment and fresh composition. The triennial periods $1842-4$ and $1848-50$ are interesting examples.' On the other band, widespread practice of composition in the hope of prosperous years, which was falsified by events, would tend to sustain the figures above their true level. The period $1845-7$ illustrates this. The remaining years of composition, 1853 to 1859 ,

[^107]present no fluctuations for adjustment. With the annual reimposition of the tax the provision became obsolete, ${ }^{1}$ and it was formally repealed by the Statute Law Revision Act.
From the Ist Report may be gathered the extent of composition 1853-4 to $\mathbf{1 8 5 6 - 7}$, as the duty indicates:-

while in 1858 -9, when there was no differential duty, the excess of duty over and above $5 d$. in the $£$ on the net assessment is due to the inclusion of compounding duty of 5 per cent., and accounts for composition upon $£ 2,888,640$.
The preceding table may be carried down to $\mathbf{1 8 5 9 - 6 0}$ as follows (assessments compounded) :-

| 1850-I | $\underset{3,045,000}{f}$ | 1855-6 | - 3,025, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 1856-7 | 2,9 |
| -4 | 3,079,000 | 1858-9 | 2,889,000 |
| 854-5 | 3,079,000 | 1859-60 | 1,832,00 |

These estimates are arrived at partly as above and partly from " residual duty." ${ }^{2}$

The r33rd section reduction ${ }^{\text {a }}$ did not apply to assessments under composition, and whatever the loss may have been there was no repayment. ${ }^{\text {. There were numerous cases of }}$ great loss at the end of 1847 , and as the composition did not expire till 1848 the original assessment was paid. ${ }^{5}$ In only two instances, in cases of death and insolvency, were the assessments revised." In the city of London " the great majority of the assessments, all the large assessments," were made under composition; " almost all the great banking and
${ }^{2}$ Senior, "Handbook to Income Tax Lav and Practice ${ }^{30} 1868$.
"Vide p. 953 on "Clessification of Assessments."

- The night to revise an assessment by bringing a poor result into the average at the end of the year of assessinent:
- Income Tax Report, 1852, Os. 994-996.

Ibid. Os. 991-994.

- 1bid, Qer 1,253-7.
mercantile establishments compounded for three years," and these assessments were more strictly inquired into. ${ }^{1}$
The reason for the decrease in 1848 -9 was the fact that the 1845 assessment was low, and the manufacturers, anticipating an increase, preferred to compound to a greater extent than in $1848 .{ }^{2}$
In making an attempt to adjust the figures of the gross assessments to allow for the effect of composition on the foregoing lines it is prima facie probable that the true figures lie between the official figures and figures which represent an even progression from fixed point to fixed point, as indicated below :-
( 000 omitted.)

*Vide p. 255.
t The actual figure given officially is $\mathbf{4} 57.663 .000$, bat this mas, for administrative reasons, too high (as in the analogons case of the first year in Ireland, 1st Report, vide $p$. 505). The tunusually high amount in schedule of discharges is sufficient evidence of the fact. One half of the excess of the discharge schedule in 1842 over eucceeding years has bees asigned to Sch. $D$ and the total corrected accordingly.
(5) The Exclusion of Iroland, 1842-1852 : Effoct apoz Statistice for Great Britain.
The tax from 1842 to 1852 provided for the taxation of income received by residents in Great Britain from securities

[^108]and possessions in Ireland in the same clauses which provided for taxing such income from countries abroad. These references to Ireland were necessarily repealed as soon as the tax was extended to that country itself ; and what had hitherto been assessed in Great Britain as income from overseas became assessed at the source in Ireland. Rents from Enniskillen received by a London resident were assessed under Sch. D in England prior to 1853 ; after that date they were assessed under Sch. A in Ireland. Hence for purposes of comparability the figures for Great Britain prior to 1853 should be reduced by the amount of the assessments on income from Ireland; and this is especially necessary if an estimate is made for Ireland (1842-52) to complete the comparison for the United Kingdom, otherwise this income would be included twice over.

The only clues to the necessary facts are Parliamentary Papers for the years 1848-9 to 1852-3 ${ }^{1}$ :-

| Income from Ireland. | 1848-9. | 1849-5a. | 1850-1. | 285x-2. | 1852-3. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sch. D. : Securities and possessions <br> Sch. C: Dividends from Irish funds ${ }^{*}$ <br> Sch. E: Selarice and pensions $\dagger$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} 6 \\ 734,352 \\ 106,309 \\ 82,732 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 695.347 \\ 214.368 \\ 80.575 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \\ 663.769 \\ 105,098 \\ 81,017 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \& \\ 699,676 \\ 102,720 \\ 84,822 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 670,719 \\ 104,895 \\ 85,680 \end{gathered}$ |

Material variation during other years is very improbable, and the required corrections have been made on this basis.
(6) Change in the Exemption Limit, 1858.

The exemption limit was lowered from $£ 150$ to $£ 100$, and thus many assessments came into the " gross " statistics, in the manner explained in Appendix I., where the effect upon the totals is estimated at $£[11,000,000$ for Great Britain for Table Dr.
H. C. $270-1850$ and H. C. 194-1854
(7) Change in the Exemption Limit, 1876-7.

The exemption limit was raised to $£ 150$ again, and the effect was that gross assessments to the extent of $£ 20,000,000$ $\pm £ 500,000$ were excluded.

- (8) Change in the Exemption Limit, 1894-5.

This is also dealt with in Appendix I., and the effect estimated at a loss of $£ 8,800,000 \pm £ 700,000$ for Table D.

This change should not be confused with the allowance of abatements, which do not affect gross assessments.
W. H. Price associates the 1894 exemption change with the 1898-9 abatement extensions in comparing gross income, Sch. D, and makes the same comment against the two years (" The British Income Tax," Quaterly Journal of Economics, February, 1906).
W. H. Mallock compares $189 x-2$ and 1902-3 for percentage increase in consideration of unemployment, and ignores this break (" Expatriation of Capital," Nineteenth Century, March, 1906).

## (9) Sch. D Assessments : Inclusion of Railways, ete., after 1865-6.

Up to 1865-6 the assessments on quarries, mines, ironworks, fisheries, canals, railways, gasworks, etc., were included under Sch. A. In 1866-7 (when the amount was $\left.£^{3} 3,600,000\right)$ they were transferred to Sch. $D$, the total of which increased from $£ 134,000,000$ to $£ 173,000,000$ in the year. The statistics have been fully dealt with under Sch. A, ${ }^{1}$ and the transfer is shown in Table D.

The figures under Sch. $\mathbf{D}$ are sometimes quoted for a series of years without any attention being drawn to this transfer, and are therefore misleading, e.g., in evidence of the prosperity of British trade-" Fiscal Dictionary," p. 141 (Sir L. Chiozza Money).
G. Howell ("Capital and Labour," 1878, p. 41I) quoted figures for 1861 and 1875 as evidence of growth of trade, without drawing attention to this break
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## (Io) Unassossed Duty.

In the 45th Report it was explained that " the figures of gross income as given in previous reports have not covered quite the whole of the ground . . . for they have been confined to the gross income brought into assessment, and have been commonly described under the term 'gross assessments': and they have thus left annually out of account some two to five millions of income on which tax is collected without regular assessment. For in the course of collecting the tax it occurs that errors and omissions in assessments are discovered, and of these a considerable number are adjusted, with consent of the persons liable, by payment of the tax found to be due, and without formal correction of the original assessments." The description was accordingly altered from " gross assessments " to " gross income " or "gross income reviewed." It will be found on a comparison of the two systems that in practice the whole of the income unassessed is added to the gross Sch. D assessments, though presumably some of it relates to Sch. E, or even, in the case of the correction of abatements, etc., wrongly allowed, to Schs. A and B. But undoubtedly the largest proportion relates to Sch. D, and any error arising in this way is negligible. The amount added was as follows (thousands omitted) ${ }^{1}$ :-

|  | ¢ |  | t |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1891-2 | - 7.404 | 1896-7. | 4,295 |
| 1892-3 | 5.474 | 1897-8 | 5.133 |
| 1893-4 | 4.79 I | r898-9 | 4,096 |
| 1894-5 | - 3.840 | 1899-1900 | 3,712 |
| 1895-6 | - 4.937 |  |  |

No information is given in the Board's reports since this change.
The actual corresponding figures for earlier years are not ascertainable, but in the 44th Report and prior thereto the actual $d u l y$ recovered is added to the duty charged in order that the "net produce" and "net produce per penny"

[^109]of the tax may be ascertained. It is, however, not given alone, but with other duties under the title " Receipts for Unassessed Duty and for Recoveries from Default Schedules of Prior Years," and the details under this heading may be seen right back to $\mathbf{1 8 4 2 .}{ }^{1}$

## (II) The Transfer or " Drain " from Sch. D to Sch. E.

(I) General,-As a consequence of the legal distinction between Sch. D and Sch. E a constant drain from the former to the latter is going on, the net effect of which is that a series of gross assessments for Sch. D always shows less than the true increase, and a series for Sch. E shows more than the true increase. The amount of the average annual transfer is small relatively to the total Sch. D assessments, and does not vitiate time comparisons to a serious extent, but it is very considerable relatively to the total Sch. E assessments, and no inferences should be drawn from the latter without taking it into consideration. The following case is typical of the way in which it arises. An established business, having six employees liable to tax, with salaries (which for simplicity we will assume have been fixed for some years) aggregating to $£ 2,000$, is turned into a private limited company. The profits of course remain under Sch. D, but all the salaries go over to Sch. E; the $£ 2,000$ is a mere transfer, and serves to depress the real growth under Sch. D and to exaggerate the real growth under Sch. E. The safest course, for time comparisons, is to aggregate the two Schedules where possible.

Since the number of established businesses being registered as companies is considerable, the amount of this drain is important, but there is no way of determining it exactly. We can, however, obtain some idea of the limits within which it must fall.

The following table shows, from 1898-9-(a) the total Sch. E assessments other than Government cfficials; (b) the total of the assessments on "Employments" under Sch. D

[^110]which have been classified separately since 1898 ; while (c) gives the total of the two representing all employees liable to tax, and the last column shows, for comparison, the number of companies standing on the Board of Trade Register:-

| Year. | (a) Sch. E <br> notiacluding <br> Government <br> Oficials). | (b) Sch. D <br> on <br> Employ- <br> ments. | (c) <br> Total <br> Employ- <br> ments | Number of <br> Companies |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1898-9$ | 45,060 | 21,874 | 66,934 | 27,969 |
| $1899-1900$ | 49,088 | 21,840 | 70,928 | 29,730 |
| $1900-1$ | 52,762 | 22,452 | 75,214 | 31,429 |
| $1901-2$ | 55,880 | 22,541 | 78,421 | 33,259 |
| $1902-3$ | 59,564 | 22,373 | 81,937 | 35,965 |
| $1903-4$ | 63,449 | 23,049 | 86,498 | 37,287 |
| $1904-5$ | 67,049 | 23,204 | 90,253 | 39,616 |
| $1905-6$ | 70,027 | 23,402 | 93,429 | 40,995 |
| $1906-7$ | 73,531 | 23,751 | 97,282 | 43,038 |
| $1907-8$ | 80,117 | 25,279 | 105,396 | 45,304 |
| $1908-9$ | 85,177 | 27,069 | 112,246 | 46,474 |
| $1909-10$ | 88,981 | 26,736 | 115,717 | 51,787 |
| $1910-11$ | 94,005 | 26,929 | 120,934 | 53,707 |
| $1913-4$ | 116,979 | 31,191 | 148,170 | -2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

On the reasonable assumption that apart from existing businesses being continually registered as companies the number of additional employees and increased salaries in private businesses would tend to be similar in proportion to that in companies, we may say that, but for the transfer we are discussing, the percentage increase of total employments in any period would be approximately the percentage increase for the two separate sections also, i.e., the section assessed Sch. D and that assessed Sch. E. The amount by which the facts deviate from this result may be taken as indicative of the effects of the annual "drain." Thus the increase in total employments between 1898-9 and rgio-II is 80 per cent., but Sch. E shows 109 per cent. and Sch. D only 23 per cent. Now if Sch. E has really increased only 80 per cent. it would be for 19ro-II $881,108,000$ only.
instead of $£ 94,005,000$, and the balance $£ 12,897,000$ represents the " drain" in twelve years, or rather over $£ 1,000,000$ per annum. It is unlikely that the rate of increase in new companies (not being existing businesses) and in bona fide salary advances for old companies is less than the rate of increase for private businesses, so that this calculation gives the maximum amount of the transfer. But there have been other disturbing factors since 1907 (dealt with below), and it will be safer to deal only with the period 1898-9 to 1906-7, eight years. On this basis the maximum annual transfer is one-eighth of $£ 7,966,000$, or just under $£ \mathrm{I}, 000,000$. During these eight years public companies have increased 54 per cent. and Sch. E assessments 63 per cent.
Effect of Employers' Declarations of Wages Paid.-It will be observed that a recent rise in Sch. Demployments has succeeded to a period almost of stagnation; this has not been because the transfer to Sch. E has been less in operation, but in consequence of the Finance Act of 1907, which made it compulsory apon employers to furnish details of salary, bonuses, etc., paid to all liable employees. As a result the assessments rose by $£ 3,318,000$ in two years, or nearly twice the amount of the increase of the preceding eight years, but the effect was soon spent and, the " drain" to Sch. E once more asserting itself, the Sch. D employments remained practically stationary until the recent trade boom.
(2) Effect of Differentiation since 1907.-The private trader assessed under Sch. D has the benefit of the compromise which treats interest on his own working capital employed in his business as "earned income," but in no case are the profits of a limited liability company allowed the lower rate. Hence upon turning his business into a private company he takes out his profit, after charging his salary as an expense, in the form of dividends, and since only the salary is assessed under Sch. E at the earned income rate and the dividends must pay at the highest rate, his new position compares unfavourably with the old. It will be readily understood that a tendency is set up to take out as much of
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the profit as possible in the form of salary, thereby reducing the dividend, to increase the sum chargeable under Sch. E and reduce the sum chargeable under Sch. D. ${ }^{1}$
(12) Wear and Tear Allowances : Comparisons before and aftor 1878.

This " break " is fully explained on p. 178, where the facts relating to comparisons were more conveniently set out in connection with the present interpretation of the figures. The necessary adjustments of the earlier statistics have been made in Table D.
(13) Ireland, 1006-7 : Land Purchase Scheme.

This administrative " break" is only of importance because it is considerable in relation to Irish figures, and has given rise to erroneous inferences. (The increase in Sch. D assessments was over $£ 1,400,000$.)
"The gross income of England and Wales for the year to the 3rst March, 19ro, reviewed by the several bodies of Income Tax Commissioners, was $6877.888,487$, or 86.8 per cent. of the gross income of the United Kingdom. It is instructive to note that Scotland does not appear to be increasing ber income at such a rapid rate as England and Ireland.
" For the year to the 3rst March, 1910, there was a decrease of $\{3.184,024$ in the amount of the gross assessment for Scotland. which compared with an increase of $\{3,893.638$ in the case of England and an increase of $\{454,805$ in the case of Ireland. Moreover, during the ten years ended the 3rst March, 1910, there was an increase for the United Kingdom of $\mathbf{6 2 . 4 1 5 , 0 0 0}$ in the gross assessments to income derived from business cancerns, professions, and employments under Sch. D. This increase was distributed as follows:-

Amonet of Incrense. Per Cont.

"These figures show pretty clearly that during the period named Ireland has progressed at a much more rapid rate

[^111]than either of her partners."-Edgar Crammond, "England's Economic Position," Nineteenth Century, March, 1912.

Mr. Erskine Childers refers to the above as a "glaring instance of error," and points out that there is an official paragraph below the table to the effect that the Irish increase is illusory; "it includes annuities (in lieu of rent) on purchased land, transferred in the accounts of the Commissioners since 1906-7 to Sch. D. A corresponding amount has been written off from Sch. A " (" The Real Issue in Ireland," Nineteenth Century, April, 1912).

> Table DI.-United Kingdom-Grose Sch. D Assessments (in million $£$.
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Table Dr-comtimed.

| Year. | Official gross Figures hitherto genorally used. | True com Sorich, if E Limit he $\$ 150$ thro | arable amption been ghout. | True comparable Series, if Exemption Limit had been E160 throughout. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | + or - |  | or - |
| 1871 1872 | 202.9 228.9 | 191.4 214.2 |  | 186.6 208.8 |  |
| 1873 | 249.9 | 235.6 | $2 \cdot 0$ | $208 \cdot 8$ 229 | 2.4 |
| 1874 | 266.9 | 254.5 |  | $248 \cdot \mathrm{x}$ |  |
| 1875 | 272.0 | 268.2 | $\cdot 5$ | $254 \cdot 6$ | -8 |
| 1876 | 256.9 | 262.6 |  | 256.0) |  |
| 1877 | $260 \cdot 6$ | 266.0 |  | 259.3 |  |
| 1878 | 257.4 | 261.2 |  | 254.6 |  |
| 1879 1880 | 349 359.5 | 255.5 |  | 249.0 |  |
| 1880 | 255.4 | 259.0 |  | $252 \cdot 5$ |  |
| 1881 | $267 \cdot 4$ | $272 \cdot 4$ |  | 265.5 |  |
| 1889 | $279 \cdot 1$ | $284 \cdot 7$ |  | $277 \cdot 5$ |  |
| 1883 | 291.3 | $298 \cdot 3$ |  | $290 \cdot 8$ | $\cdot 3$ |
| 2884 | 292.5 | 298.7 |  | $291 \cdot 2$ |  |
| 1885 | 289.4 | $295 \cdot 7$ |  | 288.2 |  |
| 1886 | 285.9 | $293 \cdot 3$ |  | 285.8 |  |
| 1887 | 28.5 | 2974 |  | 289.9 |  |
| 1888 1880 | $302 \cdot 7$ | $310 \cdot 2$ |  | 302.4 |  |
| 1889 | 325.3 | 331.4 |  | 323.15 |  |
| 1890 | 351.6 | 35718 |  | 348-2 | -2 |
| 1891 | $362 \cdot 3$ | $371 \cdot \mathrm{x}$ |  | 361.8 | 2 |
| 1892 1893 | 360.3 358.8 | 3690 356.6 |  | 359.6 | - 1 |
| 1893 1894 | 358.8 336.7 | 356.6 349.3 |  | 3473 340.6 |  |
| 1895 | $35 \times 17$ | 365 |  | 3456 356 |  |
| 1896 | 372.8 | 386.8 | \ |  |  |
| 1897 | $396 \cdot 8$ | 418.7 |  | 401.3 |  |
| 1898 | 412.4 | 427.3 |  | 416.5 |  |
| 1899 | $432 \cdot 3$ | 447-5 |  | 436.2 |  |
| 1900 | 466 | 4775 |  | 466-2 |  |
| 1901 | 4877 | 501.0 | $\varepsilon$ |  |  |
| 1908 | 4916 | 504.2 |  | 498.6 |  |
| 1903 | 5024 | 514.7 |  | 508-4 |  |
| 1904 | 5046 | 518.9 5218 |  | $50^{6} 6$ |  |
| 1905 | $503 \cdot 7$ | 521.8 |  | 503\%7 |  |
| 1906 | 518.7 | 5320 |  | 518.7 |  |
| 1907 | 543.7 | 5577 |  | 5437 |  |
| 1908 | 5056 558.6 | $580-2$ 5730 | 3 | 565 |  |
| 1910 | 583.3 | 593.3 |  | 550.3 583 |  |
| 1912 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1912 | 628.6 | 6447 |  | 688. |  |
| 1913 | 6706 | $63_{7} 7$ |  | 6706 |  |

Table D2.-Amounts for the United Kingdom (Great Britain to 1852-3) (£000 omitted).
(Partly estimated prior to 1861-2.)

| Year. | Quarries. | Mines. | Ironworks. | Canals. | Railways. | Gasworks. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1814-15 | 70 | 679 | 638 |  |  |  |
| 1842-3 | 240 | 2,081 | 559 | 1.307 | 2.599 | 400 |
| 1845-6 | 262 | 2,213 | 923 | 1,26I | 4.607 | 639 |
| 1847-8 | 282 | 2,280 | 900 | 2,110 | 5,871 | 636 |
| 1848-9 | 333 | 2,434 | 999 | 1.173 | 6.340 | 710 |
| 1849-50 | 315 | 2,410 | 915 | 1, 170 | 5.934 | 725 |
| 1850-1 | 295 | 2.390 | 870 | 1,130 | 6,208 | 740 |
| 185土-2 | 291 | 2,374 | 805 | 1,016 | 7,091 | 760 |
| 1852-3 | 315 | 2,340 | 833 | 999 | 7.876 | 762 |
| 1853-4 | 378 | 2,851 | 1,286 | 906 | 8.932 | 814 |
| 1854-5 | 327 | 2,937 | £,378 | 901 | 9.581 | 824 |
| 18556 | 324 | 3,036 | 1,427 | 900 | 10,029 | 831 |
| 1856-7 | 324 | 3.06I | I.459 | 909 | 10,72I | 827 |
| 1857-8 | 420 | 3,882 | $\mathbf{~} \mathbf{1}, 88 \mathbf{1}$ | 895 | 12,447 | 1,002 |
| 1858-9 | 424 | 3.950 | 1,777 | 873 | 11,646 | 1,041 |
| 1859-60 | 418 | 4,084 | 1,517 | 868 | 12.783 | 1,092 |
| 2860-1 | 420 | 4,269 | 1,619 | 949 | 13.935 | 1,186 |
| 1865-2 | 440 | 4,436 | 1,080 | 967 | 14,814 | 1.318 |
| 1862-3 | 444 | 4,516 | 1,021 | 938 | 15,125 | 2,392 |
| 1863-4 | 461 | 4.572 | 1,130 | 936 | 15.455 | 1,436 |
| 1864-5 | 590 | 4.829 | 1.798 | 900 | 16,576 | 1,849 |
| 1865-6 | 606 | 5,080 | 1,840 | 962 | 18,537 | 1,892 |
| 1866-7 | 575 | 5,612 | 2.398 | 823 | 18,878 | 2,151 |
| 1867-8 | 641 | 5.745 | 2,014 | 743 | 18,83土 | 1,991 |
| 1868-9 | 646 | 5.480 | 1,911 | 714 | 19.780 | 1,971 |
| $1869-70$ | 697 | 5.544 5.802 | 2,019 | 747 | 20.718 | 2,157 |
| 1870-1 | 719 | 5.802 | 2,701 | 774 | 21,956 | 2,605 |
| 1871-2 | 756 | 6.335 | 3.141 | 753 | 23,129 | 2,667 |
| 1872-3 | 763 | 7,283 | 4.762 | 790 | 25.440 | 2.797 |
| 1873-4 | 814 | 10,546 | 7.218 | 755 | 26,035 | 2,666 |
| $1874-5$ $1875-6$ | 916 | 14,108 14.614 | 7.265 3.856 | 1,007 | 26,215 26.117 | 2,630 3,030 |
| 1875-6 | 952 | 24,614 | 3.856 | 2,865 | 26,117 | 3,030 |
| $1876-7$ $1877-9$ | 1,096 | 14,091 | 2.795 | 3012 | 27,796 | 3.434 |
| $1877-8$ $1878-9$ | 1,348 1,356 | 12,900 10,088 | 2.315 | 2,993 | 28,291 | 3.923 |
| 1878-9 | 1.356 | 10,088 | 1.934 | 3.125 | 28.959 | 3.973 |
| $1879-80$ | [ 150 | 7,501 6,667 | E,721 | 3,189 | 29,368 | 4.175 |
| 1880- | 926 | 6,667 | 2,179 | 3,196 | 29,131 | 4,505 |
| 188r-2 | 923 | 6.728 | 2.905 | 3.393 | 31,882 | 4,640 |
| 1882-3 | 880 | 6.734 | 2,963 | 3.292 | 32,075 | 4,687 |
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Tably D2-continued.

| Year. | Quarries. | Mines. | Iron- works. | Cenals. | Railways. | Gasworks. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1883-4 | 914 | 7.065 | 3.017 | 3.365 | 33.053 | 4,879 |
| 1884-5 | 933 | 7.603 | 2,265 | 3.546 | 33,270 | 5,026 |
| 1883-6 | 863 | 7.519 | 1,786 | 3.394 | 32,960 | 4,875 |
| 1886-7 | 823 | 7.487 | x,503 | 3,374 | 32,376 | 4,695 |
| 1887-8 | 816 | 7.152 | 1,216 | 3.226 | 32,685 | 4,68x |
| 1888-9 | 834 | 7.290 | 1,399 | 3,172 | 33.461 | 5.133 |
| 1889-90 | 876 | 7.452 | 1,634 | 3,219 | 34.643 | 5.402 |
| 1890-2 | 933 | 8,808 | 3,105 | 3,491 | 36,445 | 5,120 |
| 1891-a | 986 | 10,872 | 2,979 | 3.43 I | 36,477 | 4,608 |
| 1892-3 | 1,000 | 12,047 | 2,089 | 3.472 | 36,266 | 4,506 |
| 1893-4 | 1.043 | 12.322 | 1,832 | 3.494 | 35.787 | 4.771 |
| 1894-5 | 8,069 | 12,676 | r,834 | 3.268 | 34.355 | 5.077 |
| 1893-6 | 1,143 | 12,278 | 1,934 | 3.561 | 36,465 | 5.959 |
| 1896-7 | 1,208 | 10,509 | 1,840 | 3.434 | 37.54 I | 5.529 |
| 1897-8 | 1,362 | 9,078 | 2,556 | 3.626 | 39.715 | 5.583 |
| 1898-9 | 8,467 | 8,901 | 3.008 | 3.506 | 40,034 | 5.636 |
| 1899-00 | 1.582 | 9.492 | 3.212 | 3.477 | 39,358 | 6,053 |
| 1900-1 | 1,064 | 12,032 | 5.380 | 3.426 | 40,674 | 6,362 |
| 1901-2 | 1.633 | 17.642 | 6,600 | 3.236 | 38,7xI | 5,899 |
| 1902-3 | 1.544 | 20,259 | 4,021 | 3.392 | 38,060 | 5.469 |
| 1903-4 | 1.687 | 21,194 | 3.415 | 3.516 | 40,607 | 6,776 |
| 1904-5 | 1.729 | 21.236 | 3.135 | 3.608 | 41,21I | 7.607 |
| 1903-6 | 1,696 | 20,000 | 2,084 | 3,847 | 41,242 | 7,414 |
|  | 8.520 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19078 | 1.400 | 16.400 | 4.500 | 4.200 | 42,689 | 7.600 |
| 1903-9 | 1,356 | 16,614 | 5101 3.850 | 4.243 | 43.360 | 7.834 |
| $1909-10$ $1910-12$ | 1,205 | 18,460 19.343 | 3.850 3.233 | 4,046 | 41.765 43.439 | 8,385 |
| 1980-11 | 1,215 | 19.343 | 3,233 | 4.172 | 43.439 | 8,156 |
| 1911512 | 8.607** | 19.685 | 3.429 | 4,182 | 46,100 | 8.793 |
| 1912-13 | 2,645* | 20,899 | 3.476 | 4.358 | 47.565 | 9.484 |
| 1915-14 | $2.57{ }^{\circ}$ | 19,612 | 4.172 | 4.729 | 45.701 | 9.115 |

- Now includes Marlrets, Tolls, etc.


## Sch. D Assessments-Classification by Source of Income.

The official tables give a classification of the assessments according to certain sources, viz., railways in the United Kingdom, mines, gasworks, quarries, ete., with sub-classification showing where the assessments are made, and the persons or bodies assessed in each case. It would puzzle any ane approaching the subject for the first time to account for the choice of concerns which are thus separately considered. He may be seeking for information as to the profits of
banking or the cotton trade and has to rest satisfied wi $h$ very precise details of cemeteries and salt springs. The explanation is simple. These concerns, known as " concerns" in No. III., Sch. A, were originally assessed as propertics, under Sch. A, upon their prefits, and in the classification under Sch. A, being of such a distinct character, they were naturally kept separate. This practice began under the old income tax, and was repeated after 1842 . When the transfer to Sch. D took place in 1866 the division was continued, and has remained to the present day. In the last two or three years the minor concerns have not been detailed so minutely. Some of the early parliamentary returns classified Sch. A by parishes and divisions, so that profits in many instances could not have been kept as very confidential information.

Businesses, Professions, etc., not otherwise detailed (including Salaries of Employees)-This main class covers the whole of the assessments made under case I. and case II. of Sch. D on trades, etc., on the average of the three preceding years.

The procedure in assessments and appeals under Sch. D has been described by official witnesses :-
S. C. on Income Tax, 1851-2, Qs. 1,517, etc.
S. C. on Inland Revenue and Customs, 1862-3.
I. T. Committees, 1905 and 1906.

Details of the assessments on employees other than public cfficials are given separately.

Up to the 45th Report the classification had been divided into "Trades and Professions" and "Other Public Companies,' and these were then merged into one. At the same time it was made possible to see the aggregate of all public companies, inclading mines, gasworks, etc. ${ }^{1}$

Railways in the United Kingdom-The number of assessments and the total sum assessed are given for the four territorial divisions. The sum assessed is generally less (by about 5 per cent.) than the "net receipts" returned in the Board of Trade figures, and given in the Statistical Abstract, the difference being due to certain charges not included in

[^112]"working expenditure," which are allowed as expenses for income tax. The basis of assessment is the preceding year's profits.

Mines.-These represent only the mines situated in the United Kingdom; foreign mines come under the general heading. As mines are assessable where they are situate, the division into countries is rather more significant than usual, while details as to ownership by persons, firms, etc., are not without interest. As the basis of assessment is the average of the preceding five years, it is difficult to bring the figures into precise comparison with other statistics relating to mines. The 56th Report gives a county classification of coal mines, which aggregate to $£ 18,348,000$ out of $£ 19,68 \mathrm{r}, 000$ for all mines, showing that the other mines form but a small part of the total. These county details are not usually given.
It should be noted that all royalties are included in these assessments ; even when losses are sustained, ${ }^{1}$ the royalties and dead rents paid are charged, so that the assessments represent more than the "profits" of the trade (except so far as the allowances for exhaustion of capital expenditure in pit-sinking, etc., may not be allowable ${ }^{9}$ ). These royalties have been estimated at $£ 6,000,000$, but they were recently stated in the House of Commons to amount to $88,000,000 .{ }^{3}$ The Mineral Rights Duty statistics for 19r3-14 were :-

|  | Cases. | E |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| England and Wales | 9,105 | 305,190 |
| Scotland | 1,383 | 46,632 |
| Total | 10,488 | I, |

which at is. in the $£$ equals $£ 7.036,000$ in royalties paid, or royalty equivalents taken by the owners.

It is natural, of course, that these statistics should have been well utilised in the recent controversy on profits and wages in the coal industry.

1 Vide Sir Algernon West's evidence before R. C. on Mining Royalties, 1890, Qs. 3.559-3.58a

Vide P. 194.
: There have been many extravagant estimates W. R. Sorley (S. J., 1889), on "Mining Royaltice" quoted W. Abrahar's estimato of \& $36,000,000$ per annum.
"As this (the assessment total) includes royalties and profits of iron, tin, lead, ganister, and other mines, as well as coal pits, and also the income from coke ovens and various by-product plants and even from wagons in some cases, it will be seen that the income from actual coal mining is likely to be something less than $£ 14,000,000$ a year, or about is. a ton" (Economist, 23 rd May, 1914.)

The gross profits, less $£ 6,000,000$ royalties, $=£ 9,000,000$, or $8 \frac{1}{d}$. per ton. But depreciation of leases has to come off, requiring a redemption fund of $\mathrm{I} \frac{1}{2} d$. to $2 d$. per ton. "So the landlords, as royalty owners, receive nearly as much from the working of the mines as the masters who provide all the rijks."-Sir A. B. Markham, "Coal Strike," Quarterly Revieto, April, 1912.

Mr. W. H. Mallock compares the gross profits with total selling value of coal sold from 1895 to 1909, establishing a general percentage of 16 to 17 , and states that these profits include "cost of upkeep of fixed capital," which is true only to a limited extent, viz., original coal values and cost of shafts, for the rolling stock and general machinery are subject to the renewal and depreciation allowances. The selling values are not equated to the equivalent profits by bringing them into quinquennial averages, and the royalty values are not distinguished (" Statistical Monograph," No. 20).

It is of value for some purposes to consider what proportion of the total mining profit is regarded as rateable. Two Parliamentary returns have given figures for 1877 and $1890^{1}$ in unions, and the totals are as follows:-

England and Wales ( $£ 000$ ).

| - | Poor Rate Valdes, 1877 . |  |  | Poor Rate Values, $\mathbf{1 8 9 0}$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coal <br> Iron <br> Other mines | $\begin{array}{r} \text { No. } \\ 2,688 \\ 386 \\ 593 \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered}\text { G. E. R } \\ \text { 3.394 } \\ \text { 521 } \\ \text { 211 }\end{gathered}\right.$ | R. V. 2,777 438 195 | $\begin{array}{r} \text { No. } \\ 2,104 \\ 240 \\ 555 \end{array}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{gathered} \text { G. E. R } \\ 3.602 \\ 363 \\ 308 \end{gathered}\right.$ | R. $V$ V 3.086 344 298 |
| Total | 3.667 | 4,126 | 3,410 | 2,899 | 4.273 | 3.728 |

For further details, see H. C. 179-1899. Coal mining statistics showing the amount remaining each year 1886 to 1900 for profits and expenses, except wages. Also H. C. 197 -1903 (wages and profits in coal mining, 1901 and 1902) ; H. C. 142-1913 (certain mining royalties in Scotland).
${ }^{2}$ H. C. $457-1877$, and H. C. $405-1890$

Clasworkn.-These are assessed on the preceding year. The great bulk belongs, of course, to public companies and local authorities, but about a hundred small private " gasworks " are also included. ${ }^{1}$

Ironwork.-_" Broadly speaking, the figures may be said to include the profits of that section of the iron trade which is concerned with the smelting of the ore, whether such profits arise solely from smelting or from smelting carried on conjointly with other industries." The assessments are based on the profits of the preceding year. The classification into persons, firms, etc., ceased after the 55th Report.

There is sometimes a difficulty in drawing a definite distinction between iron mines (five years' average), ironworks (one year's basis), and general iron and steel works and manufactories (three years' average), because some large composite concerns cover the whole field. These figures are therefore far from being a complete record of the smelting industry. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

The 1895-6 to rgor-2 assessments are quoted, as for " iron and steel works," against protection in the staple trades, by G. Barnes, "Labour and Protection," p. 245.

Used, though uncertain in character, by Giffen as evidence before R. C. on Trade Depression (Q. 840).

Used in evidence before the Tariff Reform Commission. Also statistics, 1897-1902, for anti-dumping arguments, by J. J. Shaw, Journal of Social and Statistical Inquiry Society of Ireland, 1904.

Waterwork.-Basis of assessment: profits of preceding year. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ This calls for little comment, except that the description is rather grandiose for some of the items included. There are 691 cases belonging to "persons," and these

[^113]include small payments for water supply, water rents, etc., which do not greatly affect the total amount of the assessments.

Canals, Docks, etc.-Basis of assessment: profits of preceding year. These were for many years described as "canals," but they include docks, levels, and other similar concerns.

Quarrios.-Basis of assessment : profits of preceding year. The analysis given annually shows that nearly 3,000 out of 4,000 assessments are for " persons." The scope is wide, and covers slate, limestone, chalk, granite, gravel, sand, etc. It includes numerous small rents and royalties, but is not a good representation of the total profits from quarrying, because in many cases of gravel and sand pits for which rents are paid the profits obtained fall below the exemption limit, or the pits are not worked for sale or profit at all.

Other Concorns.-Basis of assessment : profits of preceding year: -

The law and practice concerning the assessment of sporting and fishing rights are rather complicated. A large part of their value is assessed under Sch. $A^{2}$; the last occasion on which they were given separately was 1903-4:Sch. A, £718,235, and Sch. D, $£ 215,525$-total, $£ 933,760$. (There is no legal power to assess sporting rights under Sch. A in Ireland, so that they are brought in under Sch. D.) These figures fall far short of the true value of all sporting and fishing rights in the United Kingdom, owing to technical peculiarities or conventions in relation to assessment.

[^114]Indian, Colonial and Foreign Securities (other than Government Socuritios) and Possersions.-The Government securities are assessed under Sch. C. The basis of assessment for the other securities, not taxed by deduction, but upon return by the taxpayer, is the current year. But the larger proportion is paid through agents and bankers who deduct tax and pay it over to the Revenue ; this section is almost entirely dealt with in the metropolis.

The "possessions" are assessed upon the taxpayer's return, and were until 1914 based on the average receipts of the three preceding years. Income from a tea plantation, or from a business abroad, would come within this class. It is a matter often of fine legal distinction as to whether a company is assessable here on its whole profits under the general case, or whether it is chargeable only upon its receipts from securities and possessions. 1 On the question of unremitted income, see Chapter VIII.

Assessments on Bankers and Coupon Dealors in respect of Coupons.-These have been dealt with by way of deduction since 1885 . The Act $48 \& 49$ Vict. c. 51, s. 26 , had an immediate effect in securing revenue that formerly had escaped.

Vide C. K. Hobson, "Export of Capital," where the continuity of this classification materially affects the computations for the carlier years.

Railwaye out of the United Kingdom.-The classification is given in the usual way for persons, firms, companies, etc. This serves to mark a very real distinction that otherwise could not be made. Under this heading are included the whole profits of companies having their seat and direction in this country, whether such profits are remitted to this country or not, and including any shares accruing to persons out of the United Kingdom. But it also includes dividends and interest received by individuals in the United Kingdom from foreign or colonial railway concerns. Such dividends are very largely paid through agents and bankers, who

[^115]account for the tax. The sums under the several heads are shown clearly in the reports.

Interest from Loans secured on the Public Ratos.-This was separately distinguished down to rg10-11, but is now merged. It amounted to $£ 6,807,394$ in that year. It is charged upon the sum paid in the year of assessment.

The interest arising out of the profits of municipal undertakings such as gasworks, tramways, electricity undertakings, markets, etc., is not included under this head, but is merged in the ordinary assessments upon those profits, and cannot be separately shown. In so far as interest is paid out of taxed profits or property (technically known as ' set-offs ') it is not separately assessable. The assessments during the past ten years have been greatly affected by two important High Court cases dealing with this question, ${ }^{1}$ and the effect is particularly noticeable in 1905-6, when the assessment fell from $£ 9,040,000$ to $£ 6,687,000$.

The true character of these assessments has been frequently misunderstood. ${ }^{2}$

Sir T. Whittaker, "Ownership and Taxation of Land " (vide reference on p. 294).
W. H. Mallock, "Expatriation of Capital," Nineteenth Century, March, 1906.

Other Interest-Separately distinguished to 1910-11, £5,596,282 ; now merged with " other profits."

This includes many miscellaneous items, particularly small amounts of interest on inscribed stock (tax not being deducted from dividends under 50s. half-yearly), savings bank interest, and ordinary bank depcsit interest.

In 1900-I the number of cases was 35,460, and in 1910-II it was 107,807 , although the sum assessed did not increase in so great a proportion. In rgo6-7, when the amount was £5,982,641, the number was $\mathbf{5 1 , 1 2 6}$ only. There has evidently been some statistical transference from this class to the

[^116]general class so far as companies are concerned. The significant increase is in persons :-

| 1900-I | - • | Cases. <br> - 33,14I | $\underset{1,876,305}{\in}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1903-4 | - - | - 38,640 | 1,88I,74 |
| 1905-6 | - - | - 43,84I | 1,790,570 |
| 1906-7 | . . | 46,872 | 1,841,085 |
| 1907-8 | - . | 57,937 | 1,828,384 |
| 1908-9 | - - | 81,937 | 2,446,531 |
| 1909-10 | - . | - 93,902 | 2,312,497 |
| 1910-11 | - - | . $\mathbf{x} 02,36 \mathrm{I}$ | 2,351,048 |

The rapid growth in numbers and the slow growth in amounts are indicative of the inclusion of large numbers of small sums. The effect of the legislation in 1907-8 relating to differentiation is very apparent. Large numbers of people for the first time made statements of total income (in order to claim the lower rate on earned income where the total income did not exceed $£ 3,000$ ), and these untaxed sums were in consequence disclosed. The new liability was a small price to pay for the new relief.

The high rates of interest ruling generally in recent years have also affected willingness to let sums remain on deposit with banks instead of being invested in ordinary taxed securities.

Other Profita - Distinguished down to rgro-II ( $\{2$, III, 229 ).

This represents the "sweeping clause " of the whole tax. Anything that is not a trade or profession or business, and is not specifically charged elsewhere, falls to be included here. Profits from furnished lettings, rents from advertisement hoardings, casual easements, wayleaves, etc., all find their way into this class. Now included under this head, but formerly given separately, is a trifling amount for profits from the occupation of lands-the occupiers of which have elected to be assessed under Sch. D (50 \& 5 I Vict. C. 15 , s. 18). ${ }^{1}$

[^117]
## " Income from Abroad so far as it can be Identified."

Under this or a similar heading, since the 45th Report, various items have been brought together from the source classification under Sch. D and Sch. C into an aggregate and presented in tabular form under three heads :-
(r) Indian Government stocks, loans, and guaranteed railways.
(2) Colonial or foreign Government securities.
(3) Colonial or foreign securities (other than (2)) and possessions, "coupons," and railways out of the United Kingdom, other than Indian.
The totals of these classes have been given since 1882-3, ${ }^{1}$ but there is a little uncertainty in the classification for the early years. Reference should be made to the official tables which it is unnecessary to repeat here.

The official reports now very carefully indicate that the sums thus segregated or identified do not represent the whole of the income from abroad that is included in the tax assessments. The sums which can be officially earmarked are disclosed as follows:-
(a) Interest is paid by foreign or colonial Governments through agents appointed for the purpose. These agents have the statutory duty of deducting tax and paying it over.
(b) Dividends and interest paid by foreign or colonial companies or corporations through agents are similarly dealt with.
(c) Ordinary coupons from abroad realised by a banker or agent for the recipient are taxed upon encashment.
(d) Direct returns under Sch. D are required from recipients of income from abroad which has not been otherwise taxed. The assessments are separately classified.
(c) British companies owning and working railways abroad, the seat of management being in this country, are assessable on the full profits whether remitted to this country or not. These assessments also are separately classified.

Beyond this earmarked figure there exists a large amount
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## SCHEDULE D. PROFITS OF BUSINESS, ETC. 23I

of income from abroad which in many cases cannot (in the absence of details which the taxpayer alone could furnish) be identified as such in the assessments, and which is therefore included in the sum of $£ 483,073,777$ appearing under the head of " Businesses, Professions, etc., not otherwise Detailed" (see p. I7I). The fact that this unidentified income from foreign countries and British colonies and possessions is of some magnitude will be appreciated when it is considered that it includes the profits derived from the following sources :-
(f) Concerns (other than railways) situate abroad but having their seat of direction and management in this country, e.g., mines, gasworks, waterworks, tramways, breweries, tea and coffee plantations, nitrate grounds, oil fields, land and financial companies, etc.
(g) Concerns jointly worked abroad and in this country, such as electric telegraph cables and shipping.
(h) Foreign and colonial branches of banks, insurance companies, and mercantile houses in the United Kingdom.
(i) Mortgages of property and other loans and deposits abroad belonging to banks, insurance companies, land, mortgage, and financial companies, etc., in this country.
(j) Profits of all kinds arising from business done abroad by manufacturers, merchants, and commission agents resident in the United Kingdom.

The chief error in connection with these figures is the treatment of them, despite the above warnings, as a complete record of the income from abroad. Exactly how much the balance may be that is included in the general assessments we do not know. One writer has put it at $\{58,000,000$ in 1907. ${ }^{1}$ As there was no separate table prior to 1900, and therefore no official warning, it was left to individual workers to bring the several details together, unaware of the "unidentified " section. Six examples will suffice :-
(i) Giffen's wark upon these statistics quite lost sight of this feature:-
"The next item, that of foreign investments not inchuded in Schs C and D, will perhaps ercite more question. I have put

- For the question of evasion under this head, vile P. 323.
the income thus omitted at $£ 40,000,000$. . . . That there is something omitted is evident from the small amount of income from foreign investments which is dealt with in Schs. C and D. . . . It is impossible to believe that this $£ 29,000,000$ " (Sch. C, Sch. D, cases IV. and V., and railways out of the United Kingdom) " is the total income derived from the investment of British capital abroad. . . . We have also to consider that there is a large British capital invested abroad privately, through mercantile houses having dependent houses abroad, through insurance companies doing business abroad, through Anglo-colonial banks receiving deposits here and investing them abroad. . . . In what way the authorities are to get at the income which now escapes them . . $\because$ (" Recent Accumulations of Capital": "Essays in Finance," I., p. 170).
(2) In "The Growth of Capital" ( $\mathbf{1 8 8 9}$ ) he pursued the subject on similar lines (Appendix, p. 16x), and set out, from financial sources, dividends of Anglo-foreign banks and industrial companies and insurance business abroad, with which he compared the income tax figures as above ( $£ 35,000,000$ ), showing for foreign investments not in Sch. C or D fifty millions." He did not recognise that a large part of his " omitted " income was actually assessed under Sch. D, case I., but cannot be separately identified in the statistics as foreign income.

In 1894, Harris estimated that one-sixth of the profits of public companies in the metropolis might be taken to repre-
 subjected Giffen's "undiscovered" figure to some criticism. I have good reason to think that this estimate was modest, and that a truer figure in 1894 would have been $\mathbf{£} 15,000,000$ or rather more. At the present time it probably exceeds $£ 50,000,000$, when all the rubber, tea, oil, and mining companies are included.
(3) Similarly, prior to any special warning, Professor Bowley, endeavouring to ascertain the total income taxable at given dates, took Giffen's figures in "Recent Accumulations of Capital," and accepted Baxter's old estimate of one-fifth of " trades and professions" as escaping tax, remarking :-"There is reason to believe that much, though a decreasing proportion, of interest on investments abroad is not taxed. . . . By a careful scrutiny of import and export statistics which I made in 1891 I was able to obtain an estimate of the interest reaching is from abroad in
different years." ${ }^{1}$ Subtracting from these figures the amount which appears in Schs. C and D, we obtain the third line of the following table :-

Estimate of Income assessed to or eluding Income Tax
( $\mathrm{I}=£ \mathrm{I}, 000,000$ ).

| Years. | 1860. | 2866. | 1870. | 1874. | 2877. | 1880. | 2883. | 1886. | 2892. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Grosa income amoreed | $\underset{y \in 1}{8}(i)$ | $415$ | $6$ $44$ | $\operatorname{sis}(3)$ | $\underset{5 \% 0}{2}$ | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ 576 \end{gathered}$ | $\frac{5}{652}$ | 6 6 | ${ }_{49}^{4}$ |
| Profits of trede, otco, eludint tax |  | * | 35 | $35$ | 35 | 32 | 35 | 35 | 38 |
| Forcign inventmants alud- infe tax |  |  | 52 |  |  |  |  |  | 46 |
| Total mubject to licome tax (stona) | 376 | 485 | 538 | 635 | 651 | 659 | 696 | $7 \times 5$ | 78 |

- Dr. Giffen given E40,000,000 for 3875, but conuldere that the has understated the amount.

The third line, which is the residuum after deducting the income under Sch. D classified as from abroad, is to a considerable extent included in the ordinary Sch. D assessments-mades and public companies. At the time Dr. Bowley wrote there were no warnings in the official reports on this point ("Changes in Wages in the United Kingdom between 1860 and $189 \mathrm{I}^{\prime \prime}$ ).
(4) Writing since the official analysis has been made clear, Mr. Robert Walsh uses the figures to help him balance the " balance of trade " account, but quotes only the known items, and, ignoring the remainder of the official explanations, gives the " total subject to income tax $£ 66,062,109$ " for 1904. His balance unascertained is then $£ 273.937 .89 \mathrm{I}, \mathrm{viz}$ :-" By the estimate of George Paish, Esq., of the foreign investments in 1910, which amounted to $\left\{3,192,000,000\right.$, and yielded interest at $5^{-2}$ per cent. Deduct six years at $\{140,000,000$, equals $\{840,000,000$, leaving it to stand at ${ }^{\circ}(2,352,000,000$ in 1904; this should amount to f122,304,000, and would lame the above retwre short by $f 56,241,891$. And in addition the profits of British citizens on private foreign trading would require to amount to $£ 217,696,000$ in order that they might discharge the liabilities contre. If the foregoing be correct, this would show an approximate balance of British profit on foreign trade and foreign investments which remain abroad and do not apparently contribute to the taxation of the United

```
2 Viz. (in million 0):-
1860. 1860. 1870.ccccccccccc
```

Kingdom of $£ 273,937,891$. . . ." His conclusion is that this sum " probably escapes paying income tax, by which the British Treasury possibly loses $£ 16,000,000$ per annum, these profits being only available for taxation in the United Kingdom when the estates of the investors become subject to payment of death duties on such of these profits as are accumulated and capitalised" (" Industrial Economy," 1912, pp. 142, 144, 177).
(5) Mr. Mallock refers to these figures as "a very bad analysis . . . everything thrown together into the common pot of official stupidity and obscurantism," and comments upon the omission of foreign business, evidently assuming that the classification follows voluntary instead of compulsory lines. He considers that out of the remaining Sch. D assessments $£ 77,000,000$ must be derived from abroad, but this is only assumed because be finds that it remains to be accounted for ! Later he says "I bave shown $£ 70,000,000$ to $£ 80,000,000$. . ."'

In dealing with details he remarks concerning foreign railway stock (1902-3):-"The income which comes into the country from this source is $£ 39,000,000$, a sum larger than the profits of our entire railway system at home." This amount is made up by taking in with $£ 5.3$ millions for Indian guaranteed railways, colonial and foreign Government securities, $£ 12.3$ millions and $£ 7 \cdot 5$ millions respectively, making $£ 25,000,000$, described as "Indian, colonial and foreign guaranteed railways,'" and adding the correct $£ 14.5$ millions for " railways out of the United Kingdom"! One is inclined to comment:-" $\mathbf{A}$ bad analysis and hardly free from urofficial stupidity" ("The Expatriation of Capital," Ninetcenth Century, March, 1906).
(6) Mr. J. Holt Schooling similarly takes these statistics of profits from abroad in decennial averages for comparison with excess of imports without making any addition in this respect. and his whole treatment of the subject falls to pieces. On the rgor-10 average he finds a balance against us of $£ 48,000,000$, and says:-" This balance was possibly paid for by a transfer of capital securities from British to non-British owsership, the capital remaining in the United Kingdom, paying income tax and being commonly regarded as British-owned capital "(" The British Trade Book," 1911, p. 183).

## Refetences to Use of these Figures.

## (1) Balance of Trade Investigations.

[^119]Sir R. Giffen: "Excess of Imports," S. J., 1899 ; S. J., 1877 (the balance is taken to be the $\{30,000,000$ assessed to income tax).
E. E. Spicer: " Exportation of British Capital," Igr2 (gives a " balance of trade " in 19ro).

Dr. C. K. Hobson repeats the official tables, with the necessary explanations, and then uses the figures in conjunction with Sir George Paish's estimate of income derived from abroad for 1907. which is taken as a basis, all the other years being computed in proportion. This assumes that the unidentified income changed in the same ratio as the identified income. My own impression is that the profits of concerns situated abroad but directed from this country have increased in a greater ratio during the past twenty-five years. But the method gives results for 1881, 1885 , and 1895 fairly comparable with other independent estimates. He says:-" The figures of the Inland Revenue officials relate to the financial year (April to March), but for the present purpose the figures are assumed to be identical with those for the calendar year in which the greater part of the financial year is included." Of course a considerable portion of the whole represents income assessed on bases prior to that year. Foreign possessions are upon a three years' average. From the total obtained by the above method is deducted annually the " balance of capital and interest transactions," and the difference is attributed to "export of capital," rising to nearly $£ 226,000,000$ in 1912 . Dr. Hobson ignores the important effect of the Coupon Act, 1885, upon these statistics ${ }^{2}$ (" The Export of Capital," pp. 199-204).

The Board of Trade Fiscal Blue Book, ${ }^{2}$ 1903, contained a memorandum on the excess of imports, in which these figures are used, with the proper cautions, and the comment:-" The records . . . leave little doubt that the interest receivable on foreign investments has increased in recent years. . . . It is certain that the profits assessed form only part of the whole, and that some of these profits escape assessment, while others are not identified as foreign. It should, however, be mentioned that probably part of the increase shown in the table, especially in carlier years, is apparent only, being due to greater stringency on the part of the Inland Revenue." To the total figures in the table is added the note:-" This column includes a certain amount (from $£ 6,000,000$ to $(7,000,000$ ) in recent years exempted from the tax, mainly on the ground that it belonged to foreigners and others resident abroad." In all these investigations it must also be remembered that there are many holders of British company shares who live abroad.

[^120]
## (2) Growth of Foreign Investment.

TARIFF REFORM CONTROVERSY.
Mr. Harold Cox :-" In 1885 the income returned as due to foreign investments was 35 millions; in 1900 tbis had risen to 60 millions. If we assume an average rate of interest of 5 per cent., this means an increase in our capital invested abroad of 500 millions. in fifteen years. Thus so far from dissipating our capital we are increasing our foreign investments at the rate of about 30 millions a year" ("The Effect of the Corn Laws: A Reply," Nineteenth Century, February, 1903).

## " Export of Capital-Driving Capital out of the Country."

J. R. Macdonald : Financial Revievo of Reviews, April, 1909 (1906-7 figures quoted, and multiplied by $20-$ on a 5 per cent. basis-give $£ 1,591,000,000$, "altogether an underestimate." " Probably 50 per cent. of income derived from foreign investment is never disclosed." The "complete" fallacy is repeated).

A" Financial Expert" : Socialist Review, March, 1909 (quotes increase from 1886 to 1906, and uses a 5 per cent. basis).

## FOREIGN INVESTMENT GENERALLY.

" The analysis . . . brings out the fact that there has been a very great increase in the amount taxed on the declaration of bankers' agents, etc., which means that the Commissioners are getting into their net a great deal of taxable income that formerly escaped . . . the rate of interest is also higher than it used to be. . . . These two considerations mean that the value of British capital abroad has probably not risen nearly so fast in the last ten years as the figures of income would suggest " (Economist, 1913. p. 879 ; and similarly, 1910, p. 552).

Sir L. Chiozza Money : "Things that Matter," 1912, p. 94 (comparison with ocean tonnage, and shows our increasing power to invest abroad).
R. C. on Financial Relations, 1896. Giffen made an estimate of $£ 80,000,000$. The Inland Revenue estimate was $£ 60,000,000$ to $£ 70,000,000(Q .8,128)$.

Sir E. Speyer : Journal of Institute of Bankers, 1905 (capitalises at twenty years' purchase).
(3) Profits and Comparison with Wages.
" Mercatante," replying to W. T. Layton (Economist, rgir), deducts $\{58,000,000$ for business abroad worked from the United Kingdom in 1907, and $£ 55,000,000$ invisible investments, or $£ 73,000,000$ in all. He deducted I2 $\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. of the income from abroad as belonging to the foreigner, and having no "influence on the home rates of pay "- $x 18,000,000$ unconnected with wages here.
Mr. Mallock assumes $£ 880,000,000$ as the income from abroad included in the income tax total. He deducts this sum to arrive at the home-produced national income, and also to get a " general comparison between profits and wages "in refutation of Marxian contentions. But he does nothing further towards deducting from " labour income" that which is not gained in competition with capital on material production (" Social Reform," p. 123).

Other estimates of the interest from abroad and capital exported are:-
E. Crammond, 1917 : $£ 180,000,000$ income and $£ 175,000,000$ exported (Ninateonth Contury, March, IgI2).
Sir T. Whittaker, 1907 : $£ 240,000,000$.

## Sch. D Assessments-Classification by Place of Assessment: Comparisons.

A warning was given in the rath Report "against an implicit reliance upon the inferences which the mere figures appear to warrant," and it was pointed out how easily the most erroneous conclusions may be drawn.

The danger is present whenever direct comparison is made between assessments in England and Ireland. " London is the great central establishment of banks and public companies of the United Kingdom, and of many which carry on their business in the colonies and in foreign countries. The investments of the Irish themselves in Irish companies are assessed not infrequently in London, where the head offices of the companies are situated."
A recent example of this class of inference was Mr. John Redmond's speech at Newcastle on 14 th November, 19r3, when be quoted a House of Commons return of December, ryin, and used the Sch. D figures of Dublin in contrast with those of Belfast.

## 238

A letter in The Times (27th November, 1913) drew attention to Mr. Lloyd George's comments in debate on the system of central assessment, giving Dublin the " credit " for (a) salaries of officials; (b) interest paid by Land Commission; (c) income of the representative body of the Church of Ireland.

Classification by Ownership.<br>" Persons," "Frrms," etc.

The well-known tables classifying the assessments under Sch. D and Sch. E have appeared from time to time in the Board's Reports (from the roth down to date), but with many changes in form which are only discernible upon very close inspection. These changes in what appears at first to be a uniform series, together with the inherent difficulties of the classification, have led to many erroneous uses, and one is well advised to leave the tables alone altogether, so far as historical comparisons are concerned, unless prepared to study them thoroughly, and indeed minutely. before drawing any inferences. For the benefit of any who may wish to use the old tables for comparative purposes a note is appended to this section, classifying the sources of information, and the chief differences and difficulties that occur through the series. Many hours have been spent in analysis of the earlier returns, and light has been thrown on not a few obscurities, and much recomputation of estimates for small disturbing elements not previously taken into account has been necessitated : it would be a pity if any other investigator had to go over the ground again without the benefit of these labours.

This section will be devoted to the classification as it is rendered in the present Reports.

The tables represent classifications of assessments or parts of incomes, and not of individual incomes. It is necessary to repeat this warning with great frequency and insistence, because here lies the pons asinorum of many writers on the distribution of income. In the weekly papers of the "snippets" type it is not uncommon to see such a paragraph as "There are twenty-five people in Scotland with over
£50,000 a year," which has its origin in a cursory perusal of these tables. The mistake continues to be made although the official explanation is very clear and is repeated annually; the report sets out a hypothetical composite income of $\mathbf{£ 5 , 0 0 0}$ to show that out of ten component items three would not appear in these tables at all, seven appear in various parts of the table, and the whole sum does not appear at all. Scorn has been poured upon the repeated appearance of this interesting phantom, but it is quite probable that its suppression would lead to a recrudescence of erroneous inferences.

There is a general looseness in the use of the word " income" ${ }^{\text {:- }}$
" Twenty-six employees under Sch. D and 406 under Sch. E are returned as having incomes exceeding $£ 3,000$ a year each, and of these 106 with incomes of more than $£ 5,000$ a year each were assessed for an aggregate income of $£ 1,038,124{ }^{\text {a }}$ (Whitaker's Almanack, 1908, p. 663).

Mayo-Smith recognises that they are not total incomes, but does not realise that they are not even total Sch. D incomes :" Men are arranged in certain classes according to their incomes, but these are only the incomes they declare under that head " ("Statistics and Economics," 1899, p. 426).

Others who have confused " incomes " and "assessments" include:
H. Morgan Browne, New Liberal Review, 1903.

Mallock, "Progress and Property," pp. 209, etc.
Soetbeer, Zur Einkommonstatik vow Presussen, Sachen wnd Grossbritannion, mobst Bemarkungen \#iber Einkommenbestoworwng. These are compared with "incomes" in Prussia. See also Economist, 10th December, 1887, and S. J., 1888.

Take first the class "not exceeding $\mathbf{8 1 6 0}$ but not exempt." It may include, under "persons," f 5 bank interest (for a person with a very large income) ; ( $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ literary profits for a
 who has a house worth $£ 15$ per annum. Under "firms " and "public companies" it may include very large concerns which have been doing badly, and have but a small assessable profit, or are liable on a small amount of "interest
paid." Under " local authorities" a dozen small assessments on different items of interest or other liability for different funds of a great corporation, as well as interest, etc., for parochial bodies, may appear. Under "employees (D)" are included chiefly assessments on employments which form part of small total incomes (i.e., $£ 130$ abated for a clerk whose wife has a little house property) ; but "employees ( E ) " includes many fees for directors with large incomes, or, for example, a council clerkship held by a wealthy country solicitor, or small appointments held by a medical man. In fact, cases exist in which one person holds a dozen or even a score of small appointments which aggregate to a respectable income, but all of which figure in this class.

Examination of the figures for a series of years reveals some curious results, which are explainable only upon the lines of administrative change. For example, the number of persons dropped from 1904-5 to 1906-7 and the average amount dropped also. There was a sudden rise in 1907-8, and again in r909, extraordinary in numbers, but the average continued to decline. The first was due to the elimination of many cases which, though actually exempt, had been included in the assessments for administrative reasons and allowed as fully abated, with no significance so far as net duty was concerned. The second was due to the 1907 and 1909 legislation, which, in differentiating between various classes of income, necessitates a careful separate enumeration of small items of interest, etc., that had previously been treated less strictly, and assessed with other items. It is unsafe to draw many inferences from this class by itself. All through, however, it may be taken that the tendency has been of late years towards a more precise assessment of separate sources of income and a more detailed treatment statistically.

Just as it is important to note that any one assessment may be only a part of an income, so it is equally important, especially in the higher classes, to note that any one assessment may be more than one person's income. All the Sch. D assessments cover interest paid by the persons
assessed, so that an assessment of $\{40,000$ may represent $£ 30,000$ to the proprietor and $£ 10,000$ interest on borrowed capital. This is equally important in the case of firms. If two partners are working a colliery, and the assessment is £ 30,000 , it may include a very large payment for royalties to a third person. So, also, it should be observed that all the figures in these tables are gross, prior to the deduction of depreciation.

The chief use made of these tables has been for the determina tion of the distribution of incomes. Dr. Bowley, with a full knowledge of their difficulties, utilised them before the Income Tax Committee of 1906, ${ }^{1}$ reducing the "firms" to "persons" by a multiple of $2 \frac{1}{t}$, and comparing the results with a Pareto graduation. ${ }^{\text {P }}$ The treatment assumes that there are no duplicates, and that the persons and employers are all distinct. Public companies were omitted, and the table was intended to refer to "earned income." It will of course be evident from what has been said that under "persons" and "firms" (apart from the compromise which treats interest on a business man's own capital as earned income) are many assessments upon foreign possessions, interest, royalties, etc., and there is therefore much that would be duplicated with his Table III., "unearned income," based upon the Estate Duty figures, if these were not deducted. The various Sch. D tables show separately the numbers of assessments, persons, firms, etc., on interest, foreign securities, etc., and it all these are first deducted from the total of these classifications, and the net total redistributed over the several classes, a much finer result for "earned incormes" distinct from the Estate Duty classes is obtainable.

Dr. Bowley has suggested that a sufficient number of samples to total incomes would show how many duplicated "persons" appear in these tables "; but this of course would be only a partial test, as the range of returns of total incomes is limited to claims for abatement, carned rate and supertax.

Mr. Mallock's use of the tables shows that he has not been fully alive to their difficulties. He brings them into direct

> 1 Table IV., p. 283, and Q. 1.197.
> - Vide p. 464.
> - ago6 Report Q 1, aqa
comparison with abatements, and naturally finds " inconsistencies ":-
" Out of the 622,000 abatements actually claimed and granted one single class, namely, the salaried employees of the Government, companies and private firms, will account for 440,000 , or more than two-thirds of the whole. . . . The total number of salaried employees assessed in 1905 was 502,000, and of these about 60,000 earned more than $£ 400$ a year." (The actual figures are 503,000 and 54,000 , leaving 449,000 . Of these 168,000 were under $£ 160$ (average $£ 66$ each), and therefore parts of incomes only.) He goes on :-" It is impossible to suppose that there are only 230,000 other persons enjoying similar incomes, when we realise that the shopkeepers are estimated to number at least 450,000 ; that the farmers occupying from 50 to 500 acres number about 160,000 ; and that there are at least 90,000 persons whose main means of subsistence are derived from pensions, annuities, and investments in Government stocks or companies. Of these 650,000 persons (more or less) the probabilities are that at least 400,000 have incomes exceeding $£ 160$, but not exceeding $£ 400$; or in other words, that the total number of such incomes, instead of being 670,000 , are substantially in excess of 840,000 ."

Of Mr. Mallock's total of 700,000 persons he regards 400,000 as entitled to the $£ 160$ abatement, but adds only 198,000 .

The number of shops charged to House Duty in Great Britain was 307,000 , of which only about 100,000 exceeded $£ 40$ in value, and this may be taken as a minimum figure for liable shopkeepers. While we are discussing income tax abatements we must adhere to the conventions of the tax, and reference to Sch. B will show that the liable farmers would not exceed 00,000 in number (a figure borne out by the House Duty numbers). There is nothing really inconsistent between the numbers of assessments as revealed and the numbers of "official abatements."

Mr. Mallock says:-". Mr. Bowley's estimate of $\mathbf{1 6 3 , 0 0 0}$ on the number of incomes between $£ 400$ and $£ 700$ may, by parity of reasoning, be regarded as similarly deficient, the true number being probably over 200,000.". There is no "parity" because full effect has already been given to the considerations he urges in the treatment of incomes below $£ 400$. He then adds the two results, making $1,040,000$, and says "even this must be set aside as too low, when we find that the number of incomes between $£ 160$ and $£ 700$ assessed under Schs. D and E alone is some 930,000 , exclusive of all those derived from Government stock, from pablic companies, and those also derived from agricultural land and houses. All things considered, then, the number of
assessments on incomes not exceeding $£ 700$ a year would probably amount to something like $1,400,000$, and the number of individual incomes, allowance being made for plural assessments of the same persons, would be $1,200,000$." His "separate assessments " are made up of " persons," " firms (two and a half persons to a firm), about 28,000 very small companies, which must really be personal ventures, and about 460,000 salaried employees" ("The Nation as a Business Firm," p. 55). The conclusion is certainly not justified from the figures. If two and a half persons exist to each firm, obviously only the firms exceeding $£ 400$ should be counted. The inference about the "very small companies" is very doubtful -so many represent the composite investments of much wealthier people, probably to the extent of half the number; while the influence of "plurality "is quite underrated.

In a similar treatment elsewhere Mr. Mallock makes the same doubtful comparisons:-
He takes (for 1905) persons 380,000 , firms ( $60,000 \times 2 \frac{1}{3}$ ) 150,000, and employees 500,000 - total of $1,030,000$; and after pointing out that no income from property, farming, investments in stocks, etc., is included, remarks:- " Since, then, these incomes alone exceed Mr. Bowley's estimate of all incomes taken together, it is evident that, all allowance being made for multiple assessments, this estimate must fall far short of the truth."

The assessments " not exceeding $f_{1} 160$ " under "persons" and "employees" amount to 290,000 , and it may safely be said that the bulk of these represent "multiple" assessments. This fact also robs Mr. Mallock's further comparison of its value, viz., Dr. Bowley's 833,000 incomes between $£ 160$ and $£ 700$, and the number of "such incomes assessed under Schs. D and E alone," 930,000 (although by his method of compatation for firms it is actually 946,000 ).

Sir L. Chiozza Money used these tables in a similar way to ascertain the Schs. D and E income of persons with over $£ 700$ a year. The "persons" and "employees" added to the "firms" (resalved into individuals by the multiplier 2.5) gave, for 1903-4. 52,728 persons possessing upwards of $£ 700.1^{1}$ These are added to numbers of persons (in each grade) enjoying property (derived from the Estate Duty returns). Sir L. C. Money treated them all as separate " units " or distinct individuals for convenience, and, though he recognised that identity of persons in the two tables was obvious, he does not seem to have referred to the possibility of duplicating the imcome by this method. But it is quite certain

[^121]the Sch. D tables include a great deal that is interest on capital which pays Estate Duty. Both persons and incomes were so far below the figures required by other considerations that this seemed an unnecessary refinement leading in the wrong direction, but a reconciliation is impossible upon Estate Duty lines. ${ }^{1}$

Mayo-Smith compares persons 1843 and 1879 (as to the classes " under $£ 150$ and not exempt" and " $£ 150$ and under $£ 200$ ") with $1896-7$ (classes " under $£ 160$ and not exempt" and " $£ 160$ and under $£ 200$ "). "I take it that these two should be added together for purposes of comparison with the earlier years. The smaller and medium incomes seem to hold their own very well" (" Statistics and Economics," p. 425). The effect in the change of the exemption limit from $\boldsymbol{f}^{150}$ to $£ \mathbf{x} 60$ is not grasped (vide Appendix I.).

## Firms.

It will be obvious that there is a continual drain from this category to " Public Companies," owing to the constant conversion of established businesses into companies ${ }^{2}$; for the term " public companies" covers also " private limited companies" under the Companies Act, 1907. The following stages are instructive :-

| Year. | Firms. | Companies. | Total. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1904-5 | 59,227 | 31,408 | 90,735 |
| 1906-7 | 58,049 | 33,508 | 91,557 |
| 1908-9 | 53,663 | 37,937 | 91,600 |
| 1910-17 | 54,041 | 41,933 | 95,974 |
| 1913-14 | 57,822 | 50,466 | 108,288 |

The $1908-9$ reduction in firms was in spite of 1907 legislation, which in the ordinary course would have added to the number. It was no longer permissible to deal with partners separately (a practice which had previously not been uncommon for professional partnerships, doctors, solicitors, etc.), bat they had to be assessed in one sum, counting as "firms." Hence there was transfer from persons to firms, which is quite masked by the transfer from firms to companies. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

[^122]The quotations on $\mathbf{p}$. 243 raise a question which is important when these tables are being used to determine numbers of taxpayers or distribution of income, viz., the average number of persons in a firm. This point was discussed in connection with Dr. Bowley's tables before the Select Committee of 1906. ${ }^{1}$ It appeared that statisticians thought vaguely that the number would be greater than two, and two and a half was a reasonable figure.
" It seems quite possible that the high incomes dated as belonging to firms may belong to firms with great numbers of partners. That should increase the divisor as you go up the scale. That would bring a perceptible amount of income below 55,000 .""I think you will find that once you begin to find firms with fio,000 and upwards, they would want more than two and a half partners ? It would bring less than $£ 200,000,000$ over $£ 5,000$ a year, it would knock $£ 10,000,000$ to $£ 20,000,000$ off."

Sir L. Chiozza Money dealt with the same point, and suggested a sample investigation.: He used 2.5 as a multiplier. Mr. J. Ackland uses $3^{\text {² }}$; Zorn 4 as a fair average, and 5 for higher ones."

In order to settle this question I have made observations equivalent to a sample of a considerable number of firms, ${ }^{8}$ amounting to one-eleventh of the whole. In order to ascertain that it was an unbiassed sample the known total number of firms from the Board's Report was distributed into classes (amounts of assessments), according to the proportions shown by the sample. The results were compared with the actual number in each class given officially and found to agree very closely. It may therefore be considered to be a reliable index to the general conditions. The average number of partners for all firms is 2.4, and this is also the average for firms " under $£ 160$ but not exempt." This class does not necessarily consist of small businesses, but includes

1O. 1,193-6, 1,230, 1,258-9. 1,308-13.
Os. 546
a "The Revolution in the Incidence of Tasition." Consempernery Revies, May, 1901.

* "Incidence of the Income Tax."
- With the assistance of personal friends in the Inland Revenve Department, who have made similar observations on lines sugsested by me.
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assessments on items of interest paid for large firms making losses, or on items of interest received by bodies of persons of varying numbers.

The classes then proceed in regular progression :-


Grouping these results into larger classes to see the broad effect, we find the percentages of each large class having different numbers of partners as follows:-

| Class. | Two Partners. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} 7 \text { or } \\ \text { more. } \end{array}$ | Total. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Not exceeding 1 160 | 81-6 | 12.4 | $3 \cdot 1$ | $1 \cdot 3$ | $\cdot 5$ | $1 \cdot 5$ | 100 |
| £ 160 to $£ 2,000$. | 78-7 | 154 | $4 \cdot 2$ | $1 \cdot 1$ | $\cdot 3$ | $\cdot 2$ | 100 |
| (2,000 to $£ 10,000$. | 50.8 | 30.5 | 13.4 | $3 \cdot 4$ | $\cdot 7$ | $1 \cdot 8$ | 100 |
| Over $£ 10,000$ | 23.5 | $32 \cdot 5$ | 157 | 11.8 | 18.8 | 5.0 | 100 |
| All firms | 747 | 17-1 | $5 \cdot 4$ | 1.6 | $\cdot 6$ | 12 | 100 |

This table is illustrated by the accompanying graph, which shows the totally different distribution of the largest firms.

## Public Companies.

It has already been explained that this category includes private limited companies, which are now very numerous, and constant transfers from firms are taking place. Well over one-third of the companies are in the lowest grade, " not exceeding £ 160 but not exempt." There is of course no exemption for a company, however small its profits, so that the application of the title is somewhat different from that of the other columns, "persons, etc." It does not by any

Grapr. VII.
Percentage of Firms in each Class having
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means follow that only companies of small capital appear in this class, because where losses are being made, or there is practically no working, there is frequently a minimum liability on interest to be charged.

Quoting the figures for 1905-6, Mr. Mallock takes the 5,500 companies with profits over $£ 5,000$, and says :-" Of the gross income of $£ 222,000,000$ the following items can be identified ":-

| Mr. Mallock's |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Fignres. |$|$| Maximom |
| :---: |
| possible Figures. |

The right-hand column shows the maximum sum under these heads that can possibly form part of the $£ 222,000,000$ referred to. Mr. Mallock has misunderstood several points. In the first place, he has assigned to "public companies" the total profits, under each description, going to persons and firms (with which he has already dealt) and local authorities as well as to companies. Secondly, even the $£ 77,300,000$ is too mach, because it represents all public companies under these heads, and not merely those " over $£ 5,000$," so that it cannot be said with certainty how much of it forms part of the total $£ 222,000,000$ which is being analysed. Thirdly, two items are wrongly included, as the tables give them in adjoining colnmns, and they are thus clcarly no part of " public companies." There is no erudition about these corrections, as the official headings and tables are unmistakably clear.

Mr. Mallock goes on to say that out of the $£ 220,000,000$ the following parts are " unearned":-(x) Railways, home and foreign, $£ 57,000,000$; (2) loans secured on rates, $£ 6,000,000$. . .

It is thus clear that Mr. Mallock does not understand what " loans secured on rates" are, although the official heading "interest from loans secured on public rates," and the sub-reference to municipalities should have sufficiently indicated that they have nothing whatever to do with public companies (" The Nation as a Business Firm," p. 127).

Mr. Mallock sets against the $\{3,000,000,000$ of paid-up capital in our companies in 1905-6 the total profits assessed, and remarks: -" The dividend yielded by this capital was $£ 247,000,000$, or over 8 per cent." But the capital is for about 39,800 companies, and the profits represent 32,422 , so that 7,400 companies are making no profits, or losses which should be deducted from the assessed profits before this composite dividend of 8 per cent. can be declared. Moreover, share capital is a very deceptive test, for the assessments include interest paid upon debentures, loans, mortgages, etc., as well as all the reserves for depreciation, etc. (" The Nation as a Business Firm," p. I30).
Zorn assumed an average return of 7 per cent. (" Incidence of the Income Tax ").

Zorn attempts to deduce the number of taxpayers included in the "public companies." Because the companies and paying agents account for 46 per cent. of the tax under Sch. D, he makes them equivalent to this proportion of new taxpayers:-
Direct payers (persons and employees)

Firms $\times 4$$\quad$| 819,242 |
| ---: |
|  |
| $\therefore$ Public companies and agents will be |

The two classes of income are not comparable, and the number of duplicates is so great, that the method has no reasonable basis.

Goschen tested, by sample, the number of shareholders in companies, and concluded there had been a general increase ( $S . J$., 18S8, quoted by Mayo-Smith, "Statistics and Economics," p. 428).

## Local Authorities.

The assessments made on local authorities under Sch. D are made for industrial undertakings just as they would be if they were owned by companies. But by far the greater
number of the assessments are upon interest paid (secured on the rates). ${ }^{1}$ The assessments are classified separately under " waterworks," " gasworks," " markets, tolls, etc.," and give a fairly exact statement of the profits of municipal enterprise. In a special return ${ }^{2}$ reprinted for the Joint S. C. on Municipal Trading ${ }^{3}$ the net profits of municipal industrial undertakings are given as follows (five years to 3rst March, 1898) :-
England, $£ 3,613,668$; Scotland, $£ 181,327$.
Waterworks, separately, were-England, $£ 1,744,36 x$; Scotland, £44,662.
Gasworks, separately, were-England $£ 1,180,208$; Scotland, $£ 54,773$.

A similar return for four years to 3rst March, 1902,4 gave waterworks $£ 2,032,756$ and gasworks $£ 1,367,735$, which may be compared with tax assessments (for 1900-I) $£ 1,904,261$ and $£ \mathrm{I}, 642,943$ respectively.
There is, of course, a slightly artificial element about the profits of municipal enterprise which may proceed on a policy at various points between cost of service and maximum commercial yield, according to the particular prevailing theory. If there is a profit-making policy in relief of rates, so much the better for the income tax; but frequently the transferred taxed profit reduces the liability on general interest payable, so that the total tax paid is not affectedit is only differently distributed over the assessments. It may be stated with regard to municipal lighting that the book-keeping profit made on supply to various corporation departments is eliminated from the assessed profit, which is upon public supply only. "Profit " made as the result of a compulsory rate is not assessed.

## Exployers (D and E).

The relation of these two classes has been examined on pp. 214 and 266, and the stationary character of the numbers

[^123]under Sch. $D$ is explained. It is to be noted that the majority of cases " not exceeding $£ 160$ and not exempt" are those of persons with small salaries, who own property assessed under Sch. A; the bulk of the assessment is therefore " abated," leaving any net liability to be dealt with on the latter. The large decrease in 1906-7 is explained on administrative grounds, many cases being excluded that had previously counted as assessments. The rapid increase in 1908-9 was due to the effect of special legislation in 1907, which rendered returns of wages and salaries compulsory from employers, and brought into assessment numerous small cases, without of course greatly affecting the net yield of the tax.

The question of workmen on weekly wages evading the tax is dealt with under " Evasion," Chapter VIII.

## Use of Classification to show Progress in Different Classes.

Porter : Classification, $\mathbf{1 8 1 2}$ and 1848, used to trace accumulation and as to the ground for suspecting disappearance of the middle classes (S. J., 1851).

Soetbeer: Zur Einkommenstatistik von Preussen, etc., and S. J., $\mathbf{1 8 8 8}$. Suggests that the decrease in the higher classes of " trades and professions" is due to formation of limited companies.

Goschen: Increase of moderate incomes (S. J., 1887, p. 589). Percentage increese in each class for ten years. General discussion of the tables as "incomes."
S. C. on Income Tax, 1851-2. Used H. C. 90-1816 and H. C. 27-1857 to compare distribution. In 1812 247 per cent. of the persons were over the $\{500$ line and had 67 -17 per cent. of the income: while in 1849 18.27 per cent. of the persons had 61.06 per cent. of the income.

Giffen: "Progress of the Working Classes" ("Economic Inquiries," 1., p. 415). Compares 1843 and 1879. He concluded that the increase in the assessments between $£ 150$ and $£ x, 000$ is a sign of the increased earnings of the working classes "out of all proportion to the increase of population."

Sir Algernon West : Average amount of assessments- (a) trades and professions : (b) public companies, $1876-7$ to $1883-4$; and assessments, Schs. D. and E (excluding Government servants),
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1864-5, 1869-70, 1874-5, 1879-80, and 1882-3, in classes "under $£_{400}$ " and " over 6400 ," with percentage to population in each case. R. C. on Depression of Trade, 1886-tables and Qs. 874, 882, etc.

Mayo-Smith: "The statistics fail to show any marked concentration in the hands of a few " (" Statistics and Economics," 1899, p. 426).

De Foville: "Wealth of France and other Count ies" (S. J., 1893, p. 618).
Colson: "Cours d'Economie Politique," II., p. 314; "La répartition des Revenus."

## Seh. D Classification : Interprotation-Miseallancous Examples.

"The gross income brought under review is $£ 943.702,014$, deductions are given as $\{303,653,776$, and the income on which tax was received is returned as $£ 640,048,238$. The resulting difference of $\{24,686,874$ between this sum and the £615,801,364 appearing in the summary is presumably accounted for by a number of composite incomes, which are referred to on p. 188."-J. C. L. Zorn, "The Incidence of the Income Tax"

He then quotes the official warning. He has confused the gross and net total tax assessments with the Sch. D classification, and quite misunderstands the "composite "income difficulty.
K. K. Kennan, quoting 1906-7 figures, gives the Sch. D total essessments as 578,600 , "Of which 476,404 were upon individuals and the remainder on firms and public and private corporations." But, misinterpreting the summary at the foot of the classification, he adds, " to these figures might be added employees (Schs. D and E) 519,189, making a total of $1,097,789$ " ("Income Taxation," p. 72). The first number already includes the Sch. D employees, and his correction of Pepper's report is wrong.

## Note apon Classifieation of Assoasmonts, Schs, D and E: Note apen Sources and Changes in Form.

The primary source of information was 2 periodical return to an order of the House of Commons. Reference to these returns is sometimes necessary, because, although subsequent reports have apparently often repeated them, there have been important omissions. The returns are as follows:-
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\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline Tax Year. \& No. of Return. \& Session. \& Tax Year. \& No. of Return. \& Sessiona <br>
\hline 1842-3 \& \multirow[t]{23}{*}{315
107
747
317
27
480
616
341
482
313
69

465
119
508
509
466
526
565
469
488
527
460} \& \multirow[t]{13}{*}{1844
1846
1847
1849
$185 \pi$
1852
1853
1854
1855
1856
1857

Seasion 2.} \& \multirow[t]{23}{*}{| 1867-8 |
| :--- |
| 1868-9 |
| 1869-70 |
| 1870-5 |
| 2871-2 |
| 2872-3 |
| 1873-4 |
| 1874-5 |
| 1875-6 |
| $1876-7$ $1877-6$ |
| 1879-8a |
| 1880-5 |
| 1881-2 |
| 1882-3 |
| 1883-4 |
| 1884-5 |
| 1885-6 |
| 1886-7 1887-8 |
| 1888-9 |
| 1889-90 |
| 1890-1 |
| 1891- |
| 8892-3 |
| 8893-4 |
| 8894-5 |} \& \multirow[t]{6}{*}{\} 397} \& \multirow{5}{*}{1873} <br>

\hline 1843-4 \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline $1844-5$
18456 \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 1845-6 \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 1847-8 \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 1848 -9 \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 1849-50
$1850-1$ \& \& \& \& \multirow[t]{3}{*}{298} \& \multirow[t]{2}{*}{1879} <br>
\hline 1851-0 \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 1852-3 \& \& \& \& \& <br>
\hline 1853-4 \& \& \& \& 234 \& 1885 <br>
\hline $1854-5$
$1855-6$ \& \& \& \& \& <br>

\hline 1855-6 \& \& \& \& $$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { No } \\
& \text { funt }
\end{aligned}
$$ \& <br>

\hline \& \& \& \& 234 \& 188) <br>
\hline $1856-7$
$\times 8578$ \& \& 1858
1850 \& \& \& <br>
\hline 1857-8 \& \& \% 8859. \& \& No \& <br>
\hline 1858-9 \& \& 1860 \& \& \& <br>
\hline $1859-60$
$860-1$ \& \& 1865 \& \& 228 \& 1890 <br>
\hline 1860-1 \& \& 1862 \& \& \& <br>
\hline 1861-2 \& \& 1863 \& \& \& <br>
\hline 1862-3 \& \& 1864 \& \& \& <br>
\hline $8863-4$ \& \& 1865 \& \& \& 1894 <br>
\hline $1864-5$
88650 \& \& 1866 \& \& 322 \& 1895 <br>

\hline 186\%-7 \& \& | 1866 |
| :--- | \& \& \& <br>

\hline
\end{tabular}

The returns for 1849-3, 1843-4, and 1844-5 are simple tables of duty collacted, under each schedule, and under each class of Commissioners. The return for 1845-6 gives the first classification proper, " $£ 150$ and under $£ 200$," etc., for both schedules, with particulars of "income on which duty is charged," "amount of tax received from each class," and " number of persons in each class." Only the last-mentionod colmmen is tolalllad. The tables of "duty collected" are given as in previous years. The returns for 1846-7 down to $1853-4$ inclusive are uniform with this, ercept that Ireland is introduced (but kept separate) in 1853-4-

In 1854-5 the tables were changed from " duty collected " to "duty assessed," the classification remaining as before, and it would naturally be expected that the total of the classes should give the same " amount of tax received "as the tables. But upon aggregation it is found that there is a materinl difference. The first year in which the classes are totalled, and the discrepancy therefore revealed without close investigation, was 1856-7; at this point, however, it is smaller than before, and it disappears
altogether in $1860-1$ and subsequent years, when the totals in the classification and the tctals in the tables agree. If we substitute for the "duty collected" in the earlier returns the "duty charged" shown in the 13th Report, we can carry back the differences to 1844-5. An inspection of the tables in this report will show that the duty at 7 d . on the net assessments (from 1845-6 to 1852-3) never works out at the " duty charged." The explanation of these facts is given hereafter, but it would be tedious to exhibit the evidence for this explanation in full also. (a) The existence of the "composition duty " ${ }^{1}$ down to $1860-1$, which was not included in the tax charged in the classifications but was included in the totals in the tables. (b) The duty on additional assessments made after the time when the surveyors sent in their classifications was added as a lump sum to the total duty, but the tax in the classes was left unaltered. Hence, down to 1853-4 the total assessments given in the official reports are deficient to the extent of these additional assessments. (For the years 1842-3 to 1844-5 there is evidently no record of the exact "duty charged," and it is given in the 13th Report as exactly $7 d$. in the $£$ on the net assessment, omitting both composition duty and additional assessments.) After 1853-4 the whole of this difference is due to composition duty. The early parliamentary returns should only be used in so far as they contain information omitted from the 13th Report (i.e., duty charged on each class, and the whole of the Sch. E classification), because the recapitulation in the report is later and more correct, avoiding various printer's errors in the returns. Moreover, details can safely be extracted from the returns for use with the report only after totalling the return and establishing the identity of the totals: for example, the assessment and duty for Sch. $E$ in the report are throughout in excess of the assessment and duty totalled in the returns to 1853-4.

Under Sch. D the table on P. 255 shows the additions to the assessments in the 13th Report which the omission of " additional assessments " necessitates.

## Changes in Mothods of Classifieation for these Tables.

From 1842-3 to 1852-3 there were no deductions, so that gross and net assessments were alike. The classification is therefore one of gross assessments.

From 1853 life insurance was a deduction (also expenses under Sch. E) and the resulting ned assessments were classified.

From 1863-4 abatements were also a deduction and the net assessments continued to be classified, the effect being, of course,

[^124]
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much more important in this case ; but down to 1868-9 the classification was determined by the gross amount of income (excluding insurance and expenses).

In 1866-7 public companies were first excluded from the classification.

In 1869-70, although the net assessments continued to be classified, they were no longer classified by the income plus abatement, but actually by the net, i.e., $£ 330$ minus $£ 60$ abatement, $£ 70$ net, would have been classed $£ 70$ under the heading " $£$ roo and under $£ 200$ " prior to 1869-70, and under the heading " under £roo" subsequently.

| Year. | Difference. | Composition. | Balance Duty due to additional Assessments. | Additional Assessments. ( 000 ). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $E$ | $t$ | $\mathcal{L}$ | $E$ |
| $\left.\begin{array}{l} 1842-3 \\ 1843-4 \\ 1844-5 \end{array}\right\}$ | None: gross assessments computed from duty without composition. |  |  |  |
| 1845-6 | 17,353 | 6,926 | 10,437 | 358 |
| 1846 | 15,296 | 6,922 | 8,374 | 287 |
| 1847-8 | 18.610 | 6,896 | 11.714 | 402 |
| 1848-9 | 10,085 | 4,440 | 5,645 | 193 |
| 1849-50 | 12,527 | 4,440 | 8,087 | 277 |
| 1850-1 | 15,630 | 4.440 | 11,190 | 384 |
| 1851-2 | 10,295 |  | 10,295 | 353 |
| 1852-3 | 12,149 | 420 | 12,149 | 416 |
| 1853-4 | 24,834 | 4,420 est. | 20.414 | 700 |

In 1873-4 the classification was again determined by the gross amount of assessment, as prior to $1868-9$, but in this year it was really gross and included life insurance. The whole classification is however still one of net assessment.

From 1877-8 the detailed classes under Sch. E were abolished. and only two given-( $x$ ) $£ 150$ to $\{400$, and (2) over $£ 400$.

In 1894-5 the Sch. E details appeared under these two classcs, for the last time. The Sch. D parliamentary return is on the old lines, and the same details appeared in the 39th Report (ercept the duty in eech class). It was still a classification of ned amoments of income after allownence of abetements, atc., but classified according to the gross assessments. Scotland is, however, given separately from this date.

In 1898-9 the present system began. Sch. D classification of net assessments was abolished and classification of gross assessments began. Instead of confining the tables to "persons and firms" under one heading, the details are given separately for (1) "persons"; (2) "firms"; (3) "public companies"; (4) "municipal corporations and other local authorities": (5) "employments"; and separate tables for England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, and the United Kingdom are given.

Sch. E.-A full classification on lines similar to Sch. D. This method has remained unchanged ( $1914-15$ ).

The 13th and 28 th Reports give a valuable summary of all the* Sch. D classifications down to those years, omitting the duly columns.

## Deductions from Gross Assessments.

(a) Exompt Income and Impersonal Deductions.
(i) Exemptions: Income not exceeding fi60.-This deduction, amounting now to over $£ 10,000,000$, represents almost entirely income which has been taxed at the source, and upon which repayment is claimed-i.e., interest and dividends paid by public companies to persons who have incomes below $£ 160$. It does not include, as it did formerly, ${ }^{1}$ certain cases of persons trading on their own account, etc., who are manifestly exempt, but is confined to those who must be dealt with, according to the system of taxation in force, by repayment. A very small sum, however, represents those who are exempted " by schedule." ${ }^{8}$
(2) Chartties, Friendiy Societies, etc.-This deduction also represents repayments upon interest and dividends received by these bodies, upon which they are entitled to exemption by statute.
(3) Foreign Dividends belonging to Foreigm Resi-dents.-Vide Chapter VIII.
(4) Allowances for Wear ard Tear-These have already been fully explained.:
(5) Other Allowances, Reductions, and Discharges. -This considerable item represents, to the extent of about three-fourths, actual reductions on appeal, errors, and

[^125]double assessments given effect mainly to " by schedule," after the assessments have been closed up ready for the collection, and partly by repayments. Included here are repayments upon losses, against other taxed income, under the Act of $1890 .{ }^{1}$ The balance is the net sum which is carried into schedule as irrecoverable for various reasons.

## (b) Porsonal Allowances.

Abatements, life insurance premiums, and relief in respect of children are dealt with in Chapter VIII.

## Income Tax Profits used as a Test of Trade Prosperity.

This test is generally regarded as one of the most reliable, and it has been made by many writers. ${ }^{9}$ There is no doubt a close correspondence between the assessments and trade, but the following cautions may be mentioned or recapitulated :-
(a) All legal or administrative " breaks" in the figures must be watched (p. 204).
(b) The "drain" to Sch. E should be considered (p. 215).
(c) The real movement of profits is masked by the average (p. 182).
(d) For many purposes it is necessary to consider the assessment in relation to changes in population before any fair inference can be drawn. ${ }^{\text {d }}$
(o) It may be necessary to consider improvements in administration. ${ }^{\text {b }}$
(f) In times of depression the non-appearance of average losses in the gross assessments leaves the latter unduly high."

[^126]
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In the "Fiscal Blue Book," 1903,' the tables of comparative trade statistics include the gross income tax assessments under each schedule from 1853, with quinquennial averages. The figures are unadjusted, but warnings are given in footnotes for Sch. A transfers to Sch. D 1866-7, net Sch. A and Sch. Bin Ireland to 1874-5. Sch. B generally, and even the small transfer from Sch. D to Sch.' C in 1892-3. No comment whatever is made, however, as to the change in the exemption limit 1876-7 and 1894-5 and its important effect upon the figures.

Sir L. Chiozza Money quotes the "trades and professions,", Sch. D, from 1854 as an evidence of growth of trade, and comments :-" The figures understate growth, because in recent years the extension of the exemption limit has cut out incomes which of old were included," but he ignores the countervailing gain from the Sch. A transfer in 1866-7 ("Fiscal Dictionary," p. 141).

The number of assessments and the average amount of assessments for successive years have been used " to test if possible the accuracy of the opinion that competition, although it may not have reduced the aggregate profits of English traders, has necessitated the division of those profits amongst a larger number of individuals." ${ }^{3}$

Sch. D should always be taken as a whole (unless the businesses are separately given, e.g., gasworks) because there is continual shifting between private trades and companies, and from fluctuations of neither separately can inferences properly be made as to prosperity, and comparisons with other fluctuations should not be made. ${ }^{3}$

## Profits compared with Wages: Labour Unrect, Trade Unionism-Effocte, ote.

The increase under Sch. D has been quoted in comparison with increases in wages-(a) as a percentage increase over a certain period "; (b) by comparison of annual totals and changes.

[^127]The following quotation by Dr. Bowley from a working class newspaper shows the defects of such treatment and " the effect which an ignorant use of statistics can produce ":-
"While trade unionism is stronger financially and numerically to-day than at any previous period in history, the workers are weaker relatively to the increasing resources of capital. This is plainly seen from the calculations of the Board of Trade as to the changes in the wages bill for each year since 1894 , and the amount of income brought under the review of the Inland Revenue for income tax purposes during the same years.
"Table A.-The Respective Increases.

| Yoar. | Yearly Wagea Changes. | Total Profits, Rents, and Salaries. | Year. | Yearly <br> Wages Changes. | Total Profits, Rents, and Salaries. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8894 | $\stackrel{\&}{2.344,000}$ | $\stackrel{6}{673.715,000}$ | 1901 | $4,082,000$ | $\stackrel{f}{833.355,000}$ |
| 1895 | 1,346,000 | 657,097,000 | 1902 | 3.774,000** | 866,993.000 |
| 1896 | 1,382,000 $\dagger$ | 677.769,000 | 1903 | 1,993,000* | 879,638,000 |
| 1897 | x,638,000 | 704,741,000 | 1904 | 2,039,000* | 902,758,000 |
| 8898 | 4,202,000 | 734.461,000 | 1905 | 113,000* | 912,000,000 |
| 1899 | 4,732,000 | 702,667,000 | 1906 | 3,010,000 | 935,000,000 |

- Decreese.
$\dagger$ Incrense.
"The net gain in wages during those thirteen years is fro,639,000, a sum which works out at 145. 4d. per annum, or 3 dd. per week, to the $\mathbf{1 4 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ wage workers concerned. Compare this with the net gain to the income tax paying class. In the thirteen years the incomes of the $\mathbf{1 , 1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ income tax payers have increased by $\{351,289,000$ per annum, or at the rate of £3197s. per annum on the average. To put it in another way: the wage earning classes have increased their incomes during the thirteen years at the rate of $d d$. per week each year. The income tax payers, on the other hand, have increased their average incomes $\{24 \mathrm{gr} .6 d$. each year, as compared with 14 s . 42 . to the worker, and 95.64 . per week each year, as compared with the warker's $\mathbf{1 2}$ per week. Further, the increase in the income of the income tax payers has been continuous, with the exception of 1895. while the workers have suffered decrease in seven out of thirteen yearss. ..."

Dr. Bowley gives the following table and comments (" The Improvement of Official Statistics," S. J., 1907) :-
"Table B.-Rough Estimate of Wages and of Income above
Exomption Limit Relative to Population.

| Year. | Wages: Index Number. | Income above Exemption Limit relative to Population: Index Number. | Income paying Tax ander <br> Schs. A, B and C (million \&). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1894 | 100 | 100 - | 182 |
| 1895 | 99 | 102 | 183 |
| 2896 | 100 | 104 | 184 |
| 1897 | 10I | 109 | 190 |
| 1898 | 107 | III | 190 |
| 1899 | 109 | 115 | 194 |
| 1900 | 114 | 118 | 197 |
| Igor | 113 | 118 | 199 |
| 1902 | III | 118 | 201 |
| '1903 | 110 | 118 | 203 |
| 1904 | 109 | 118 | 204 |

" Note.-1894-1904, increase of population of the United Kingdom, 10 per cent.
". . . In dealing with the income statistics, the passage I have quoted errs in four ways. First, the gross totals of income bear a varying relation to the net totals, and the excess of the former has increased relatively to the total. Secondly, a great amount of earned income, much of it salaries which do not differ in any essential way from wages, is included. The amount under Schs. A, B, and C, as shown in Table B, has not increased faster than population. Thirdly, population has increased 10 per cent. during the period, and the last number should be discounted by about ro per cent. before it is compared with the first. Fourthly. the wrong years are taken; thus, the total for 1906 is for the income reviewed in the year beginning April, 1905, and in a great number of cases this income is based on the average of previous years; perhaps 1904 is a reasonable date to take for it. For the paper I have just quoted, I made an estimate of total income above the limit of exemption, including earned and unearned, and gave it the form of index numbers relative to population;
these I have continued roughly to 1904 in Table B; the comparison cannot yet be made for more recent dates. Now we find that income per head thus defined has increased 18 per cent. in the eleven years, wages 9 per cent. (I should emphasise that these figures are not final), against the 35 or 50 per cent. (according to the year taken) for income and the I or İ per cent. for wages shown in the passage under discussion. The gain of income on wages thus shown is a recent, and not improbably temporary, phenomenon; the corresponding figures for the last forty years are :-

Index Numbers.

| Yoar. | Wagos. | Income. | Year. | Wagos. | Income. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1864 - | 70 | 77 | 1894 | 100 |  |
| 1874 | 94 | 104 | 1904 | 109 | $118{ }^{\prime \prime}$ |
| 1884 | 87 | 99 |  |  |  |

To these comments it may be added that not only did the writer treat the number of taxpayers as constant ( $1,100,000$ ), but he also made an error of $£ 100,000,000$ in the "increase" for thirteen years.

## Miscellaneous Sources of Information for Sch. $D$.

H. C. 492-1857-8; H. C. 2-1859. County return of Sch. D. 1856-7.
H. C. 546-1860. Detailed return by parishes for Great Britain, 1859-60.
H. C. 528-1863. Special Commissioners' appeals.
H. C. 5II-1866. Sch. D, 1814-15, England and Wales, by counties.
H. C. 454-r870. Sch. D. 1842-69, Great Britain, by counties.
H. C. I03-I87I. Paper on The Use of Employers' Returns of Wages.
H. C. 87 -1874. Sch. D in cities, boroughs and counties (United Kingdom), showing (for 1869-70, 1870-1 and 1871-2) -(x) The number of persons paying under Sch. D: (2) the number of returns sent in, and number not sent in: (3) the
number of assessments made above the returns; (4) the number of appeals : cases (a) sustained, (b) reduced, and (c) dismissed ; (5) the amount of reduction in (4) ; (6) poundages.
H. C. 368-r869. Five decadal returns of gross assessments.
H. C. 75-1878. Detailed return of unassessed duty, 1875-6, and also totals for five years.
H. C. 402-1878. Analysis of assessments, 1875 to 1878 , trades and professions, complete list of surveys, and duty for each, and trades, etc., classed for every county.
H. C. 292-1882. County classification.
H. C. 206-1883. Ditto.
H. C. 25-1884. Ditto.
H. C. 235-1884. Ditto.
H. C. 32-1892. Ditto.
H. C. 217 - 1896 . Ditto. ( $1889-94,1869-70,1874-5$, 1879-80 and $1884-5$ ). Note. -The footnote as to the rate of tax in 1874-5 is a misprint, and has misled several writers.
H. C. 307-1901. Continuation of above, 1895 to $1899-$ 1900.
S. C. on Income Tax, 1852. Q. 5,056, Sch. D assessments. Number of cases where there were no returns or insufficient returns. Appendix I.-Exemptions, 1848-9, under each schedule, and how allowed. 1848-9, Sch. D. Cases of returns, charges without returns, or beyond returns, appeals and reliefs. Appendix III.-Number of Sch. D. assessments and exemptions, 1842-3. Return of special assessments and composition duty.

## CHAPTER VII.

## Schedule E.-Salaries of Officials.

## DEFINITION AND SCOPE.

" For and in respect of every public office or employment of profit, and upon every annuity, pension, or stipend payable by Her Majesty or out of the public revenue of the United Kingdom, except annuities charged to the duties under the said Schedule C." ${ }^{2}$ "The said duties shall be annually charged on the persons respectively having, using, or exercising the offices or employments of profit . . . or to whom the annuities, pensions or stipends . . . shall be payable, for all salaries, fees, wages, perquisites or profits whatsoever accruing by reason of such offices, etc. . . ." The "public offices " are defined to include "offices belonging to either House of Parliament, any court of justice . . . any criminal or justiciary or ecclesiastical court . . . or court-martial ; ... under the civil Government," also in the army, navy, militia and volunteers; under any ecclesiastical body, whether aggregate or sole, "or under any public corporation, or under any company or society, whether corporate or not corporate . . . under any public institution or on any public foundation for whatever purpose . . . and every other priblic office or employment of profit of a public character." 2

Provision was made, in the case of large public departments, for separate departmental commissioners to administer the tax, and to deduct the duties from payments of salary, etc., but in all other cases the duties were assessed by the ordinary district commissioners and collected in the usual manner. The basis at first was obviously intended to be the payments of the year, but it was not perfectly clear, so

[^128]that subsequent enactment was necessary to ensure the due assessment of any additional salary, fees, or emoluments beyond the amount of the original assessment. ${ }^{1}$ An increment in salary is immediately assessable. The only part of Sch. E strictly assessable on any other basis is " perquisites arising from fees or other emoluments," which may be estimated either on the profits of the preceding year, or on the average of three preceding years. There is a well-known concession, however, under which employees in a subordinate capacity and not holding a distinctive office are granted the benefit of the three years' average. Not all employees of public bodies are assessable under Sch. E, moreover, for engine drivers, porters, and labourers are not persons holding an office or employment of profit, and they are assessable under Sch. D. ${ }^{2}$ Case law has decided, inter alia, as follows:-
(I) A college bursar, an officer of the college, but not a member of the corporate $b c d y$, is assessable under Sch. E.
(2) The value of a bank agent's residence and of " board and lodging " are not emoluments assessable under Sch. E.
(3) An allowance to a deserving clergyman from the Curates' Augmentation Fund, renewed at the discretion of the society, and not a payment in respect of his services in a particular parish, is not assessable. An allowance from the Queen Victoria Clergy Sustentation Fund, being a grant to the benefice and accruing by reason of the office, not personal to the recipient because of his circumstances, was also chargeable. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

It must be observed that the distinction between assessment under Sch. D and Sch. E rests not so much in the character of the duties performed as in the constitutional character of the employer. For example, a clerk performing exactly the same duties at exactly the same salary may one year be under Sch. D and the next under Sch. E merely because the employing firm has become registered as a limited company; a Wesleyan or a Presbyterian minister is

[^129]assessable under Sch. E, whereas a Baptist or Congregationalist is assessable under Sch. D, the difference resting in the character of the body under which he serves. Hence the necessity, in any real consideration of employments, for the inclusion of all employees assessed under Sch. D.
It is clear that the Sch. E assessments represent for the most part the income of the year of assessment ; the proportion assessed upon the average of the three preceding years would not be great enough to disturb the whole more than three months, and it may fairly be said that the income assessed for 1912-13 corresponds to the actual income of the calendar year 1912. ${ }^{1}$

## Gross Assessments: Present Statistics.

Classification by Kinds of Officials.-The classification at the present time is under three heads: (x) Government officials ; (2) corporation and public company officials; and (3) other persons assessed under Sch. E, but until quite recently it was under two only, the third class above being included under "Government officials." This is a point that will have to be watched in future in making comparisons.
"Government officials," as a heading, includes " assessments made in respect of payments out of voted moneys or charged upon the Consolidated Fund." "Other officials " refers in "England to the India Office, and the London offices of Colonial Goveraments, the Bank of England, Trinity House, the Ecclesiastical Commission, Queen Anne's Bounty Office," etc., and, in Ireland, to " the Representative Body of the Church of Ireland, the Bank of Ireland, Registry of Petty Sessions Clerks, Irish Lights Commission, and Dublin Ports and Docks Board." ${ }^{2}$
The eorporation and public company officiala comprise four-fifths of the persons and amounts assessed. These range over salaries in every branch of industry, from directors' fees in banks and insurance companies to the odd guineas paid to directors of Starr Bowkett building societies; from a

[^130]magistrate's clerk to a Wesleyan minister, or the managing director of a " one-man" company who takes most of his profil in the form of remuneration. It is obvious that to cite the whole of Sch. E as evidence of the growth of " bureaucracy " is a little wide of the mark.
" The most flourishing class in the country would seem to be the salaried officers of the Government, corporations, and public companies. They nearly doubled their incomes between 189 x and 1900. Imagine a bureaucracy costing us seventy-ive millions sterling a year."-W. R. Lawson, Fortnightly Review, May, 1903.
"Company directors are not returned as employees in the income tax returns."-ZORN, " Incidence of the Income Tax."

The Drain from Sch. D.-This is one of the most important considerations in connection with Sch. E. "The conversion of private concerns into public companies is a factor constantly tending to increase the assessments under this schedule and to diminish the assessments on employees under Sch. D." ${ }^{1}$ Reference should be made under this heading to the remarks on Sch. $D,{ }^{2}$ but it may be mentioned here that the conversion of private concerns into public companies affects Sch. E in three ways:-
(r) It transfers whole groups of assessments from one schedule to another.
(2) Many of the assessments, instead of being on a three years' average, are at once made on the actual salary of the year, and are generally increased thereby.
(3) In the case of small trading concerns, in which the proprictors have taken cut the profits only to a small extent as salary, and to a larger extent as profits, the "earned income rate" is obtainable on the whole in one assessment. On conversion into private companies, if profits are taken as dividends, the earned income rate is not allowable, so that the amount taken definitely as remuneration is often purposely increased. Much that was chargeable as ordinary profits under Sch. D may figure under Sch. E after the conversion as directors' fees.

[^131]" Sch. E registers company promotion activity more faithfully than general prosperity" (W. H. Price, "The British Income Tax," Quarterly Journal of Economics, February, 1906, in examining the income tax as an index of prosperity). He is referring, however, only to the promotion of new concerns, for his generally accurate and well-informed article says: " No schedule shows as large and as constant annual increase as does the one which embraces salaries of Government and public company officials. Gross income under this head shows far greater increases than taxable income, largely because public companies have been rapidly increasing, and many of their employees assessable under this schedule receive salaries below the limit of exemption." He fails to note the constant transfer of Sch. D assessments to Sch. E, and he errs in supposing that the salaries "below the limit of exemption" affect the gross figures. The difference between gross and net increases is of course due to the fact that the abatements bear a large proportion to the gross salaries.

Classification by Countries.-The statistics are given for the metropolis, rest of England, Scotland, and Ireland separately. But this indicates only where the assessments are made, and not necessarily where the officials carry on their duties, for in many cases all assessments are made where the head office is situated. The warnings given under Sch. C and Sch. D must be repeated here. ${ }^{1}$

The 12th Report refers to the " danger of inferences which the mere figures appear to warrant " in connection with a House of Commons return on the comparative burden of taxation in England and Ireland. "Sch. E again is as fallacious a guide as the others . . . nearly the whole of the civil, naval and military servants of the British Empire being assessed in London. Even the public servants employed in Ireland are for the most part charged in England."

But although forty years have passed, the warning is still necessary :-
"No. of officials in Ireland, 4.397; in Scotland, 944 " (rgog-10 figures).
"This assertion has become a commonplace argument of the Home Rulers for British platforms. It has found its way into all their text-books, and the general soundness of their financial
propositions may be gauged by it. It had its origin in a speech of Mr. Kettle, ex-M.P., in Parliament in 1908, with which he says he amazed the House of Commons. It is based upon a patent misapprehension of the returns of income tax assessments under Sch. E.
" These tables do not show, as Mr. Redmond's argument would lead his hearers to suppose they did, that there are only 944 civil servants on the Scotch establishment. What they do show is the number of certain assessments made in London, in the rest of England, in Scotland, and in Ireland. If Mr. Redmond's deduction was correct the tables would prove that while it required 944 officials to manage Scotland and 4.397 to manage Ireland and 82,896 to manage London, all the rest of England was managed by nobody. The income tax assessments are made at the source of payment and not at the place where the employee is stationed, and the explanation of the tables is that London is the great financial centre for Government offices in Great Britain and the usual pay office for civil servants not only in England but in Scotland; while the pay office for nearly all Irish civil servants is the Paymaster-General's office in Dublin. The income tax is deducted at headquarters."-A. W. Samuels, " Home Rule : Its Financial Aspects," Financial Reviev of Revicos, March, 1912.

## Gross Assessments.

Classification by Amounts.-The whole of the Sch. E assessments are given classified in stages in the General Schs. D and E classification, ${ }^{1}$ but, unlike Sch. D, there is no attempt to subdivide into classes of persons also. They are obviously all assessments upon "employees" in a very broad sense, and when included with employees (Sch. D) give a complete view of one class.

A peculiarity of Sch. E materially affecting the numbers in the tables is that assessments are not made upon full personal liability under the schedule, but are impersonal to the extent that it is really the office held that is assessed in the name of the holder for the time being. So a country solicitor, who is clerk to magistrates, clerk to rural district councils, to income tax commissioners, to guardians, and to various institutional bodies and charities, may have

[^132]
## SCHEDULE E. SALARIES OF OFFICIALS. 269

twelve or fifteen separate assessments under Sch. E. Simi- . larly a medical man often has six or more small appointments all separately assessed, as medical officer for various bodies. In the same way one man is a director of five or six cotton companies in Lancashire. Altogether the number of multiple assessments is very considerable, and the large proportion (two-fifths) of the whole number of assessments which fall in the class " under $£^{160}$ but not exempt" is clearly explained, and the low average of that class, E 58 , can be well understood.

This consideration becomes important when the tables are used for estimating the number of taxpayers and the distribution of income.

It should also be remembered that this classification is one of gross assessments, without regard to any expenses which have to be deducted. ${ }^{1}$

## Deductions from Gross Assessments.

(1) Expenses.-Under the 1842 Act there was no allow. ance for the necessary expenses of performing the duties of an office. This was remedied in 1853, when deductions were allowed ${ }^{2}-(\mathrm{x}$ ) for the expenses of travelling, keeping a horse, and any other expenses "wholly, exclusively, and necessarily " incurred in the performance of the duties; (2) for any expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of duty by a clergyman or minister of any religious denomination.

Deductions under (2) have been held not to include voluntary contributions to the stipend of an assistant minister, the expense not being necessarily incurred in the parsonal performance of duty: In Scotland allowable deductions for a minister included expenses of visiting his congregation, attending church meetings enjoined on him as part of his duty, stationery and communion expenses, but not the value of part of his house used as a study, nor the expense of books.

[^133]But the deductions under (1) are of more importance statistically. The expenses of directors travelling from their residences to the office of their company are not allowable, ${ }^{1}$ and the expense of travelling between two places in order to carry out two separate offices ${ }^{2}$ is inadmissible. The expenses must be incurred in the performance of duty. The claim of a national schoolmaster (assessed to include the salary of his wife who was a schoolmistress) to deduct the wages and maintenance of a domestic servant, on the ground that her employment was necessary in order that the duties of the household might be carried on, was disallowed. ${ }^{3}$

Generally speaking, compulsory contributions to superannuation allowances are deductible as an expense. The only recent change is the allowance of one-eighth part of the rent paid by a clergyman, in respect of a room used as a study.

The amount of these expenses is not now shown separately. In 1899 it was $£ 850,636,{ }^{6}$ but is now much more, and is included in " Other Allowances, Reductions and Discharges."

From 1853 to 1873 no account was taken of this allowance, which was deducted before the gross assessments were classified, so that to restore the sequence of figures from 1842 to the present time it is necessary to increase the gross assessments (vide Table E).
(2) Other Allowances and Reductions-These are reductions on appeal, fees credited but finally waived, double assessments, etc., at all stages in the administration, and must be deducted from the gross to give true income for statistical purposes.
(3) Exemptions: Income not exceeding $\$ 160$,-It will be observed that this sum bears but a small proportion to the total. All income known to be exempt at the time when the assessment books are made up is excluded, and this small amount sepresents the incomes for which exemption claims are completed by schedule or repayment. ${ }^{5}$

[^134]
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It is obvious that to arrive at true income of liable persons deductions ( 1 ), (2), and (3) should be made from the gross assessments.

Peraonal Deductions.-These are abatements, life insurance premiums, and allowances for children, and the remarks under Sch. D are equally applicable here. These deductions should not be made when the true income of taxable persons is in question.
It should be noted that life insurance allowances were deducted from gross assessments, 1853 to 1873, and did not appear in the gross statistics at all.

## Gross Assessments-Sequence.

Apart from the continuous effect of the drain from Sch.D, the following are the chief breaks in statistical continuity :-
(I) False gross assessment.
(2) 1842 to 1853 .-Omission of Ireland.
(3) $\mathbf{1 8 5 3}$.-Exemption limit reduced from $£ 150$ to $£ \mathbf{E 0 0}$.
(4) 1876.—Exemption limit raised from $£ 100$ to $£ 150$.
(5) 1894.-Exemption limit raised from $£ 150$ to $£ 160$.
(6) 1853 to 1873.-Reduction of gross assessment by amount of life insurance allowance and expenses.
These have already been explained under Sch. D. ${ }^{1}$ The effects of (2) have been computed in Appendix III., and of (3), (4), and (5) in Appendix I., while (6) is allowed for in Table E .

Broek 5.-W. H. Price, in accounting for the Sch. E decrease in 1894-5, speaks first of "dull business," and company failures, and adduces " finally" the proper reason, but does not give it sufficient weight ("The British Income Tax." Qmartarly Jowrnal of Economics, February, 1906).

2 P. so4.
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Table E.-Sch. E Assessments, United Kingdom (in million $£$ ).
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| Year． | Official Gross Assessments generally used hitherto． | Trae Comparable Sories with Exemption Lmits 8150. | True Comparable Serles with Exemption Limit $£ 160$ ． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1884 1885 | $38 \cdot 3$ 39.4 | $38 \cdot 3$ 39.4 | $36 \cdot 7$ $37 \cdot 4$ |
| 1886 | 40．3 | $40 \cdot 3$ | 38.6 |
| 1887 | 41.3 | 41.3 | 39.6 |
| 2888 | 42.8 | 42.8 | 31.0 |
| 1889 | $45 \%$ | 450 | 43.8 士 |
| 1890 | $47 \%$ | $47 \cdot 7$ | $45 \cdot 7$ |
| 1891 | 49.5 | $49 \cdot 5$ | $47 \cdot 4$ |
| 1892 | 51.6 | 51.6 | 49.4 |
| 1893 | 52.6 | 52.6 | 50．3 |
| 1894 | 51.0 | 53.3 | 51.0 |
| 2893 | $53 \cdot 3$ | $55 \cdot 7$ | $53 \cdot 3$ |
| 1896 | 56.4 |  | 56.4 |
| 1897 | 59.8 | 62.5 土 | 59.8 |
| 1898 | $65 \cdot 3$ | $68 \cdot 2$ | 65.3 |
| 1899 | 70．${ }^{\text {\％}}$ | 73. | $70 \cdot 1$ |
| 1900 | $75 \cdot 4$ | 78.8 | 754 |
| 1901 | 79.8 | 82.77 | 79．2 |
| 1904 | 80.4 | $86 \cdot 1$ | 82.4 |
| 1903 | 86.1 | $89 \cdot 9$ 土 4 | $86 \cdot 1$ |
| 1904 | $89 \cdot 4$ | 93.4 | 89.4 |
| 1905 | 93.4 | 97.3 ） | $93^{\circ}$ |
| 1906 | 97.1 | 102－5） | 97.1 |
| 1907 | 1040 | 1086 | 1040 |
| 1908 | 8096 | 1145 | 1096 |
| 1909 | 8158 | 1189 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 113－8 |
| 1910 | 1197 | 125－0 ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ | $1 \times 9 \cdot 7$ |
| z98t | 18y9 | 1330 | 2076 |
| 1916 | 1356 | 848．7） | $135-6$ |
| 1913 | 1456 | $25^{*-2} \pm 8$ | 1456 |

## CHAPTER VIII.

The Income Tax as a Whole.

## Section I.

## GENERAL TABLES FOR THE WHOLE INCOME TAX.

The first table appearing in the present reports is that giving details of Budget estimates, amounts paid into the Exchequer, net receipt, net produce, and produce for asch 1d. in the 8 . These are shown for eleven years in comparative form, and the table gives details for a year in advance of the remaining tables. In this form it dates from 1900, but the last three headings are given separately in earlier reports.

Definitions. 1_" Budget estimate" is the amount at which the Chancellor of the Exchequer places the Exchequer receipt of tax for the financial year.
" Exchequer receipt" is the amount of tax which is paid over to the Exchequer within the year, and stands as the realisation of the Budget estimate, with deficit or surplus.
" Net receipt " is the amount of tax actually collected by the department within the year (no matter for what year the tax may have been assessed), less the amount of tax refunded etc. within the year.
" Net produce" is the estimated yield of the tax imposed for any particular year, irrespective of the date of actual collection.
" Produce per Id." represents the net produce divided by the rate of tax ; it shows roughly the effect of adding $x d$. to the rate of tax.

## Use of "Net Produce " Statistica.

The first three headings are of ephemeral importance and interest only, and have little statistical value. The figures
${ }^{2}$ Vide 45th Report, p. 169.
depend so much on the accidental circumstances of the collection, or the financial requirements of the Budget for the year, that each year exhibits its own peculiarities, having no relation to the amount of the assessments. The net produce, on the other hand, is the net duty on the income assessed for the year, and has some value, but perhaps its chief use is to enable the net produce per penny to be computed. The produce per penny is a figure which may be held to have some degree of real comparability year by year, and it is frequently adduced as evidence for or against the general progress of the community, being pressed into controversies about tariffs, bimetallism, and other subjects into which the question of "progress" enters. It is obvious, however, that the net produce reduced to the amount per penny by allowing for changes in rate is only comparable cateris paribus, for both wealth and gross assessments may increase and yet the yield per penny may decline by reason of additional allowances from taxable income-o.g., insurance, abatements, or any other change in the conditions of levy. This is the chief pitfall in such comparisons.

The increase between $\mathbf{~} 870-\mathrm{x}$ and 1906- 7 is quoted in Porter's "Progress of the Nation " (p. 168), with the comment "as a matter of fact the increase is even greater than these figures testify owing to the changes in the scale of abatement and exemption."

The following uses are typical :-

## Gemeral Progress.

(I) In Parliamentary Return 217 of 1896 there is an error in the footnote which gives the rate in 1874-5 as 3d. instead of 22 . Dividing the yield under each schedule by 3 instead of 2, Mr. Williams accordingly obtained very low figures throughoutfx,172,000 instead of $\mathrm{f} 1,916,000$-with which to compare ( $1,974,000$ for $1894-5$, twenty years later, and he concludes that the increase was 71 per cent. (insteed of 3 per cent. actually), despite the restricted range of income covered, which he duly observes.

In commenting upon the increases nuder Sch. D, however, he computes an increase from $1869-70$ to $1894-5$ of 88 per cent.
without referring to the effects of legislative changes (" Twentyfive Years of the Income Tax," Investors' Review, October, 1896).
(2) W. R. Lawson, following the passage quoted on p.310, says that the rate of increase in gross and net assessments upsets the " favourite plea that if the national expenditure is growing by leaps and bounds, the national wealth is keeping pace with it," of which only one proof is offered, " and it is an ambiguous one. They point to the certainly curious and paradoxical fact that the more the income tax is raised the greater is the yield of each individual penny of it. That sounds as if the taxpayers had very progressive and elastic incomes, but it admits of an alternative explanation-unfortunately a most prosaic one, and only too likely to be correct. The increased yield per penny may be largely due to more vigilant assessment and collection. It has always been subject to erratic fluctuations difficult to account for, and not to be attributed solely to any single cause " ("Two Record Budgets, 1860 and 1903," Fortnightly Review, May, 1903). He then quotes the years from 189 It $1900-1$, ignoring the depression in 1893-4, and the Finance Acts of 1894 and 1898, and concludes :-" If there be a key to these variations it is the tax gatherer's screw rather than the growth of national wealth."
(3) On comparisons between wealth and poverty, see also Benjamin Kidd, " Imperial Policy and Free Trade," Nineteonth Century, July, 1903.

## Free Trade and Protection.

(4) " Free trade statisticians point to the returns of our income tax collection as a proof of our continued prosperity. . . . Yet when I examine these returns I fail to agree. . . . The yield of our income tax has remained the same for the past ten years. It remains $2 \cdot x$ millions for every penny levied. Yet the population has increased by no less than three millions in the interim. Therefore the returns have decreased " (G. Byng, "Protection," 1901). The effect of the additional allowances in 1894 and 1898 has been ignored.
(5) "In the last five years the yield of the income tax per penny in the pound has increased from two millions to two and a half millions. Does that look as if our capital were disappearing?" -Harord Cox, "The Effect of the Com Laws: A Reply," Nimeteonth Centwry, February, 1903.

Similarly, Harris, "Depression of Trade and National Progress," Journal of Institute of Bankers, 1885.

Gifien, in discussing the rate of material progress (S. J.,
1887), quotes the aggregates in ten-year periods from 1855 to 1885. " making all allowance for the limit of tax and improved collection," and discusses generally the relation of prices to these results. He used quinquennial averages, 1864-84, in various forms before the R. C. on Trade and Depression, 1886.
E. Crammond compares gross assessments, $1900-10$, and makes por capita comparisons for England, Scotland, and Ireland respec-tively-14.7, 13, and 2I ("Ireland's Economic Development," Nineteonth Contury, May, 1912).
W. M. J. Williams quotes Irish assessments, 1894-5 and 1908-9, as evidence of Irish progress (Contemporary Reviow, February, 1912).

Leroy Beaulieu compares 1897-8 and Igri-12 (L'Economiste Francaiso, IIth July, 1914).
"Anti Bimetallism : Yield per Id., 1870 to 1892 " (Journal of Institute of Bankers, 1895, p. 377).

A further use to which the figures have sometimes been put is to prove that high taxation increases evasion:-" It must be remembered that, in reducing the rate of income tax, you always increase the yield per xd."-F. W. Hirst, " An Ideal Budget," Indepandeni Reviaw, December, 1905.

Vide also Schuster, Journal of Institute of Bankers, 1904. p. 217.

It will be clear that before comparisons are made regard must be paid to the effect of legislative changes, but for most purposes the relative population should also be considered, as total wealth is of small significance by itself. For example, see H. C. 163-1896 (000 omitted).

| Youth | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yield } \\ \text { per Id } \end{gathered}$ |  | Yield at boginning. | Yiold at end. | Growth. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Pur } \\ \text { cent. } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1875-6 to 1885-6. 1835-6 to 1895-6. | $\begin{aligned} & 8.7^{8} \\ & 1.980 \end{aligned}$ | 4 80 $\times 75$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathcal{C}_{1,988} \\ 1,805 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 8.9 \\ 3.980 \\ \text { (арprox.) } \end{gathered}$ | \% ${ }_{6}^{8}$ | $\begin{array}{r}3-23 \\ \hline 1547\end{array}$ |

(Growth over the whole period, 15.43 : growth in population, 19.17.)
If the Id. in the $\{$ produce is divided by population withont regand to changes in abatements, etc., inferences may be grotesque. (Vide G. Drage, "Imperial Orgenisation of Trade es (p. 28), whe quotes from Schulte Gavernitz, p. 251.)
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Sir R. H. Inglis Palgrave gave the produce per Id., 1843, 185 x , and each decade to rgor, making an index number, and also the produce per head of the population :-1843, 6.93d.; 1851, 6.90d.; 1861, 9.30d.; 1871, 12.10d.; 1881, 13.17d.; 1891, 14.23d.; 1901, 14.65 d . There is no reference to the abatements and other breaks ("Enquiry into the Economic Condition of the Country," Journal of Institute of Bankers, 1904).
F. Platt Higgins quoted Palgrave's results above, and derived satisfaction, as a tariff reformer, from the results (Journal of Manchester Statistical Society, 1905-6, p. 54).

## Tables showing Virtual Rates of Tax, after allowing for the Effect of Abatements.

## Official Table 94 of 1913-14 (Graduation).

The use of abatements is merely a device to obtain a kind of graduation. Because of a certain roughness in its results it has been greatly abused by many who do not understand the practical difficulties, in a " stoppage at the source" system, of applying actual graduated rates to each stage. This is not the place to discuss or defend the system, but it may certainly be admitted as one of its attendant disadvantages that few people know with reasonable exactness what is the feal rate of income tax they are paying. One hears eloquent grumbling on the part of men with incomes of $£ 300$ about an " intolerable tax of 1s. $2 d$. in the $f$," or whatever the normal rate of the year may happen to be, quite regardless of the fact that the real rate on that income is only $6 \frac{1}{2} d$.

This table is therefore a useful reminder that the tax is graduated, and it acts as a ready reckoner to the true rates. Moreover, since people must make comparisons, if not odious or invidious, generally inaccurate or inadequate, it gives an opportunity for a correct comparison of rates with other countries, where a direct system of taxation by a graduated scale is in force.

Misleading comparisons may be illustrated by the following :-
(1) "Our income tax, allowing for abatements, amounts to from gd. to Is. in the f. The German income tax amounts only to
from $\frac{9}{4}$ d. to $9 \frac{1}{2} d$. in the $f$."-J. Ellis Barker, Fortnightly Review, May, Igog.

This statement is meaningless unless the levels of income are indicated, since the Prussian tax reaches $4 \frac{1}{2} d$. in the $f$ at the place where the British tax begins, and our rates, "allowing for abatements," were (at the time of the quotation) $\cdot 3 \mathrm{~d}$. where the Prussian rate was $5 d$., and $5 \frac{1}{2} d$. where theirs was 7d. (" earned " incomes prior to the Igog "additions" in Prussia). After rgog the rates were widely divergent (in favour of the British rate) up to $£ 600$ income, then closely similar up to $£ 2,000$, then divergent again (in favour of the Prussian rate). No comparison for " unearned " income can easily be made.
(2) Another writer, anxious to make his proposal for rates of $7\}$ per cent. on incomes of $£ 10,000$ and 10 per cent. on $£ 50,000$ appear quite harmless, said:-" This is moderation too compared with the ratos of income tax which are now being proposed by the German Chancellor. The latest advices from Berlin give the following rates as those which are to be imposed for the next three years : Incomes from $£ 60$ to $£ 150$ to be additionally taxed 5 per cent., those from $£ 150$ to $£ 525$ Io per cent., those from £525 to $£ 1,20015$ per cent., and so on to those of $£ 1,750$ with an augmented tax of 25 per cent., which is the maximum."P. Snowden, M.P., Socialist Review, March, $1 g 09$.

This language is quite misleading, since these percentages are not ratas of cax at all, but rates of addition to the sums previously payable-a vastly different matter. If 4 per cent. were payable previously and the 25 per cent. addition has to be made, the effect is to raise the rate to 5 per cent. I
(3) "Germany is in a far more favourable position than Great Britain, not only as regards indebtedness, but also as regards taxation, as the following figures show :-


Mr. Barker might have furnished the real Gigures for Great
 94.: f3,000, 15. (earned incomes, 1909-10).

The subject of graduation is, in itself, outside the scope of this work, but it is bound up with the question of deduction of tax at the source. The methods of deduction, etc., are often referred to, and there are many misconceptions.
(I) " Every payer should make an annual return . . . direct. This would save inconvenience, irritation and loss of revenue in cases such as the following:-A. borrows $£ 500$ on a property ; B. lends the same. B. must (by law) allow income tax 18 . in the $f$ at present. A. returns his income under $£ 500$ per annum, and therefore pockets the difference between the 1s. in the $f$ allowed him and the lesser rate he is chargeable with. Therefore both lender and revenue suffer."-Rev. J. Cardwell Gardner, Financial Review of Reviews, February, $190 \%$.

But A. is not charged a "lesser" rate; he gets an abatement, which is quite a different thing. If his gross income is $£ 450$, and his net income (after payment of interest) $£ 425$, he is charged on £ 450 minus $£ 150$ abatement, or $£ 300$ net at (say) 1s. in the $£$. He deducts tax on $£ 25$ at 1s. from B., and therefore finally bears tax on $£ 275$ at $1 s$.
(2) "Public companies ought to pay their dividends free of moome tax to their shareholders, as by so doing they would save them a fraction over $\frac{1}{2} d$. in the $f$. For example, a company pays a dividend of $£ 5$ to Mr. John Smith, and it deducts from the interest warrant the amount of 5 s. and pays Mr. Smith $£ 4$ 15s. Now the amount Mr. Smith receives is $64 \mathbf{1 5 s}$. and no more; and the income tax on that is 4 s . 9 d ., and not 5 s . Now if the company had paid the income tax upon Mr. Smith's dividend instead of deducting it, they would have paid 5s. and no more to Somerset House. Consequently, Mr. Smith would have in this event paid is. income tax for each $£ 1$ received, but owing to his having his income tax deducted by the company he is made to pay 43 . gd. on the $£ 415 s$. he received, plus 3 ., which makes his income tax on this something over 15. ol $d$. in the $f$. This is not generally perceived, consequently shareholders continually pay more than $x s$. in the $f_{6}$." -Sie R. Edccunbe in Financial Revicu of Reviaos, February, 1907.

This is quite fallacious. The tax paid by the company to the Revenue is the same in any case, whatever method it has in dealing with its dividends. Assume for simplicity that its total profits are $£ 1,000$; it is assessed and pays $£ 50$ tax thereon. Then it has only $£ 950$ to distribate, and it can either pay out $£ 950$ as dividend "free of tax," or pay the full nominal ( 1,000 dividend, deducting tax, and disbursing $\mathbf{6 5 0}$ as the net cash. But it is
physically impossible to pay $£ 50$ to the Revenue and also $£ 1,000$ in full to the shareholder.

## Net Receipt of Income Tax in each Part of the Kingdom (Table 83).

This table is of small use for general purposes, any inferences from it being severely limited. The net produce figures are in every respect superior. The effect of the financial deadlock in 1909 upon these two tables should be observed, and the difference between them will be clearly understood.

## Gros: Income brought under the Review of the Dopartment (Table 96).

This table is perhaps the most important of all the official statistics. At any rate, these figures are more often quoted and used than any others, and their limitations should be clearly grasped. They represent, of course, an aggregation of the "gross" figures for each schedule already discussed, and many of the "faults" of the separate tables are of course present here. But one class of difficulties in the separate schedules vanishes in this aggregate, vir., the complications arising from transfers from one schedule to another, whether by special legislation (as when railways, mines, etc., were transferred from Sch. A to Sch. $D^{3}$ ) or by the nature of the case (as with the continuous "drain " from Sch. D to Sch. $\mathrm{E}^{\mathbf{2}}$ ).

The most important fault in this aggregate of gross assessments is that the components are unlike in scope. Sch. A and Sch. B both include all the income within their respective classes, whether liable or exempt, Sch. E is practically confined to liable income, and Schs. C and D include only that exempt income which represents dividends and interest paid (under deduction of tax) to non-liable persons who claim repayment ; that is to say, the inclusion of exempt income is only allowed where it is quite unavoidable. It is clear, therefore, that to get a homogeneous figure the whole of the

[^135]exempt income-" that fraction of the income of exempt persons which for administrative reasons comes within the purview of the department "-must be deducted.
" When the Income Tax Commissioners record that such and such a gross amount has been 'reviewed" by them, they simply mean that they have collected a vast number of documents, each purporting to represent a certain sum of money, and have reviewed them, or (in plain English) gone through them with the object of picking out those, and those only, which stand for net private incomes amounting to more than $£ 160$ a year." W . H. Mallock, "Social Reform," p. 117.

It will be seen that this explanation hardly meets the case-in fact it really misrepresents it. Sch. A and B exempt income is wholly included, but Sch. C and D exempt income is almost entirely excluded; it is only where it is necessary to claim exemption by repayment that it must be included in gross assessments. There are thousands of returns under Sch. E where exemption is claimed and none of these get included in the gross statistics, the exempt income included under this schedule temporarily being very small indeed. A more accurate description is perhaps the following :-
"The officials throw their net over a wide area, and at the first cast of it they get into its meshes a considerable amount of income which they have to release later."-Sir Thomas Whitiaker, " Ownership and Taxation of Land," p. 47.

The position is very well set out by Mr. W. H. Price, who says that while in 1903-4 Sch. D accounts for 44 per cent. of the gross income brought under review, it provided 60 per cent. of taxable income and revenue, and the wide difference is " due to the fact that persons and firms whose incomes are below $£ 160$ are not required to declare their incomes; while in the case of the other schedules, and likewise in that part of Sch. D which applies to companies, such income is brought under review but is omitted from taxable incomes" ("The British Income Tax," Quarterly Journal of Economics, February, 1906).

The official description of "gross income" was as follows:-

[^136]
#### Abstract

"The figures of gross income as given in previous reports have not, however, covered quite the whole of the ground described above, for they have been confined to the gross income brought into assessment, and have been commonly described under the term 'gross assessments,' and they have thus left annually out of account some two to five millions of income on which tax is levied without regular assessment." ${ }^{1}$


Again, the income belonging to exempt charities, hospitals, and friendly societies is completely included so far as Sch. A is concerned, but only partly included under Schs. C and D. This, too, must be deducted to give consistent results. It is obvious that these two items, if fairly constant, would mask the true percentage growth of the significant gross income.

A third item, which does not relate to true liable income at all, is " foreign dividends belonging to foreign residents." Such payments come administratively through the machine, but do not belong to it in any way.

The deduction of these three classes gives an aggregate representing the gross assossmonts upon the income of liable persons, consistent and comparable.

Can the gross assessment oxhibit fictitious changes ?-(a) It is obvious that if a number of large " fancy" assessments were made, and then allowed off " by schedule " and never collected, the gross figures might be swollen to any extent. The details of "other allowances, reductions and discharges" are therefore of importance and should be observed.
(b) An administrative or legal change may add to the gross assessments at the same time that it adds equally to the deductions. This tendency is exhibited whenever capital assets that have been dealt with by way of renewals are brought under the method of "wear and tear " allowances."

Any one scanning the tables for the past decade will observe that the gross assessments have grown more rapidly than the "income on which tax was received "; the former have advanced $£ 190,000,000$ in the ten years 1902 to 191I, or

[^137]
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$21 \cdot 6$ per cent., and the latter $£ 112,000,000$, or $18 \cdot 4$ per cent.

The differences are made up as follows :-


Two new allowances were introduced during the decade, the additional repairs under Sch. A and the children allowance. The "wear and tear " method of allowance has been greatly extended. These three items alone account for a considerable part of the difference.

The really significant figure for comparative purposes is the tarable ineome, ${ }^{1}$ which is given clearly in new tables in the 56th Report for the first time. Table $\mathrm{G}_{4}$ includes similar figures estimated for previous years.
${ }^{1}$ Discussed further on p. 295.

But with all their limitations these total gross assessments will doubtless continue to be used for comparative purposes in every possible connection. It is necessary, therefore, to consider them in some detail, sufficiently illustrating the kind of errors which are most prevalent.

> Total Gross Assessments: Sequence of Statistics. Time Comparisons.

The following are the chief " breaks " in the series ${ }^{1}$ :-
(I) The Omission of Iroland, 1842 to 1852.

The figures for Great Britain during this period have frequently been brought into deliberate comparison with figures for the United Kingdom for subsequent years.
Hyndmen, in "England for All" (quoted by W. H. Mallock. "Property and Progress," p. 150), compares the "total gross annual value of property and proits, $£ 275,000,000$, in 1848 , with $5588,000,000$ in 1878, yet the total population in 1848 was $28,000,000$ as against $34,000,000$ in 1878 . Here then in the United Kingdom an increase of rio per cent. in income since 1848 is accompanied by an increase in the population of only 20 per cent."

## (2) The "False " Gross Acsossmonte undor Sches. D and E, 1842 to 1867.

These have beed explained under Sch. D. ${ }^{2}$ All writers who have had recourse to gross assessments have used the official gross figures instead of the official net figures, and the latter were subsequently regarded as the gross. It would therefore be idle to specify particular instances.

## (3) Change in Exemplion Limit, 1853.

The reduction in the limit from $£ 150$ to $£ 100$ in $\mathbf{1 8 5 3 - 4}$ increased the gross assessments under Schs. D and E, and

[^138]therefore affected the total gross assessments. It has been frequently ignored:-
G. J. Shaw Lefevre quoted the $1867-1876$ decade correctly for the purpose of illustrating the commercial progress of the country, but in comparing it with the decade 1847-56 the percentage of the latter was calculated without reference to the 1853 break and wrongly given as 16 per cent. (S. J., 1878).

Giffen quoted the increase in income tax assessment in the twenty years 1848 to 1868 as $£ 135,498,000$, or " about 60 per cent., or 3 per cent. per annum," against a population increase of $\mathrm{r} \cdot 3$ per cent. per annum, in accounting for the depreciation of gold since 1848 (" Economic Inquiries and Studies," I., p. 86).

## (4) Change in Exemption Limit, 1876-7.

The change from $£ 100$ to $£ 150$ reduced the amount of income coming under gross assessments (Schs. D and E), and therefore affected the total gross assessments very materially. ${ }^{1}$

Dr. Bowley estimated a total difference of $\left\{30,000,000,{ }^{2}\right.$ which is very close to the amount arrived at in Appendix 1 . Giffen's estimate of $£ 4,800,000^{3}$ (for Sch. D) is manifestly inadequate.

On the whole we have had an epoch in which our capacity to reduce our debt must have greatly increased, as witness the fact that the gross amount of the value of property and profits assessed to income tax was $£ 490,000,000$ on the average for the five years $1870-4$, and is now probably $£ 710,000,000$ " (" British Finance in the Nineteenth Century," Edinburgh Revicw, July, 1899).

Leone Levi compared gross assessments for 186 r with 1882 similarly ("Progress of the Country," S. J., 1884).

In considering the " recent rate of material progress in England "Giffen quoted (inter alia) the percentage increases

[^139]between 1855-65, 1865-75, and 1875-85, and remarked:" Making all allowance for changes in the mode of assessment by which the lower limit of the tax has been raised, for the apparent increase before 1875, which may have been due to a gradual increase of the severity of the collection, and for the like disturbing influences, I believe there is no doubt that these income tax assessments correspond fairly well to the change-in the money value of income and property in the interval." The great difference between the 44 per cent. increase in 1865-75 and the to per cent. in 1875-85 is assigned to the fall in prices, " hence the tax assessments by themselves are not a perfectly good test in a question like the present " ("Economic Inquiries," II., p. 102).

Giffen was thus quite aware of the 1875 break, although he sometimes omitted to make the necessary allowances in other comparisons.

For example, he takes the average of ten years (gross income) 1867 to 1876-7, $£ 492,000,000$, as $£ 15$ Ios. per head (of the population) and compares it with the ten years 1877-1886, $£ 599,000,000$, or average $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{I}} 7$, and also compares the average per head for 1875-6 with 1885-6, when "the income per head is found to have even slightly diminished "; and he concludes:-" Unless, therefore, there has been something different in the progress of non-income tax incomes from what has taken place in income tax incomes, the inference would be that the appreciation of gold measured by commodities of late years is an appreciation which has not extended, or has yet extended very little, to the diminution of income per head " ("Economic Inquiries," I., p. 177).

## (5) The Wear and Tear Allowanca, 1878-9.

The effect on Sch. D has been explained. ${ }^{2}$ The total gross assessments are also affected where any comparison is being made between a period before $1878-9$ and one after that year. The effect is unimportant, and no illustrations are needed.

## (6) The Change in the Examption Limit, 1894.

The present limit, $£ 160$, was instituted in 1894-5. The gross assessments under Schs. D and E were affected, being

[^140]reduced in volume, ${ }^{1}$ so that the total gross assessments are also involved.

## (7) Change in the Mothod of Assessing Sch. B, 1896-7.

This change was important, because, prior to this date, the full rental value of land had been included in the total gross assessments, and after that date only one-third of the value, without any real change in the circumstances. ${ }^{2}$

In the numerous comparisons covering the period 1894 to 1896 both (6) and (7) are generally ignored together.
(x) "The commercial and professional income of the country improved nearly a hundred millions during the decade 189x-2 to 1goo, if we take gross assessments. But when we turn to the amount on which income tax was levied, nearly half of the improvement disappears."-W. R. Lawson, "Two Record Budgets, 1860 and 1903," Fortnightly Reviecs, May, 1903.
(2) In comparing the gross totals for 1878 with 1899-1900 Morgan Browne adds $£ 35,000,000$ to the latter "for the change in the method of computing the annual value of lands under Sch. B," making it $£ 823,000,000$ ("Sir R. Giffen's Indiscretion," Now Liberal Review, February, 1902).

In a subsequent comparison $£ 37,000,000$ was added, making it £825,000,000 (Naw Liberal Review, April, 1902).

Correct adjustment is thus attempted for Sch. B, but (6) is omitted. A similar error is made by Colson ("Cours d'Economie Politique," II., p. 314), who is otherwise very clear and correct on the subject.
(3) "What the actual increase (of wealth) per head is since 1861 has already been glanced at. It cannot, in any view, be less than 25 per cent. in face of the figures showing the growth of income tax assessments between 186x and 1901 from $£ 335.500,000$ to $\mathbf{7 7 8 8 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0 , 2}$ or over 130 per cent., as compared with a growth of population, reckoning Great Britain only, of 60 per cent. This would imply an increase of 40 to 50 per cent. per head, and would certainly more than justify the assumption of an increase of 25 per cent. only, which is necessary to the doubling of the resources of the country. Reckoning, moreover, the changes in the income tax returns by which the gross amount is understated as compared with what was the case formerly, that is adding

[^141]mearly forty million pounds to the above figure of $\left\{788,000,000,{ }^{1}\right.$ the increase then would be no less than 140 per cent., as compared with an increase of 60 per cent. in population, and would imply an increase of wealth per head of over 50 per cent. Comparing 1871 with Ig0I we have an increase from $£ 465,000,000$ to the above $\{788,000,000$, or rather $£ 828,000,000$, or at the rate of about 80 per cent., as compared with an increase of 54 per cent. in the population of Great Britain only. This would be equal to an increase of 16 per cent. per head, and although not quite doubling the whole wealth of the country in thirty years, comes very near to doing so."-Sir R. Giffen, "A Financial Retrospect, 186I-ryor ": "Economic Inquiries," II., p. 323.

It will be observed, in the words italicised, that an addition of $£ 40,000,000$ is made. This appears to refer to the Sch. B break (No. 7), but all reference to breaks (4) and (6)-the changes in the exemption limit from $£ 100$ to $£ 160-$ is omitted.
(4) Vide also Journal of Institute of Bankers, I90r.
(5) Comparing the 1889-90 total gross assessment with that for 1898-9 in his essay "Are we Living on Capital ?" Giffen makes the allowance for $£ 38,000,000$ under Sch. B in $\mathbf{1 8 8 9 - 9 0}$, but no allowance for the $\mathbf{I 8 9 4 - 5}$ change in exemption limit, when he gives the increase as $£ 631,000,000$ to $£ 759,000,000$, or 20 per cent. in ten years.

The increase is contrasted with a 10 per cent. increase in population: "there is, consequently, an increase of the total capital per head as well as an absolute increase " ("Economic Inquiries," II., Pp. 285-6).
(6) W. M. J. Williams, in a comparison designed to show the relative progress of population, revenue and commerce, uses the income tax assessments : 1855, £308,139,000; $\mathbf{1 8 8 6}, £ 529,412,000$ (7x per cent.): $x 895$, $\{540,137,000$ ( 21 per cent.)-"An annual increase of $2 \ddagger$ per cent. to I886, while the period ending with 1896 shows but little over $\$$ per cent."

The comparison is of course worthless, since he not only ignores the 1875-6 and 2894-5 changes in exemption limit, but also sets the total med assessments for 2886 and 1895 against the grass for 1855, and all abatements and allowances are ignored. The handling is too careless to be of any use whatever ("The British Revenue, 1801-7," Jowrnal of Finance, May, 1897).
(7) G. Drage (" Imperial Organisation of Trade," p. 28), in considering the general condition of the country, quotes the decadal total assessments 1861 to 1gor, and divides by the population, without reference to the exemption limit changes, though the sorrection for Sch. B is introduced.

[^142](8) J. Ellis Barker gives the following table ${ }^{1}$ :-
"1893-4
"The foregoing table tells its own tale. The fact that British income subject to income tax increased very slowly during the good years which preceded the South African war, and that it increased very rapidly during the time of the war and during the bad years which followed it, suffices to show that our income tax figures are unreliable as an index to our prosperity-that they have been swelled, not by a great increase in our prosperity, but by the exertions of our tax collectors. . . . The increase in our income shown by the income tax statistics is fictitious."

The first point is the correction of 1893-4 to 1892-3, which by increasing the divisor would make the yearly increase $£ 11,000,000$. If the correct figure for $1893-4, \mathfrak{£} 673,700,000$, is substituted, the increase is $£ 15,100,000$. But the second point is the fact that the 1894-5 break is ignored, and that the true comparable figures for 1892-3 and 1893-4 would make the average increase per annum $£ 14,000,000$ and $£ 19,000,000$ respectively. The third point is that the comparison is not fairly indicated. The influence of "good" or " bad " years must be looked for mainly in the Schs. D and E assessments, and the average yearly increases in the three periods are (correcting for " breaks") $£ 12,000,000, £ 27,000,000$, and $£ 12,500,000$. Now the years represented in the first comparison are 1890,1891 , and 1892 (averaged) with 1894, 1895, and 1896 (averaged), and may fairly be put as 1891 with 1895 ; the second is, similarly, 1895 with 1898 , and the third period 1898 with 1904 . Mr. Barker's "very good years" are those from the depth of the trade depression to the first sign of recovery; his "during the time of the war" is a period completely over before the war, during which trade rapidly recovered, and the " bad years which followed it " are really the actual years of the war, inchuding the record year of 1900 and the subsequent set-back. The case for the unreliability of the figures as an index to prosperity is not in any way made out, but rather refuted. No evidence whatever is brought forward to

1 ". British Finances and Imperial Responsibilities," Formighly Review, May, 1909.
show that the extra " activity" of taxgatherers coincided with the war period, and such action coinciding with the imposition of high rates of duty is prima facie improbable. The figures given above are taken roughly as three years' averages, ${ }^{1}$ though including the " one-year concerns" and the " five-year concerns"; if greater exactness is required, and we take only the "threeyear concerns," the average increases are respectively $10 \frac{1}{4}, 18 \frac{1}{2}$, and 41 millions sterling, which correspond pretty closely with what we might have expected in these periods.
(9) Philip Snowden, M.P., contrasting the recent increase in the incomes of the "richer classes " with the position of the working classes, takes 1884-5 for comparison with 1894-5, showing an increase of $£ 26,000,000$ (against an increase in the next decade of $£^{268,000,000}$ ), but if 1893-4 had been taken the increase would have been $£ 43,000,000$ (Socialist Revicus, March, 1909). Break (6) was ignored.

## Use of Gross Assessments.

In addition to the foregoing examples, the following may be mentioned :-

The Inequality of Local Taration.-Comparison of the effect of levying poor rate upon rateable value with the results which would arise if it were levied upon the income tax assessments under Schs. A, B, and D was ingeniously made by Sir R. H. Inglis Palgrave. He set out the actual poor rate in the $f$. grouping the separate cownties according to the amounts. Against these were put the groups of counties resulting from levying rates on the assessments. He found that the grouping corresponded with great closeness:-" Neither an equalising of taxation, nor a gain to those counties which appear heavily weighted, would be caused by an alteration in the mode of assessment from a property to an income tax basis." The method of course ignores the centralising effect of Sch. D assessments, particularly for railways, canals, etc., rated in every parish and county, but assessed only in the great centres. This factor is much more important now than in 1871, and would make the comparison of little value. Even as it was then, the lightest "taxed "counties were Middlesex, 33 (maximum rate being ro0), which on the rate index stood at 69 ; Derby, taxed at 36 and rated at 55 ; Warwick (Birmingham), taxed at 45 and rated at 58 : Lancaster, taxed at 45 and rated at 6a. Apart from this centralising factor, however, and where Sch. D assessments belonged properly to the places where assessed, the similarity in grouping is remarkable,
especially when it is remembered that the poor rate is computed on a valuation wholly lacking in uniformity (" Essay on Local Taxation, 1871," S. J., p. 213).

## Deductions froy " Gross Income Reviewed" to arrive $a t$ Gross Income of Taxpayers.

## Exomptions. ${ }^{1}$

(I) Incomes not exceeding 8160 a Year-The character of the figures under each schedule has been dealt with under the detailed deductions there given, and it has also been referred to in the description of "gross income reviewed." 8 Those references should be studied by any who wish to use these aggregated figures for the income tax as a whole.

The greater part of the total is due to the inclusion of all property under Schs. A and B, and nearly all the balance to the repayments on dividends and interest under Schs. $C$ and D necessitated by the " stoppage at the source" system. The amount " dealt with by mistake ${ }^{3}{ }^{3}$ is insignificant, and it is quite a misapprehension to imagine that this sum represents the gropings of the tax officials just below the border line of liability.
" Amongst the various deductions made from the gross sum surveyed for purposes of income tax there are others besides those which are made in respect of abatements, and amongst these last are exemptions in respect of incomes which must approach, but which are shown to fall short of $£ 160$. The amount of these exemptions in 1905 was $£ 52,000,000$. If we assume, then, that the average for such incomes was $£ 155$, their total number will approximately have been 330,000 . . . . We shall find that, of incomes belonging to this latter class $(460,000$ middle-class with incomes exceeding $£ 150$ but exempt because not exceeding $£(160$ ), we are able to establish definitely, by means of the income tax returns, the existence of as many as 320,000 ; and if we suppose that of such incomes, which are 'surveyed ' only to be exempted, one oat of every three is not surveyed at all, their actual number and the estimate in the table will coincide."-W. H. Mallock, Nineteonth Century, March, 1910, p. 476.

These suppositions are all erroneous. The $\{52,000,000$ is not made up of 330,000 incomes about $f 155$ each, but of incomes IThe statistical effects of lowering the limit to $130-$ in the Budget of September, 1915 -cannot be reliably known for several years.
${ }^{2}$ P. 281.
s W. H. Mallock, "The Nation as a Businces Firm," p. 62.
or parts of incomes of all magnitudes from $£ 1$ to $£ 159$, for owners of small cottages, occupiers of small holdings, recipients of $£ 5$ dividend from Lipton's shares, or $£ 20$ from Consols. The last part of Mr. Mallock's reference therefore falls to the ground', as the question of " surveying " incomes of $£ \leq 50$ to $£ 160$ for inclusion in these figures does not axise.

An important point to note about the exemptions under Sch. $\mathbf{A}$ is that they are ret income, the deductions belonging thereto being included with the deductions from liable property. Thus a house of rental value $£ 24$ (free from ground rent and interest) belonging to a person whose total income did not exceed $£^{1} 60$ would appear in the statisticsas follows:-
£ 24 in the "gross assessments," $£ 4$ in "repairs," $£ 20$ in the "exemptions," and nil in the "net assessments." If £6 mortgage interest were paid the sum in "exemptions" would be $£ 54$, and in " net assessments " $£ 6$.

In deducting exemptions to obtain the "gross income" of taxable persons, it is therefore necessary also to deduct the repairs applicable thereto under Sch A. ${ }^{2}$ The same applies to charities, etc.

The sequence of the official statistics for exemptions, not given for all schedules as a whole until recent years, has been broken as follows (the chief causes only have been given, and for details reference should be made to the separate schedules) :-
(I) 1842-53. Ireland omitted (all schedules).
(2) I842. "False gross" (Schs. D and E).
(3) 1853. Exemption limit reduced $£ 150$ to $£ 100$ (all schedules).
(4) 2876. Exemption linit raised $f$ foo to $\mathrm{f} \mathbf{1 5 0}$ (all schedules).
(5) 1894. Exemption limit raised $£ 150$ to $£ 160$ (all schedules).
(6) I882-3. Method of computing Sch. B altered.
(7) 1896-7.

Ditto.
(8) 1894-5. Repairs allowance, Sch. A.
(9) 1900-I.

Method of compiling the statistics improved and repayments, etc., included.
a Vide p. sea

Corrections for these breaks have been introduced into Table G4.
(2) Charities, Hospitals, Friendly Societios, ote-This is the value of property under Sch. A which is either not charged to duty or upon which duty is repaid, ${ }^{1}$ and of dividends and interest under Schs. C and D received by charitable bodies and applied to charitable purposes, upon which duty is also repaid.

The income of charities actually exempted in the assessment, Sch. A, was reduced in the statistics after 1894 by the amount of the repairs allowance, ${ }^{2}$ so that the gross income is now rather more than is shown in the Reports.

Sir Thomas Whittaker says deductions should be made for " income of charities, hospitals, friendly societies, and municipal bodies which are exempt from tax " ("Ownership and Taxation of Land," p. 48).

These cases are not ejusdem generis.
Sir Thomas Whittaker thereupon deducts " local authorities" ( $£ 20,246,586$ for 1907), evidently under a misapprehension, for he.classes these assessments with those upon hospitals.

The assessments on local authorities are of two kinds-(x) in respect of property owned, or trading profits; (2) in respect of interest payable to individuals, secured on rates or on mumicipal property. In assessing (2) a set-off is allowed for nearly all payments under ( $\mathbf{x}$, and the total assessments on locel authorities represent, almost to the entire extent, income distributed to individuals as interest on municipal loans, mortgages, etc.

[^143]relief, viz., six months from the end of the year for which the tax is.charged." ${ }^{1}$
The deduction of the three foregoing classes from the "gross income reviewed" will give the "gross income of tazablo porsons."
Impersonal deductions or allowances from gross income of taxable porsons to arrive at the taxable income:-
(I) Repairs, land and houses.-This is fully dealt with under Sch. A. ${ }^{2}$ It need only be repeated here that the statistics given refer to all property, whether the owners are exempt or liable.
(2) Empty property.-Also dealt with under Sch. A. ${ }^{*}$
(3) Wear and tear of machinery and plant.-Fully explained under Sch. D. ${ }^{6}$
(4) Other allowances, reductions and discharges.-This large miscellaneous and sweeping class is made up of a number of allowances of a different character (see separate schedules), but for the most part it represents actual reductions of the gross assessments, although additional allowances for repairs and wear and tear are also included here.
Personal allowanoes from taxable income ${ }^{5}$ made as adaptations of the tax to individual circumstances :-
(x) Abatements.
(a) Life insurance premiums.
(3) Relief in respect of children.
(1) Abatoments.

These hold such an important place in the statistics utilised for purposes of investigation that they must be considered at some length. They are the best indication we possess of the number of incomes of various amounts at the lower range of incomes. In their inception they were a means to simple degression, and as they were extended they became a rough method of graduation in the lower incomes. effective and economical in administration. (Their disadvantages in hiding the true rate of tax are referred to under "Graduation-Virtual Rates." 9

| s3nd Roport, p. 100 P. 60. | e P. $17^{8}$ <br> s P. 422 |
| :---: | :---: |
| P. 63. | - P. 278. |

In actual practice abatements are allowed in various ways:
(a) In the Assessment.-In this case the abatement is claimed befure the assessment is made, and it is allowed as a deduction, wholly or in part, before the assessments are closed.
(b) "By Schedule."-After the assessment has been made and totalled, and during the period when the duty is being collected, abatements can be allowed and the duty deducted from the demand note.
(c) By Repayment.-This method is the only one available when the income is made up of taxed dividends, ground rents, interest, etc.
In the case of " mixed" incomes, the abatement is often allowed from direct assessments under Sch. D or Sch. E, or even Sch. A, as far as those assessments will go, and any balance due is claimed from the dividends by repayment. But since differentiation between "earned" and "unearned " income was introduced in 1907 the abatement must first be allowed from the "earned" income, so far as it will go, before any allowance is made from " unearned " income.
Until 1900 only the abatements under (a) above were shown in the statistics separately for each schedule, but the abatements for the tax as a whole under all three methods were given in a single total. Since 1900 the full abatements under each schedule have been given.
The history of the abatements has been as follows:-


As a minor point it may be mentioned that the abatements prior to 1898-9 were granted to "persons "-a term which
included clubs and corporate bodies, ${ }^{2}$ whereas since $1898-9$ they have been applicable to individuals.

Numbers of Abatoments.-The number of persons claiming abatements is, strictly speaking, unknown. But a very close approximation is obtained by dividing the total sum allowed as abatement in each class by the abatement itself. This is the method actually adopted for the official reports, and the number of abatements multiplied by the abatement will be found to give the total sum abated.

This method puts the number at a minimum, because the maximum divisor is used. As an actual fact, in a good many cases where the greater part of the abatement has been allowed from the assessment, and a small balance is left which could be claimed by repayment or by schedule, the claim is waived, forgotten or ignored. So the divisors should be some amount slightly less than $£ 160, £ 150, £ 120$, and $£ 70$ respectively, probably $£ 158, £ 147, £ 116$, and $£ 65$ approximately.

The evidence of Sir Henry Primrose before the 1906 Committee is of interest here. "I do not attribute much importance to that in the two lower abatements, the $£ 120$ and the $£ 70$, but I think in the $£ 160$ and the $£ 150$ it would have a certain importance, and I did have a calculation made on the basis of assuming the average claimed in the $£ 160$ class was £ 150 , and the average in the $£ 150$ class was $£ 140$. That would bring up the total from 695,000 which we have here to 739,000. I think perhaps that is a little too much . . . it might be at least 720,000 ": ( $\mathbf{1 9 0 3 - 4}$ figures). Personally I am quite satisfied that af least 90 per cent. of the abatements are given in full. What average deficiency in the remaining ro per cent. is necessary to give a general deficiency of Ero ? Obviously $£$ roo. But for an average deficiency in these cases this is absurd- 630 would be an ample estimate, which would make the average abatement $\{\times 57$ instead of $£ 160$. An addition of 8,000 at the present time to the official figures for this class is adequate. To be set against it are doubtless

[^144]some cases where the abatement is improperly claimed, on deficient statements of total income; - r per cent. would not indict the nation for ignorance or guilt, and perhaps 1,000 might be taken off on this account.

Do all the people entitled to abatements claim them? Around this question rages much controversy, because it has an important bearing on the number of taxpayers and the distribution of wealth. It is known, of course, that some people, through sensitiveness, apathy, ignorance, or fear that their assessments will be scrutinised, do not claim, and the moot point is as to what proportion neglect their privileges. As the rate of tax becomes higher the penalty for neglect is greater and the extra burden is harder to bear. It may readily be supposed that when the rate was low, and less public attention was given to income tax matters, the proportion was much larger than in recent years, when we have high rates of tax, numerous repayment agencies willing to cope with the technicalities, and helpful text-books on the subject. There have doubtless been many who did not object to our impersonal system of taxation which attacked their incomes silently and piecemeal, but who dreaded assembling the components and revealing in a "total income" statement their real position to local officials and bodies of commissioners. But the differentiation in 1907 made total income statements still more necessary, tad the cost of the luxury of entire secrecy became almost prohibitive. Nevertheless it remains a fact to-day that no one, unless his income is considerable and he is called upon for a super-tax return, need declare the total of his income if he is prepared to forego his privileges and pay at the full normal rate on all the separate components.
It is not surprising to find, therefore, that during the high rates of the South African war the number of abatements claimed rose rapidly. "Prior to 1900 there were an enormous number of people who through ignorance or inertia did not trouble to claim what they might have claimed. Then the question is, Have we exhausted the whole number of those people, or have we not, and how near have we come to exhausting them ? My own opinion would be that . . .
still 10 per cent. did not claim. . . ." " "I think the proportion of people who do not claim would increase as you went up. For instance, there are a great many people who would not claim a 7os. abatement who would claim if they were going to get $£ 8$, which is the $£ 160$ abatement." ${ }^{2}$ Sir L. Chiozza Money agreed to make the total abatements $(696,000)$ up to 750,000 to allow for " persons who neglect to claim or altogether escape taxation." ${ }^{8}$

Table Gx.-Number of Abatomenta, since 1894-5, en Incomes :-

|  | $160 \sim 400$. | $400-500 .$ | 500-600. | 600-700. | Total. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1894-5 | 436,325 | 13,010 | - | - | 449,335 |
| 1895-6 | 449,003 | 20,375 | - | - | 469,378 |
| 1896-7 | 464,017 | 23.492 | - | - | 487.509 |
| 1897-8 | 481,306 | 26,056 | - |  | 507,362 |
| 1898-9 | 495.79x | 31,669 | 11,115 | 3.940 | 542,515 |
| 1899-00 | 515,680 | 38,055 | 16,861 | 6,714 | 577,310 |
| 1900-1 | 530,074 | 42,123 | 20,520 | 8,647 | 60x,304 |
| 1901-2 | 554.727 | 46,967 | 23,899 | 10,490 | 636,083 |
| 1902-3 | 575.444 | 49,610 | 26,737 | 11,982 | 663.773 |
| 1903-4 | 603.338 | 51,922 | 27.777 | 12,879 | 695.916 |
| 1904-5 | 6r2,548 | 53.384 | 29,227 | 13.483 | 708,642 |
| 1905-6 | 632,437 | 56,305 | 31,100 | 14.886 | 724.728 |
| 2906-7 | 628,818 | 58,704 | 33,150 | 16,607 | 737,279 |
| 1907-8 | 638,482 | 64.560 | 39,166 | 32,272 | 764,480 |
| 1908-9 | 648.310 | 66,523 | 40,721 | 23,998 | 779.553 |
| 1909-10 | 649,100 | 66,763 | 41215 | 24,890 | 781,968 |
| 1910-51 | 606,842 | 69.945 | 43.174 | 26,316 | 808,277 |
| 1915-12 | 689,352 | 72.554 | 44,686 | 27,257 | 833.849 |
| 1912-13 | 715.783 | 74.423 | 45.948 | 28,467 | 864,62I |
| 1913-44 | 751.522 | 77.437 | 48.304 | 30,243 | 907,506 |

The effect of the high rates in 1900-I and succeeding years is very clearly shown by this Table, although the abatements
${ }^{1}$ Sir Henry Primrose, 1906 Committes, Q. 36. W. F. Price, writing just before this, reviowed the effect of increased abatements which were " no refiection" on the administration ( $Q$ werterty Jounal of Ecomomics, Fobruary, 1906).

Sir Heary Primroes, 1906 Committes, Q. 139

- Lace cit. P. 10.
for the higher incomes had only just come into full swing, and the figures in respect of them for $\mathbf{1 8 9 8 - 9}$ and 1900-I are obviously short of the true numbers. The abatements for incomes above $£_{£} 400$ show a much more rapid rate of growth than the $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{I}} \mathbf{6 0}$ abatements, mainly because the high rates have made it increasingly worth while to claim. But the remarkable change in 1907 is eloquent of the effect of the "earned income" legislation which made total income claims almost imperative. The incentive to claim for an earned income of $£ 650$ is now perhaps not much less than the incentive to claim on one of $£ 200$, because it is no longer a question of the loss of duty on $£ 70$ and $£ 160$ respectively, but of a difference in rate on the whole income.
I am therefore of the opinion that the higher income abatement claims are now made in as great a percentage of cases as the $£ 160$ abatements. If we take the year 1911-12 on this basis as the "irreducible" minimum of unclaimed abatements, and assume that the relative distribution of these incomes has been unaltered for some years, we may find the deficiencies in earlier years in respect of $£ 150, £_{120}$, and $£ 70$ abatements relative to the actual $£ 160$ abatement claims. Thus:-


Having assumed that the incentive to claim was equal throughout in IgII-I2, these comparisons give us the deficiencies due to differences in incentive in previous years. But we still have to estimate the percentage deficiency due to lack of incentive in the case of $f$ r60 abatements in those years, and then to apply that percentage absolutely to the total, as the general lack of incentive, adding the additional differences already ascertained for the higher incomes. Both in 1903-4 and 1906-7 the percentage deficiencies fall into a true series- $46: 29: 18$ and $33: 19: 11$.
In this period the deficiency in the claims made in respect of incomes $£ 600$ to $£ 700, £_{500}$ to $£ 600$, and $£ 400$ to $£ 500$ diminished 13 , 10 and 7 per cent. respectively. One is emboldened to continue the series downward, and to assume that the $£ 300$ to $£ 400$ cases showed a difference of 4 per cent. and the $£ 200$ to $£ 300$ somewhat less, in which case the difference for the fr60 abatements as a whole would be about I per cent. Of the increase in $£$ I60 abatements ( 25,480 in three years) about 6,000 would therefore be due to increased incentive and the balance to a genuine increase in the numbers of incomes at this stage. It is not unreasonable to assume, with such a considerable advance in the other stages, that the $\mathrm{f}_{1} 60$ abatements have increased 5 per cent. in the last ten years, especially in view of the 1907-8 statistics. As compared with the I9II-12 figures, therefore, abatements in 1903-4 were deficient as follows:-
( 1 ) On the higher incomes as shown - 33,900
(2) On the whole number, including (I). 4 per cent.
Total . . . . 63,100

For 1906-7, similarly, 42,300, and for 1907-8, 23,300.
To ascertain the absolute deficiency in these years the deficiency in 19rr-12 must be added. I do not think the present figure exceeds $\$ 0,000$ on a reesonable review of all the facts, 50 that the total deficiency in r903-4 would be 83,000, in $1906-7$ 62,300 and in 1907-8 43,000. This

Table G2.-Abatements ('000 omitted).

| Yoar. | Allowed In the Asucssments. |  |  |  | OffcialFigures.-Totalellowedin theAssessmenta. | Adjustments Required. | RevisedFiguresTmueAmpuntincludingRepaymenta | MinimumNumber ofClaimants(thousands). | Abatement allowed. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sch. A. | Sch. B. | Sah. D. | Sch. E. |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 6 | $\delta$ | 6 | 6 |  |  |
| 1863-4 | 8100 | 499 | 7.800 | 1,150 | 9,249 | + ${ }^{8} 465$ | 9,714 | 861.9 196.2 |  |
| ${ }^{8804-5}$ | 200 | 1,305 | 8,820 | 1.430 1.880 | 11,751 12,985 | + 22 | 11,773 13.020 | 196.2 217.0 |  |
| $1865-6$ <br> $1806-7$ | 200 | 1,301 1,300 | 9.500 10,410 | 1,980 $\mathbf{1}, 860$ | 12,981 13,570 | $+\quad 39$ $+\quad 38$ | 13,020 13.598 | 2170 226.6 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{\text {c }}^{\text {fincomes }}$ |
| 186788 $1868-9$ | 800 | 8, 285 1,990 | I 0,830 $\mathbf{1 1 , 4 4 5}$ | 2,947 2,012 | 14,262 14.947 | $+\quad 42$ $+\quad 53$ | 14.304 15,000 | 238.4 250.0 | troo to |
| 1869-70 | 308 | 1,300 | 12,006 | 9,130 | 15.644 | + 158 | 15,802 | 263.4 | E200. |
| 1870-1 | 168 | 1,983 | 82,936 | 2,193 | 16,580 | + 266 | 16,846 | $280 \cdot 8$ |  |
| 1878-2 | 178 | 1,319 | 73,592 | 8,38x | 17,470 30,408 | + $+\quad 399$ +1188 |  |  |  |
| 187893 $1873-4$ | 439 | 1,749 8.970 | 23.134 25.880 | 4.376 4.717 | 39.498 33.385 | $+1,118$ $+\quad 117$ | 30,616 33,268 | $382 \cdot 7$ 415 | [80 on |
| 8874-5 | 446 | 3,128 | 27.403 | +6.863 | 35.833 | 334 | 35,499 | $443 \cdot 7$ | ¢ 100 to |
| 1875-6 | $45^{8}$ | 3.185 | 29,193 | 3.332 | 38,168 | 312 | 37,855 | $473 \cdot 1$ | \&300. |
| 1876-7 | 686 | 3.497 | 27.586 | 5,135 | 36,844 | - 764 | 36,080 | $300 \cdot 7$ |  |
| 1877-8 | 709 | 3.643 | 30,044 | 5.480 | 39.876 | - 961 | 38,915 | 324.3 |  |
| $1878-9$ | 757 | 3.723 | 31,470 | 5.823 | 41,773 | $-\quad 369$ $-\quad 38$ | 41,504 | 345.9 |  |
| $1879-80$ $1880-1$ | ${ }_{6} 7_{58}^{36}$ | 4.194 4.390 | 31,265 $\mathbf{3 2 , 8 6 1}$ | 6,014 6,213 | 43,209 44.315 | 138 $-\quad 192$ | 42,971 44.123 | $358 \cdot 1$ 367.7 | (120 on |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | f 150 to |
| 1889-3 | 85 | 4.316 4.358 | 33.598 34.686 | 6.341 | 45.570 | + 459 | 45.656 47.259 | 380.8 | 6400 |
| 1883-4 | 8,027 | 4.689 | 34.468 | 7.909 | 48,386 | $+\quad 419$ $+\quad 1$ | 48,705 | 405.9 |  |
| 1884-5 | 8,098 | 4.832 | 36.377 | 2,032 | 49.939 | + 691 | 50.620 | 421.8 |  |
| 1885-6 | 965 | 4,498 | 37.314 | 8,008 | 50.771 | + 1,27\% | 52,042 | $433 \cdot 7$ |  |


result agrees very fairly with Sir Henry Primrose's estimate, as at 1go5, already quoted.

Dr. Bowley shows the influence of the rate of tax upon the abatements graphically, and thinks that instead of adding 13 per cent., as in 1903, we should now add less, say 6 per cent. (Quarterly Journal of Economics, February, 1914).

It is quite clear that the rapid advance in numbers in recent years has been partly through a diminution in the number of non-claimants.

Comparison of abatements 1902-3 and 1911-12:-
" This growth of more than 26 per cent. in the number of small taxpayers may partly be accounted for by the greater vigilance of the Commissioners, but it is safe to assume that it represents a real advance, and the rise of an increasing portion of the population above the $£ 160$ limit" (Economist, 1913, p. 879).

The growth is due probably as much to the greater " vigilance" of the taxpayer as to the bringing in of people who had formerly evaded tax. But when both factors are allowed for, a considerable margin must remain for the third factor : a real advance.

The abatements on incomes " $£ 150$ " (misprint for $£ 160$ ) to \{500 from 1895-6 to 1909-10 were used as evidence on the Standard of Living by W. T. Layton, Economist, 191I, P. 442.

Table G2 gives the official figures from 1863-4, and also the adjusted or corrected figures, the details of which are explained in Appendix II. It is perlaps fortunate that the net adjustment is small, owing to the component adjustments counterbalancing each other to a great extent.

The chief use of abatements statistics in connection with the number of taxpayers and distribution of income is dealt with in Chapter XIII.

## (2) Lifo Insurance Premiums.

This allowance originated in 1853. It extended to insurances effected with British companies upon the taxpayer's owa life, or on that of his wife, and included deferred amnuities, covering also any liability under an Act of Parliament to have an annual sum deducted from salary or stipend to secure a deferred annuity for widow or children after the
texpayer's death. The amount of the annual premium was allowable, with a limitation to one-sisth of the total net income. The important provision was made that it should not operate as a deduction from income for the purpose of computing income for exemption or abatement. ${ }^{1}$ It was extended two years later to insurance with friendly societies, provided the premiums payable were not for shorter periods than three months, ${ }^{2}$ and then to contracts for deferred annuities with the National Debt Commissioners. In 1904 it was extended to insurances with companies in British possessions, and in 1906 to insurances with foreign insurance companies doing business in this country. The restriction to annual or quarterly payments no longer applies, and payments on weekly "industrials " are allowed. Insurance of children is not admitted.
The allowances are made from the assessments, by schedule, or by repayment, as the case may require, and repayment can be claimed for three years. (Under Schs. A and B no allowances are made in the assessment.)
The Theory of the Allowance for Lifo Insurance.-Under the old Income Tax Act of 8806 the allowance was limited to persons whose incomes were less than $£ 150$ from particular sources. Under the 1853 Act it was general, and was a concession to a particular kind of thrift which it was considered desirable to encourage, meeting, in a small measure, the contentions of those who thought all "savings" should be exempted in a general income tax. It must be remembered that the capital sum insured, whether received as an endowment during the life of the assured or at his death, does not rank as income chargeable to tax. Therefore the modern developments of life insurance have provided ready means of exempting savings from taxation, not merely in the sum paid to meet the death risk, but also in the additional sums included in the premiums, which are, in effect, plain investments made by the agency of the insurance company. For example, on an ordinary " with profits" policy, the bonus declared annually can be realised and applied in affoct to the

[^145]payment of premiums, reducing them to a net figure. But the actual gross premium paid is allowable, and it is obvious that by paying a premium largely in excess of the actuarial requirements of the capital sum assured, and taking a large annual bonus, the allowance for premiums against the income tax may be much in excess of the true insurance. ${ }^{1}$ Again, if two men desire to retire at 60 each with $£ 5,000$, one may effect his purpose by annual investments and re-investments of the dividends, and the other may achieve it by an endowment policy. The difference between them, so far as income tax is concerned, is obvious.

Payments for insurance, therefore, may be said to be allowed to a greater extent than strict theory would justify. When the payments from insurance are considered, it will be found that the balance is to some extent redressed. For a life insurance company is rarely assessed on its profits only, in the sense of that balance between its receipts and its expenses which is retained by the company for its shareholders. ${ }^{2}$ It is really taxed on the greater part of its receipts, because its main source of income is dividends from various stocks taxed by deduction, and thus it bears tax upon a sum in excess of its "profits." So if a bonus is received from a company no question of tax may be mentioned, but it is nevertheless paid out of taxed sources, being pro tanto reduced by the tax, and may ther fore be regarded as a fully taxed receipt. This is only as it should be, for in no case would the bonus be directly assessable upon therecipient. But all the bonuses are so taxed whether paid to persons with incomes above $£ \mathbf{f} 60$ or not. In so far as the taxed dividends of stocks ultimately reach exempt persons in this way, by life insurance bonuses, the income tax statistics for " liable persons" are excessive, because repayment cannot be claimed and the sums in question by that means included in the "exemptions," as they might be if paid direct to the recipient from the original source of the income.

The statistics of the life assurance allowance have no

[^146]great value except to show, roughly and as a minimum, the growth of this class of investment amongst income tax payers.

This allowance should not be deducted from the gross assessments for ordinary purposes of ascertaining the true income of taxpayers.
W. H. Mallock says that much is included in gross assessments which, before the net incomes of private individuals is reached, "must be thrown overboard." One of these elements comprises " amounts which are not income at all, but are on the contrary outgoings, comprising insurances. . . "" "Upkeep and insurances amount to $£ 6 \mathrm{x}, 700,000$ (1905) " (" Social Reform, p. 106 ; similarly on p. Irg).

From this it is clear that " life insurance premiums" are included intentionally, but in no sense can they be termed an impersonal deduction like " repairs."

For the difference in the allowances for the purposes of supertax, vide p. 334.

## (3) Allowance for Childron.

This allowance was instituted in 19IO. Any person having a total income between $£ 160$ and $£ 500$ might claim a $£$ fo deduction from his assessments for each child living and under I6 years of age at the beginning of the year. Step-children are included; but not illegitimate children unless the parents have subsequently married each other. In 1914 the allowance was doubled. ${ }^{2}$ The assessment allowed in rgio-II was £5,050,283 and in 1912-13 $£ 5,860,262$. Division by 10 will give 586,000 as the minimwm number of the children (under 16) of these taxpayers. From an income of $£ 170$ it is obviously impossible to allow, in addition to the fi60 abatement, for more than one child, although there may be four or five children in the family, and these ineffective marginal cases prevent the figures from having much statistical value. In time they may perhaps possess some sociological or eugenic value if they enable any comparisons to be made or changes in proportions to be observed.

[^147]
## Total Net Assessments: The Income on which Incour Tax was recerved.

These figures, representing the total net assessments of all the schedules, are often used for comparative purposes. No figures can be less adapted for such use, because practically every legislative modification of the tax affects the net assessments. They are obtained by taking from the gross assessments all the deductions-not only those which represent non-taxable income and those which, as expenses, must come off to get "taxable income," but also all the abatement devices, children's allowances, which are the mere machinery of the faculty principle, designed to give the same effect as different rates of tax.
An important change was made in 1900 (in the 45th Report). Up to that time the net assessment was given, representing the state of affairs at the stage when the assessments were totalled and closed, without reference to the subsequent allowances by schedule or repayment. "We propose to discontinue altogether the term 'net assessments' hitherto employed in our reports. . . . The gross total of income brought under notice of the department undergoes diminution in various ways and by various steps until it reaches the final figure of income on which tax is actually received, and on each occasion of diminution the term ' net ' may be, and in the practice of the defartment is, applied to the reduced figure. In this way the term ' net assessment' by itself is liable to cause confusion, and as it seems to us that the figures of any intermediate stage between gross income reviewed and the income on which tax is finally paid are of little public or permanent interest, we desire in future to exclude them from our reports." ${ }^{2}$ (The past figures were corrected for ten years, but no official correction of " net" assessments has been published for the earlier period.)
For comparative statistical purposes the " net income on which tax was received " has little value. The really useful figure is intermediate between this and the gross, and is now termed the "taxable income." ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Nevertheless these fifures

[^148]are often used for comparison with past years, and therefore some comments must be made.

Net Ascessments-Sequence: Comparisons batween Years.
The chief breaks are ${ }^{2}$ :-
(I) Ireland.
(3) Exemption limit, 1853.
(4) " $\quad 1876$.
(6) " $\quad 1894$.

Vide
under " Gross Assess-
(7) Change in method of assessing Sch. B, 1896-7.) ments."
(8) " $\quad " \quad$ " $\quad$ 1882-3.
(9) Abatements introduced and extended, 1863-4.
(10) " changed, 1872-3.
(II) " $\quad 1876-7$.
(土2) $\because \quad . \quad 1894-5$.
(13) : $\quad$ 1898-9.
(14) Deductions for repairs introduced, 1894-5.
(I5) " " " extended, 1909-IO.
(16) Allowance for children introduced.
(17) Statistical change in 1900 in " net assessments."

A few examples of comparisons may be given :-
"(r) The wealth of the classes in Germany has increased as follows :-

$$
\begin{array}{lllll}
1892 . & \text { 298,069,881 } & \text {.. } & 537,151,200 \\
1909 . & . & 660,981,000 & \cdots & 652,886,576
\end{array}
$$

" Income tax is levied, and income is estimated, on different principles in the two countries. Therefore the total sums given are not strictly comparable. However, the foregoing statement is of the greatest interest, inasmuch as it shows that the income of the classes in Germany has increased by about 125 per cent. during a period when it has increased by only 25 per cent. in Great Britain. The trifling increase of about 25 per cent. of the income subjected to tax in this country is merely equal to the

[^149]increase of the population during the same period. Therefore, individual wealth has apparently remained almost stationary in Great Britain. However, in view of the fact that the British income tax collectors have of late years ' put the screw on 'in an unprecedented manner, it seems likely that the income of Great Britain has in reality remained stationary, or has more probably, decreased, during a time when it was almost doubled in Germany." -J. Ellis Barker, " Modern Germany," p. 697.

The actual figure for 1909 was $£ 686,8 \mathrm{x} 2,000$. But in any case the comparison ignores the important diminution of net income arising from the changes (II), (I2) and (13). The failure to mention the respective limits of exemption- $£ 45$ in Prussia and $£ 160$ in England-further detracts from the bona fides of the comparison.
(2) Sir Vincent Caillard compares the increase in the net income assessed in 1900-1 over 1891-2, 10.6 per cent., with the increase in the assessed income in Prussia ( $£ x 61,000,000$ to $£(235,000,000$ ), 46.4 per cent., and remarks :- " Increased abatements for small incomes have been granted since then, but other causes already mentioned probably counterbalance this" ("Imperial Fiscal Reform," p. 229).
(3) The Daily Telegraph pamphlet, "Imperial Reciprocity" (pp. 49, 181-192), compared the net assessments 1891-2 and 1900-1 without reference to "breaks" (12), (13), (14). Vide "Exposure" by J. M. Robertson, "Trade and Tarifis," p. 318.
(4) W. R. Lawson, quoting Mr. Gladstone's tests of the growth of national wealth (to set against nation. I expenditure), namely, the Schs. A, B, and D assessments, remarks that the assessments " are of two linds, and it makes a considerable difference which of them is here employed. First, there are the original or gross assessments, and, secondly, there are the assessments minus exemptions and abatements, on which income tax is actually paid. The latter are obviously the more trustworthy gauge of national wealth, but for some reason or other scientific statisticians prefer the first. It gives them much larger figures to play with, and for theoretical purposes that is no doubt an advantage. In order to spare ourselves the invidious task of choosing between them, we shall give them both-first the gross, and then the net, or paying assessments. It may interest our readers to see how large a proportion of the assessable income escapes taxation" ("Two Record Budgets, 1860 and 1903," Fortnightly Raview, May, 1903).

The last passage is, to say the least, unhappily expressed, and
some confusion of thought seems to run through the earlier part. Comparing 189I-2 with 1900-1, he finds an increase (on the three schedules aggregated) of 21 per cent. "The income actually assessed and taxed was, however, only 80 per cent. of the gross, and its rate of increase less than one-half, $9 \frac{1}{2}$ per cent." (breaks Nos. II, 12, and 13 ignored).

## Miscellaneous Sources of Information.

H. C. 339-I85I. Defaulting Collectors, 1848 to 1850.
H. C. 362-1852. Year 1850. Repayments of tax under various classes.
H. C. 218-1859. Income tax in Dublin, 1855-6, 1856-7, 1857-8.
H. C. 536-x860. Net assessments, Schs. A, B, and D, 1842, 1853, 1857 compared.
H. C. $476-1860$. Rates, etc., on Government property.
H. C. 592-1860. Assessments from 1853-60, with classification.
H. C. 172-1862. Income tax appeals (Northampton survey).
H. C. 388-1862. Ditto.
H. C. 377 -1862. 1860-I assessments, with proposed abatements on Mr. Hubbard's scheme.
H. C. 248-1863. Ditto.
H. C. 209-1864. Great Britain and Ireland. Gross receipt of income tax divided by estimated population, 1854-63.
H. C. 549-1864. Metropolitan divisions and other towns, etc. Amounts of duty assessed, and details of dates for closing accounts.
H. C. 476 -1865. Abatements, 1864-5.
H. C. 324-I866. Scotland: State of the collection of tax and dates of closing accounts.
H. C. 393-1867. Ditto.
H. C. 198-IS68-9. Life insurance income tax repayments, $1854-5$ to $1867-8$.
H. C. 317-x872. Income tax collected by Excise officers, 1864-5, etc.
H. C. 363-1878-9. Gross Schs. A, B, and D, and yield per penny for each.
H. C. 388-1878-9. Parliamentary constituencies-population, etc. Property charged for each division.
H. C. 373-1880 (2). Friendly society return ; co-operative societies and income tax.
H. C. 195-1887. Corporation duty return.
H. L. 289-1888. Charities and income tax-procedure, with list of reasons for non-exemption in certain cases.
H. C. 163-1890. Incidence of taxation (England, Scotland and Ireland, 1890-1).
H. C. 340-1903. Condition of trade and people, United Kingdom. Statistics at ten-year intervals, 1801 to 1901, including income tax yield per penny; gross incomes under review; number of persons and firms assessed; income from trades and professions; total Sch. A, etc.

Hansard (51), 1.4.13. Net produce per penny, 1904-5 to 1911-12.

Hansard (52), 6.5.13. rgox-2 and rgir-12 gross income, England, Scotland, Wales and Monmouth, under different schedules.

Financial statement, 1914-15, virtual rates, and effect of graduation.

Miscellangous Returns relatidy to Duty collected.
H. C. 315-1844. Duty collected 1842-3, distinguishing " offices and pensions, Government departments."
H. C. 107-1846. Each schedule, 1843-4 and 1845.
H. C. 747-1847. Ditto.
H. C. 100-1847. Ditto.
H. C. 65-185I. Schs. C, D, and E, 1815 and 1842-50.
H.C. 399-1852. 1842-51-amounts under each schedule.
H. C. 556-1852. 1842-5I-Sch. D and duty.
H. C. 69-1859 (2). 1855-6-amends the ist Report as to total duty.
H. C. 23-1859 (2). Scotland-population and total income tax.
H. C. 183-1871. Metropolis-total duty, 1843 to 1867, and percentage of loss by collectors' defalcations.
H. C. 22I-I87r. Duty under each schedule, 1868-9, by counties, for England and Wales.
H. C. 369-1875. 1814 to 1873-England, Scotland. Ireland. Tax charged, and percentage of each schedule to whole.

## Other Miscellaneous Information.

Hansard (16), 18.4.10. Years 188x, 1893-4. Aggregate income, life insurance, and abatements; percentage increase and net produce.

Hansard (39), 17.6.12. General totals $1908-9$ and 1909-10.

Hansard (15), 23.3.10. Total income, 1894-5 and 1907-8, and increase in yearly net produce and average virtual rate.

Hansard (I3), 25.II.09. Total income, life insurance, and abatements, $1898-9$ and 1907 .

Hansard (43), I4.II.12 ; (45), 9.12.12. Ireland-details for towns and provinces, Belfast, Dublin, Londonderry, Corka and Limerick. Gross Schs. A, D, and E, etc., I9II-12.

Hansard (45), Ig.12.12. Scotland-details for Glasgow, Edinburgh, Aberdeen, and Dundee.

For the first year of the tax in Ireland the following special details were given (in provinces) ${ }^{1}:-$

Duty, $\{569,27$ I. Sch. D assessments, 21,314: Sch. E, 2,804. Returns accepted, 18,641; returns increased, 3,114. with duty $\{6,318$; cases of no return, 1,713: assessed to duty, $£ 5,374$; appeals, $2,25 I$, of which $\mathrm{I}, 44 \mathrm{I}$ were confirmed, and 8 Io relieved, etc.

## Section II.

Reluep to Earned Incomes-Differentiation.
The full story of the origins of this change may be found in the Report of, and evidence before, the Income Tax Committee of Igo6. It was embodied in legislative enactment in the Finance Act, 190\%, and is described in the 5Ist Report."
"Earned" income includes business, professional and farming profits immediately derived by an individual from the personal exercise of his business, profession, etc. ; remune-

[^150]ration from any office or employment of profit held by an individual ; income from any property attached to or forming part of the emoluments of any office or employment. The relief in respect of ordinary pensions, etc., may be allowed even though the individual or husband or parent may have contributed thereto. There are two important limitations to the relief:-
(I) It must be claimed not later than the 30th September in any year. ${ }^{1}$
(2) It applies only to the earned parts of total incomes not exceeding $£ 2,500$ per annum. The 1907 limit was $£ 2,000$; in 1909 a relief was also given to incomes between $£ 2,000$ and £3,000; and in 1914 there were different rates applying to the stages-(a) not exceeding $£ 1,000,(b) £ 1,001$ to $£ 1,500$, (c) $£ 1,501$ to $£ 2,000$, and (d) $£ 2,001$ to $£ 2,500$.

The effect upon the statistics has been small. The 52nd Report (p. 139) stated that relief was granted in approximately three-quarters of a million cases (1908), and no further information is available.

The new tables showing " taxable income" very conveniently give the sums chargeable at each rate, so that the aggregate falling within the respective limits is known. In using this information the following points must be borne in mind :-

The " earned " income proportion ir less than the sum that might rightly be assigned under the definition for these reasons-
(1) Failure to claim by the proper date keeps a certain amount of income assessed at the normal rate.
(2) The limit of "total income" keeps in the assessment at the highest rate a considerable mass of earned income belonging to the more prosperous classes.

On the other hand, (3) the official "earned income" is swollen by the inclusion of so much profit as may be assigned to interest on trade capital in ordinary business, where the capital belongs to the proprietor. The whole of the "profits" of a draper are "earned income," although he may have $£ 2,000$ invested in his business.

[^151](4) But in the case of a private company, if the profits are taken as dividends, and not as remuneration, they rank as " unearned."
These considerations severely limit the value of the figures for economic purposes, but in a few years, when some dynamic tendencies become obvious, these statistics will assume great importance. The earned income (up to the $£^{2}, 000$ limit) rose from $23 \cdot 8$ per cent. of the whole in 1908-9 (ignoring the first year of imposition) to 25.4 per cent. in 1912-13, and this rise cannot have been wholly due to the diminution in cases falling under ( $\mathbf{I}$ ), above, though probably a tendency to increase remuneration under (4) will account for a great deal.
Table G3 gives the available official information.

## Evasion.

The question of evasion is necessarily an important one whenever the use of taxation statistics for economic and social science is under consideration. So far as income tax is concerned, the extent to which the "income assessed" falls short of the true income through evasion, wilful, negligent or ignorant, has been the subject of the most divergent estimates. The evidence given in various places, and the opinions expressed, may be briefly summarised, chief stress being laid upon the actual effect on the statistics for ordinary economic uses. We have first to distinguish carefully between " legal evasion " or "avoidance " and evasion proper. If a man takes advantage of any flaw in the scheme of taxation or has income which cannot legally be assessed, the case is quite distinct from failure to render what is legally due. Evasion proper is of two kinds: wilful evasion and evasion due to negligence or ignorance.

The Income Tax Committee of 1905 dealt specifically and at great length with "fraud and evasion." ${ }^{2}$ Their report pointed out that " something like four-ifths of the income tax now brought into account is either assessed at the source or subjected to other satisfactory methods of verification."

[^152]Table G3.-Income Charged and Tax paid at each Rate (fooo omitted).

| Yoar aad Rates of Tax.$\qquad$ | Groes Income brought under the Review of the Department$8 .$ |  | Tazable inoome (col. : leme col. 3). | Allowaticee from Traxable Income. |  |  |  | Income on which Tax wes rocerived (col. 4 losa col. 8) | Not Produce of Tax <br> 10. | Average <br> virtual <br> Rate lovied on sech Pound of Taxable Incame. $12 .$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Abate montra <br> 5. | Life Infurance Promium: <br> 6. | Relief in respect of Childron. <br> 7. | Total of cola. 3. 6, and $\%$. <br> 8. |  |  |  |
|  | $980,157$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 31,100 \\ 87,000 \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ 4,100 \\ 5.800 \end{gathered}$ | 6 | $\begin{array}{r} 6 \\ 35.200 \\ 92,800 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 576,460 94.853 |  | $\begin{gathered} 4 \\ 11.31 \\ 4.53 \end{gathered}$ |
|  |  |  | 799.313 | 118,100 | 9.900 | - | 128,000 | 671,313 | 32,380 | 9.72 |
|  | 2,009,936 | x85,878 | $\begin{aligned} & 629,34^{8} \\ & 196,710 \end{aligned}$ | 30,614 <br> 89,608 | 4.003 6,457 | 二 | 34.617 96.118 | $\begin{aligned} & 592,731 \\ & 100,59 \mathrm{a} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 29.637 \\ 3.772 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 11.34 4.60 |
|  |  |  | 824,058 | 120,375 | 20,460 | - | 130.735 | 693.323 | 33.409 | 9.73 |
| $\left.\begin{array}{c}1000-10 \\ 18.2 .2 .1 \\ 18.1 \\ \text { 94. }\end{array}\right\}$ | 1,018,800 | 288,875 | $\begin{array}{r} 608,066 \\ 6,605 \\ 807,465 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 96.597 \\ & 93.961 \end{aligned}$ | 3.532 116 7.151 | $\stackrel{398}{ }$ | $\begin{array}{r} 30.788 \\ 804.470 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 577.338 \\ 6,479 \\ 108,995 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33.494 \\ 3.84 \\ 3.662 \end{array}$ | 13727 8168 4.47 |
| Total |  |  | 882,826 | 120.538 | 20,900 | 3.936 | 135.414 | 686,812 | 37,680 | 1100 |


| $\left.\begin{array}{c} 3910-31 \\ 3.26 .4 \\ 56 . \\ 96 . \end{array}\right\}$ | 1,045,834 | \$07,524 | $\begin{array}{r} 615,247 \\ 10,851 \\ 212,211 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 28,317 \\ 96,213 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3,824 \\ 366 \\ 7,465 \end{array}$ | $\frac{670}{4,381}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32,818 \\ 3606,058 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 582,436 \\ 10,485 \\ 104,153 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33,915 \\ 524 \\ 3.906 \end{array}$ | 13-23 $11-60$ $4 \cdot 4$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Total |  |  | 838,309 | 124,530 | 21,656 | 5,050 | 142,235 | 697,074 | 38,345 | 10.98 |
| $\left.\begin{array}{c}\text { 13.24.f } \\ \text { 18. } \\ \text { 94. }\end{array}\right\}$ | 1,070,142 | 203,689 | 632,483 12,875 $2 \pi 1,095$ |  | 3.773 7,676 |  | $\begin{array}{r} 33,343 \\ 433 \\ 12,037 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 599,140 \\ 12,442 \\ 109,059 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34,920 \\ 622 \\ 4,090 \end{array}$ | 13.25 II. 60 4.44 |
| Total |  |  | 866,454 | 128,449 | 21,882 | 5,482 | 145,823 | 720,641 | 39,632 | 10-98 |
| 15. 2d. | 8,282,486 | 204,305 | $\begin{array}{r} 660,742 \\ 14,446 \\ 231,964 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,977 \\ 104,218 \end{array}$ | 3,980 490 8,049 | $\underset{5,228}{632}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 33,589 \\ 1 \times 7,495 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 627,152 \\ 13,956 \\ 114,469 \end{array}$ | 36,584 698 <br> 4,293 | $13 \cdot 29$ 11.59 4.44 |
| Tetal |  |  | 907,152 | 133,195 | 12,518 | 5,860 | 251,574 | 755,578 | 41,574 | 11.00 |
| $\left.\begin{array}{c} 10.24 \\ 10 \\ 4 \end{array}\right\}$ | $8,767,54$ | 216,844 | $\begin{array}{r} 689,477 \\ 19,812 \\ 245,753 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 29,579 \\ 810,193 \end{array}$ | 4,386 526 8,393 | ${\underset{5,599}{6,59}}^{6}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34,615 \\ 526 \\ 224,886 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 654,862 \\ 15,286 \\ 121,567 \end{array}$ | 38,200 764 <br> 4,559 | 13.30 $12 \cdot 60$ 4.45 |
| Total |  |  | 951,040 | 139.774 | 13,305 | 6,249 | 159,326 | 79x.715 | 43,523 | 10.98 |

- Party $\begin{gathered}\text { atimated. }\end{gathered}$

1The iguree on thin line relates to theome chargeable at the full rate. They include a certain amount assessed for year prier to sgep-10, whom the foll mite was se. only

Table G4.-" Tarable Income " as now given in Official Reports, earried back to 1842 in the Conditions of 1876-93 and those of 1913 respectively.

Mminoss.

${ }^{*}$ Taxable Income "-continusd.

| Yoar. | Official Figures hithorto gonerally used for Comparative Purposes, but not properly adepted for nuch use. |  | "Tazable Income." True Comparative Serles now subatituted for Offolal Tablen. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Grosa <br> Assessmenta or Grose Income nader Reviow. | Net Produce per Penny. | On Conditions of 1876 to 1898. (6.50 Exemption Limit. No Repain Allowance.) |  | On Conditions since 1894, ( fir $^{160}$ Exemption Limit and Repairs Allowance.) |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1876-7 \\ & 1877-8 \\ & 1878-9 \\ & 1879-80 \\ & 1880-1 \\ & 1881-1 \\ & 1882-3 \\ & 1883-4 \\ & 1884-5 \\ & 1885-6 \\ & 1886-1 \\ & 1887-1 \\ & 1888-9 \\ & 188990 \\ & 1890-1 \\ & 1891-1 \\ & 1892-3 \\ & 1893-4 \\ & 1894-5 \\ & 1895-6 \\ & 1896-1 \\ & 1807-6 \\ & 1808-9 \\ & 1899-900 \\ & 1900-1 \\ & 1901-1 \\ & 1905-3 \\ & 1905-4 \\ & 1904-5 \\ & 1905-6 \\ & 1906-1 \\ & 1907-5 \\ & 1908-9 \\ & 1909-10 \\ & 1910-1 \end{aligned}$ | 57 <br> $578 \cdot 3$ <br> $578 \cdot 0$ <br> $376 \cdot 9$ <br> 585:2 <br> $601 \cdot 4$ 612.8 <br> 628.5 <br> $63 \times \cdot 5$ <br> 6399 <br> $629 \cdot 4$ <br> $636 \cdot 2$ <br> $645 \cdot 2$ <br> 609.4 <br> $698 \cdot$ <br> 7108 <br> $712 \cdot 3$ <br> 706.2 <br> $690 \cdot 3$ <br> $709 \cdot 7$ <br> $700 \cdot 5$ <br> 729.3 758 <br> $793 \cdot 7$ <br> $833 \cdot 4$ <br> $867{ }^{\circ}$ <br> 8796 <br> 903. 8 <br> 912.1 <br> 925: <br> $943 \cdot 7$ <br> 1,0099 <br> 1,018-1 <br> $1,045-8$ <br> 8,070-1 <br> 1,121.5 <br> 1,167-3 | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ \mathbf{x} \cdot 905 \\ 1.909 \\ 1.879 \\ \hline-0.0 \end{gathered}$$1 \cdot 8_{47}$ | $\begin{array}{cc}6 \\ 4950 & + \text { or }-2 \\ 4990 & -2\end{array}$ |  | ${ }_{4580}^{6}+1$ or |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $461 \cdot 5$ | 1.6 |
|  |  |  | 494.5 488.2 |  | $456 \cdot 7$ | 1. 1-6 |
|  |  |  | 488.2 |  | 449.8 455.6 | 1.6 |
|  |  | 1.916 | 508.1 |  | $468 \cdot 7$ | - 6 |
|  |  | 1.963 | 521-2 |  | 48 s -1 | 1.6 |
|  |  | 2017 | $535 \cdot 7$ |  | 494.7 | $1 \cdot 7$ |
|  |  | $2 \cdot 00$ | $534 \cdot 3$ |  | 493.6 | 17 |
|  |  | 1.980 | 530.7 |  | 489.8 | 16 |
|  |  | 2-965 | $528 \cdot 8$ |  | $488 \cdot$ | $1 \cdot 5$ |
|  |  | 8.993 | 535\%\% |  | 494.7 | 1.4 |
|  |  | 2045 | $549 \cdot 8$ |  | $508 \cdot 3$ | $1 \cdot 3$ |
|  |  | 2.142 8.314 | 573.5 |  | 531-2 | 1-2 |
|  |  |  | 592.6 |  | 549.8 | 9 |
|  |  | $2 \cdot 340$ | 601.8 |  | 5576 |  |
|  |  | a.191 | 591.7 |  | 5478 | 6 |
|  |  | 8.988 | 593.7 |  | 551.4 |  |
|  |  | 2.033 | 6090 | 2 | 506.7 |  |
|  |  | 4099 | 6390 | $\cdots$ | 5854 |  |
|  |  | 2.188 | 654.9 | ${ }^{-1}$ | $610 \cdot 3$ |  |
|  |  | 2.284 | 686-2 | 6 | 6396 |  |
|  |  | 2354 | 709.6 | 8 | 6016 |  |
|  |  | \%.475 | $743 \cdot 7$ | $1 \%$ | 6946 |  |
|  |  | 8.535 | 7640 | 12 | 7139 |  |
|  |  | 2.536 | $770 \cdot 2$ | 1 | 719.5 |  |
|  |  | 2.563 2.581 | 784.4 | 16 | 7316 |  |
|  |  | 2.581 2.633 | 791.3 | 18 | 7379 |  |
|  |  | . 667 | 819 | \% | 763.8 |  |
|  |  | -60\% | $855 \cdot 5$ |  |  |  |
|  |  | $2 \cdot 784$ | 881.5 | $2-6$ | 894- |  |
|  |  | a.691 | 8800 | 28 | 8ax-2 |  |
|  |  | 2-739 | 8979 | 36 | 8380 |  |
|  |  | 2830 | 9275 | 32 | 8664 |  |
|  |  | 28970 | 969 | 34 | 9076 |  |
|  |  | 3.109 | 1,016\% | 36 | 9510 |  |

The rapid conversion of businesses into limited companies had been a material factor towards this position, and, as regards income from abroad, the "Coupons Act," 1885, had provided for the deduction and payment of tax by bankers or dealers in respect of interest or dividends on foreign and colonial investments paid by means of coupons, and this was immediately salutary in its effects. ${ }^{1}$ The Committee considered there was "abundant evidence to show that in the sphere in which self-assessment is still requisite there is a substantial amount of fraud and evasion." But they would attempt no quantitative estimate. As a remedy for evasion due to ignorance and carelessness, and the " consciencesalving method " of passive neglect, compulsory provisions as to forms were recommended. For wilful evasion an extension of powers of recovery and punishment and the power to make assessments for three years past were advised, while compulsory returns of salaries were suggested.

The evidence showed that out of a total of 649 millions sterling there was appreciable room for evasion only in respect of 150 millions. ${ }^{2}$ Many persons who speculate upon the Stock Exchange do not make returns, but on the whole this is a gain to the Revenue, since the balance of private transactions would generally be a loss. Evasion was particularly prevalent in respect of incomes from abroad, and from the activities of financial syndicates, but not perhaps so much so as was generally believed' The former had been greatly diminished of late years, but the manner in which foreign dealers, companies, and bankers trading in this country through agents were able to avoid taxation to an increasing extent was thoroughly considered and deemed to be important."

Considerable information can be obtained from the evidence before the Select Committee in 1906 as to forms of

[^153]avoidance and fraud, but practically nothing was added to our statistical knowledge. Various opinions were expressed as to the probable extent of evasion, some holding that it was very small and even balanced by tax overcharges, and others that it was considerable, Sir L. G. Chiozza Money adhering to his estimate of $£ 70,000,000$. It was clear that no conclusion could rightly be drawn from the statistics to the effect that the increases in the rate had led to increased evasion in a fraudulent sense, or to increased avoidance, by companies reconstituting themselves as foreign concerns. There was some attempt to show that a drop in the profits from British and foreign securities under Sch. C followed the increased rates, but it was not established as cause and effect; for Sch. C is taxed by registration, and not left to the taxpayer to " declare." Some interesting evidence about the methods of foreign manufacturers in invoicing goods at what was really a selling price was taken in camerd. ${ }^{1}$ Altogether it may be stated that, although the whole question of methods of evasion is fully discussed in these reports, the only solid basis for an estimate is the official statement as to the range of income over which evasion is possible.
Under Sch. A the scope for fraud is small, and for evasion less. Property is physically in view; there is the check by the poor rate, and deliberate under-statements of rent are risky and must be negligible in relation to the whole tax. Improper claims to abatement or exemption may be possible to a slight extent, but there is little incentive to conceal the existence of martgage interest. Under Sch. B, though there is considerable loss, it is entirely due to the definite legal assumptions of the system. ${ }^{\text {P }}$ Under Sch. C there is hardly any scope, though some persons receiving small untaxed dividends may fail to return them for assessment under Sch. D. Under Sch. E, apart from any abatements improperly claimed by persans who do not fully declare their taxed income, the impersanal and generally disinterested return by the employers is a safeguard against extensive evasion. The allocation of "profits" to Sch. E in the form of remunera-

[^154]tion in order to secure the "earned rate" can hardly be characterised as evasion, but a few cases of "conventional" salaries in small private concerns paid to dependants, etc. may exist. The total scope in all the foregoing is very small, indeed, and we are left with Sch. $D$ as the main field for evasion. In one section of Sch. D (the part taxed at the source by public companies, local authorities, and banks) it may be said that the field is very limited, and even over the more important part of private industry it is the practice for the larger firms to render regularly their certified accounts to the authorities for the more accurate determination of liability-a custom that has become of late even more extensive than it was at the time of the 1906 Report. The present total assessment for persons, firms and employees is $£^{226,200,000}$ (1913-14). The first section to be considered is that of wage-earners and salaried persons ( $£ 31,000,000$ ). The legal powers taken in 1907 to compel returns by employers have now reduced the scope here to unimportant dimensions. The second section may be regarded as the individual return, where evasion was possible in several ways:-(i) Neglect by private residents to make returns by ignoring applications, and thus leaving the existence of items of untaxed income unrevealed. By the Finance Act, 1907, it was made compulsory to return forms, even though the liability was nil, so that loss of duty in this respect passos from the category of " evasion " to "fraud," as a definite statement must now be made. (2) Neglect by traders and others to make returns, leaving the assessment to be made by the Commissioners. This favcurite device of former times is now far less available because in the case of all incomes under $£ 2,501$ the omission to complete the forms deprives the taxpayer of the lower rates, and a charge upon an estimated assessment at the full rate without any abatement or allowances forms in itself a heavy automatic penalty. Loss of duty is again transferred from "evasion " to " fraud." (3) Leaving income to pile up abroad has for a long time been recognised as a legal avoidance of taxation, ${ }^{1}$ and in the opinion of some there is no equitable right to tax "beyond the jurisdiction" income

[^155]that has never enjoyed the protection of the Government. ${ }^{1}$ If taxation proceeded upon the benefit principle, this view would have some measure of justification, although even then it would be doubtful in the case of colonial income ; but our system is frankly facultative, and it is idle to pretend that faculty proceeding on progressive lines is unaffected by the existence of unremitted income accumulating abroad, sc that on this ground alone such legal avoidance lacks justification in pure theory. The Finance Act, 1914, shifted the basis of liability from the remittances to the profits arising abroad, whether remitted or not. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (4) The liability of forcigners and foreign companies carrying on business in this country is a possible source of loss, owing to the difficulty, where there is a distinct trading entirely outside this country, of fixing the cost price of the goods imported. It may fairly be said to vary in degree from that evasion in which a taxpayer gives himself the " benefit of the doubt " by arranging prices so that the weight of profit falls conveniently in the most advantageous position, to deliberate fraud, in which the invoice prices are so high that no profit could possibly be assigned to the British trading. Inter-State taxation in the United States and local taxation in Germany furnish examples of difficulties of this character.
Sir L. G. Chiozza Money's estimate of $\{70,000,000$ in "Riches and Poverty" was referred to by him as following " upon the opinions of a very large number of men who have considered this subject for a very considerable number of years, and one naturally attaches weight to those opinions: and also it follows upon one's own knowledge of facts." ©

[^156]- S. C. an Income Tax, 1906, Q. 789.
H. Morgan Browne added $£ 75,000,000 .^{1}$ Ireson concluded that only about $\{70,000,000$ is understated, and therefore put the total at $£ 35,000,000$ as a maximum. ${ }^{2}$ This is the estimate adopted by Dr. Bowley before the D. C. on Income Tax, 1906. It is commonly stated that higher rates increase evasion, but W. H. Price, testing the Sch. D assessments by comparison with bank clearances, etc., considered that the assessment held its own under the strain in 1900. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

Speaking for a period about the year 19r3, if we take the unremitted income as about $£ 20,000,000$, and deal separately with real evasion after allowance for all subsequent recoveries and additional assessments, an estimate may be arrived at by taking the respective sections and applying to each what experience has suggested as a maximum percentage of loss, providing room for plenty of those glaring instances which, quite apart from natural tendencies to boastfulness often found in commercial life, afford a basis for extravagant statements by those who lose sight of the vast mass of ordinary liability accurately determined and faithfully met. Percentages have been adopted as assigned by various accountants and others of experience, and, when both the proportion of cases affected and the degree to which those cases are affected have been considered, in no instance has the total estimate exceeded Ex7,000,000 in the gross assessment, and it has often been much less, although surprise has been expressed at the aggregate result.
There are various misconceptions upon the subject. Among them may be mentioned the popular notion that many liable workmen on weekly wages escape. In the first place, the number who sustain an average of over $£ 3$ per week continuously over three years, without a break, is not large. At any given time there may be a considerable number above the margin, but they are not the same cases continuously. Secondly, machinery was provided in 1907 as adequate to secure the greater part of the real liability. Thirdly, with the children's allowances, abatements, etc., the loss in duty is very small indeed.

[^157]
## Evasion in Earlier Yoars.

The S. C. on the Income Tax, $1851-2$, heard much evidence upon the subject of evasion, the greater part of the first volume being devoted to official accounts of assessment procedure and close examination of fraudulent methods. But there is nothing of statistical value, and no material upon which a general estimate can be based. Although it was stated that Schs. A and C were obtained to the " uttermost farthing," it was the cause of gravest concern that fraudulent exemption claims were so numerous and so impossible to stop. Apart from those who by fraud or avoidance had returned their incomes just below $\{150$, there were many who claimed upon property in one district without disclosing income in other places. Just as the $£ 50$ exemption limit was introduced in the old income tax to catch those who had formerly returned a little below $£ 60$ to escape the duty, so in 1852 it was proposed to reduce the limit to $£ 100$ in order to take advantage of the returns of all those who had unhesitatingly admitted to $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{I}} 49$ when that sum was exempt! Somewhat the same result might be looked for from the lowering of the super-tax level from $£ 5,000$ to $£ 3,000$, where the former returns, made with generous accuracy because they were not liable to duty, become of effective value. The secret of all the trouble in these old exemption claims was the absence of abatements- 1 I49 incomes paid nothing, and ${ }^{\text {E }} 55$ incomes sprang into full liability on over $f_{4}$ duty. Where the limit of exemption is also the measure of abatement the entry into liability is gradual, and the motive for that class of fraud is absent. ${ }^{1}$ Attention was devoted in $1851-a$ to evasion under Sch. D, and it also appeared that very lenient assessments were the rule in 1808-10. The evidence was detailed, but affords no statistical assistance. Evidence before the S. C. on Inland Revenue and Customs, 1862-3. indicated that evasion under Sch. D was diminishing at that date.
The Commissioners of Inland Revenue, in their early

[^158]reports, were in the habit of giving details of cases of fraud that had been discovered, particularly in "compensation" cases," ${ }^{1}$ and drawing the obvious moral. "We find that in general those who intend to commit such frauds on a large scale avoid making any returns . . . they pay duty with an easy conscience (having made no false statement) upon an amount $£ 20,000$ or $£ 30,000$ below their real income." ${ }^{2}$ Numercus compensation claims in connection with an extensive demolition of houses in a certain district by the Metropolitan Board of Works gave occasion for an official estimate of evasion under Sch. D (12th Report, p. 22). It is the only statement of that character ever published, and it may therefore well be quoted in full :-

> " Estimate of Total Amount of Fraud under Sch. D.

[^159]And, moreover, this is not confined to any particular class, trade, or profession; we find the same practice prevailing among legal practitioners, when, on the abolition of their exclusive privileges, in some particular court they have to make good their claims to your lordships ; we find it on all occasions of large demolition of shops and warehouses for public purposes, in every variety of trade, and we find it in great public companies and in firms whose business is almost a national concern, from its magnitude and world-wide reputation; we therefore think that we may venture to generalise upon the facts which the most recent occasion of compensation cases has furnished.
"Those facts are, that 40 per cent. of the persons assessed had understated their incomes to such an extent that a true return would give an addition of 130 per cent. Let us see what additional revenue Sch. D would yield if the same proportion of deficiency prevails throughout the assessments. Taking the accounts of the year 1864-5 as the most convenient for our purpose, we find that the total number of persons assessed under D was 350,512 ; 40 per cent. of which is 240,204 . This then is the number of deficient returns or assessments. In order to estimate the amount of duty suppressed we must first arrive at the actual assessments in those 140,204 cases, and we cannot do this in a fairer manner than by taking them at the average assessment of the whole kingdom, that is, at 40 per cent. of frio, $\mathbf{0 0 5}, 766$, which was the sum charged under Sch. D in 1864-5.
"Thus we may assume $\{44,042,306$ as the income returned in assessment, $£ 101,297.303$ ( 130 per cent. more), the income which should have been returned, and the difference, $£ 57,254,997$, the sum on which duty was evaded. At the present rate of 6 . in the \& this would add to the revenue $\{x, 431,374$, about the produce of a penny on the whole income tax.

## "Deficiant Returns by Public Companies.

[^160]tax returns are deficient there has been a wilful attempt to defraud the Revenue. In many instances no doubt the errors which are committed are unintentional, but what we are chiefly concerned with is the effect on the public income, which is the same whatever may be the cause of the deficiency; and the real significance of the subtraction of such a large sum as we have supposed, or of anything approaching that sum, is best brought home to us when we remember that 'the exemption of one man means the extra taxation of another,' ${ }^{1}$ and that if Sch. D gave its due quota to the Revenue we might be relieved of many an unpleasant impost.
" It must also be borne in mind that on lands and houses, on dividends, and on salaries and pensions of public officers, the tax is levied nearly to the uttermost farthing which is due."

It will be observed that this estimate is equivalent to saying that Sch. D should be 52 per cent. more, and since Sch. D was then much smaller relatively, it is also equal to 161 per cent. upon the whole income tax.

Baxter, writing just before this report, estimated that the loss by evasion under Sch. D was one-sixth in England and Wales-" a very moderate estimate"-and one-tenth in Scotland and Ireland, or about $£ 18,000,000$ deficiency in all. ${ }^{2}$

After comparing the total gross assessments, $£ 396,000,000$ in 1864-5 with $£ 571,000,000$ in 1874-5, and the net assessments charged, $£ 349,000,000$ and $£ 498,000,000$ respectively, Giffen remarks that the latter, if the "exemptions" had remained the same, would in $1874-5$ have exceeded $£ 500,000,000$; " and altogether, allowing as well for the incches under Sch. $\mathbf{D}$ which escape assessment through incomplete returns, we can hardly err in placing the net incomes of the income tax paying classes at somewhere about $£ 600,000,000$ sterling." After deducting from the gross $\mathrm{E} 571,000,000$ the exemptions and various deductions required to reach the " net incomes of the income tax paying classes," the amount assigned to leakage is about $£ 65,000,000$ (upon a gross assessment of $£ 174,000,000$ under Sch. D, or over 30 per cent.) ("Foreign Competition," Economic Studies, I., p. 425).

In 1888 Soetbeer ${ }^{3}$ put the evasion at $£ 70,000,000$ under Sch. D, and although the aggregate was rapidly increasing,

[^161]this remained a familiar estimate. Giffen, in his "Growth of Capital," put it at $£ 36,000,000$, or 20 per cent. excluding foreign income.

It must not be forgotten that the local commissioners have always been legally responsible for the adequacy of assessments, and the development of any central responsibility for an administration which would minimise evasion has been gradual and tentative. The frank utterance of the sixties which has been quoted above was accompanied by no apology for administrative shortcomings. If there has been any change in the spirit in which the matter is approached at the present day it can never be vitally different or radically complete, while the legal position is maintained.

Some part of the loss was always subsequently recovered as " unassessed duty." If we include the income unremitted from abroad, it is quite possible that the estimates up to 1885 were not greatly beyond the true figure. After that time the loss by evasion was sensibly less, and it was greatly diminished after 1900 .

## The Supor-tax.

It is unnecessary to recapitulate here the interesting statistical estimates made before the super-tax was an accomplished fact, for the full details may be found in the evidence given to the Income Tax Committee in 1go6. The use of House Duty statistics, Estate Duty statistics, abatements, the classification of assessments, and Pareto's law may be found fully illustrated there, with some of the chief difficulties in such inquiries. Contemporary journalism and literature furnished little of value compared with that volume, and need not be referred to in detail. ${ }^{2}$

The recent publication of the super-tax statistics has for the first time rendered possible a direct application of Pareto's formula to the distribution of the higher incomes of the

[^162]United Kingdom. Not for 1 r2 years had any official statement appeared giving the total numbers of incomes of various amounts. Pitt's income tax of 1799 required returns from all individuals showing their total incomes from all sources, and the classification of the result, for 1801, for Great Britain is shown in Appendix IV. ${ }^{1}$
But the attempt to tax income in one sum upon the total amount was given up in favour of the present piecemeal schedule system, in which "taxation at the source" was the cardinal feature, and as an immediate result the yield of the tax was doubled. The value of the table given in Appendix IV. is therefore considerably lessened, as it is not so likely that the number of incomes should be increased as that the amounts shculd be greatly altered, with a corresponding redistribution upwards. But if we assume the underdeclaration of income to have been proportionate throughout, we have some index to the actual distribution at that time. The breaking up of the income tax into schedules has meant that no one has been required to give statements of total income unless for the purpose of claiming some abatement or relief, and the number of people not so claiming has, until recent times, always introduced an element of doubt into the statistics. Moreover, the available figures of abatements have given information for a very limited range. Even now, with abatements on incomes up to $£ 700$, and with lower rates contingent upon proof of totaj income not exceeding £3,000, if statistics of all claims made were available they would not be complete, for unearned incomes from $£ 700$ to £3,000 are not "declared" in any way. The requirements of the super-tax, however, include returns of every income over $£ 5,000^{2}$ for taxation globally, in one sum, and it is the details of these returns and assessments which have now been classified in the official reports, showing the particulars in eleven stages.

In 1906, when the Select Committee inquired into the possibility of graduating the income tax, Dr. Bowley made
${ }^{1}$ The following paragraphs are reprinted from the Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Janvary, 1914.-. A New Illustration of Pareto's Law,"-by the kind permission of the editors.
now 43,000 .


- It te necemary to oplit the clace $\ell 45,000$ to $\{55,000$ to get groupe crmparable with Dr. Bcwley's classcs, ard these iwo aggrigntes are suggented tor the comparison.
use of Pareto's law applied to the existing data, in order to estimate the numbers and amounts of income over $£ 5,000$. He made a skilful combination of hypothetical incomes from the Estate Duty capital for the upper range, abatements for the lower range, with House Duty gradation for the body, to get an index or line of distribution, which when applied to the known totals of income assessed gave the amounts at the various stages. He also utilised the classification of assessments under Sch. D-a most difficult table to handle, and a very different thing from a classification of incomes. Its chief difficulties are in the higher classes, where many assessments include large sums of interest paid (and therefore not " income" to the person assessed), while the assumption that there are two and a half partners on the average to each firm does not hold actually in the large cases. Dr. Bowley had, however, to relate his figures to the total taxed incomes, and therefore felt it necessary to distribute $£ 200,000,000$, which was assigned to incomes above $£ 5,000$. He obtained a Pareto index of $\times \cdot 53$, and his distribution of figures upon the estate duty basis, with a hypothetical "multiplier" of 32, and a rate of interest of 5.6 per cent., is given side by side with the super-tax statistics in the table on p. 33I. His additional "earned" incomes from the Sch. D tables referred to above are not so finely graded and have been omitted-the figures are given only for a comparison of the distribution and not of the $t$ thal income dealt with. The estimates of the total income over $£ 5,000$ were £200,000,000 (Dr. Bowley), $£ 250,000,000$ (Sir L. G. Chiozza Money), $£ 148,000,000$ (Sir T. A. Coghlan), and $£ 121,000,000$ Sir Henry Primrose). ${ }^{1}$

The general agreement is very striking, having regard to the nature of the data upon which the estimate had to be made, and it should be noted that the official figures were avowedly not yet complete. ${ }^{2}$ The official figures, moreover, are exclusive of life insurance, since premiums have been allowed as a deduction in arriving at income for super-tax purposes.

[^163]The accompanying graph shows the details of the supertax plotted logarithmically, on which method Pareto's formula ${ }^{1}$ gives a straight line, and it will be observed how remarkably the actual distribution agrees with his law. Only the two highest stages (and the lowest) are to any material extent away from the line, and the highest points merely exhibit a feature that is common to all applications of the law-a falling away in numbers of the highest incomes. This feature is one that appears quite natural upon a consideration of the points involved, viz., that as one approaches

Grape VIII.

impossibly high incomes the numbers must fall away. Similarly at the lowest end, strict applications of Pareto's law fail, otherwise there would be an enormous population far below the subsistence level. So, remembering that all variations in numbers of incomes for the same amount cause only horisontal movement of the points, in the former case we see the points move away from the line to the left (i.c., fewer in numbers, measured along the base), whereas in the latter
${ }^{2}$ Where $\#$ any given income, and $y=$ the number of persons with incomes of $x$ or more, then $x^{2} y=b$, and $b$ being constants. It is also commonly expressed: $\log N=\log A-\log , x_{0}$, where $N$ is the number of persons with incomes of more than fix (i.e., $N=y$ of the first formula and $A=0$ of the first formula).
case of low incomes near the subsistence level, they are found to move away from the line to the right (i.e., more in numbers). Pareto's line, adapted to cover the whole range of incomes, is therefore not straight, but like a reversed and very elongated S . In the present instance, the incomes below $£ 5,000$ are still lacking, so that the second feature does not appear. We may obtain the index or slope of the line between any two points. In this instance the slopes corresponding with the maximum number of points are 1.66 to x.68, and several cases are higher. These are very high figures, and certainly would not apply to the whole lower range of incomes from $£ 700$ to $£ 5,000$. The index found by Dr. Bowley for the higher incomes was $\mathrm{I} \cdot 53$, and it is not unlikely that the whole of this range of incomes would lic to the left of-i.e, have a higher index than-any Pareto line which was true for the main range of incomes.

The feature upon this graph most calling for remark is the position of the lowest point (incomes over $£ 5,000$ ) at A instead of the position B, which would accord with the formula. There are three important considerations bearing upen this:-
(I) It is natural to assume that the highest and most discernible incomes have been included, and that the incomes still to be declared and brought in belong to the lowest or least discernible class. It is at point A that nearly all new cases may be expected to come in. 1
(2) The whole range of incomes excludes payments for life insurance. So far from the deduction affecting the incomes which are just at the limits of the classes proportionately throughcut, and thus making no difference to the index, it is probable that such insurance is relatively of far greater importance for incomes about $\mathbf{6 5 , 0 0 0}$ than for those for higher amounts. The number excluded from the class at its lowest limit would thus be greater than the compensation received from the class above, and a deficiency compared with the formula is a natural result. ${ }^{3}$

[^164](3) It is highly probable, as indicated above, that the true index for incomes, say from $£ x, 000$ to $£ \mathrm{x} 0,000$, is appreciably less than I 66. The line should therefore be steeper at this point, and would cross the $£ 5,000$ limit at a point nearer to A than B is situated. The index obtaining between $£^{20,000}$ and $£ 10,000$ ( $=\mathrm{r} \cdot 66$ ) gave about $\mathrm{I}, 700$ more incomes for A, but I. 60 gave I,I50 more, compared with the I9II figures first published. ${ }^{1}$ (It is interesting to note that the index for the range $£ 5,000$ to $£ 2,000$ in $\mathbf{1 8 0 1}$ was $\mathrm{x} \cdot 66$.) Of course this was only a computation after postulating the number of the classes above as correct, and was all that was needed to make the series consistent. It had no bearing upon the actual correctiness of the whole series, which could only be established by relating the total to the whole amount assessed to income tax in a series which would be consistent in its other parts also; and such a reconciliation must necessarily be preceded by a discussion of the extent to which " income" is identical in scope and connotation for income tax and supertax purposes. A complete agreement for this part alone with Pareto's law is quite compatible with under-declaration throughout the whole of the part dealt with for super-tax.

The law is therefore illustrated without any reference to the statistical problem of the distribution of the total income assessed to income tax.

Dr. Bowley dealt with this problem in the light of these recent statistics in the Quarderly Jowrnal of Economics. He attempted the distribution of a total income of $\xi^{886,000,000,}$ less $£ 50,000,000$ estimated as payable to insurance companies, societies, or foreigners, by taking the abatements as evidence of the aggregated lower incomes, and the super-tax as evidence of the incomes over $\{5,000$, and dealing with the £44,000,000 for the middle range. This $£ 44,000,000$
were entiroly inadmissible, 58,900 (or 56,600 if the allowances were made an a doduction from duty peyable). 1910-11: 200 casea similarly omitted. Theses figures were basod co a 10 per cent. smmplo investigation (roply to question by Mr. Locken-Lampeocn, Hansarid 27th July, 1914).
a Reference to the later figuree on p $33^{8}$ shows that this estimate has been closely verified. A further 700 ceses have been found, and these with the 200 "insurapce" cases almost fill the gap.
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covered a kind of unaccountable excess in the middle range, for the lower range, continued upwards, would have demanded $£ 142,000,000$ only, and the upper range, continued downwards, would have required $£ 304,000,000$. The diffculty would be removed if the sums assessed in the super-tax range were considerably increased, or if it could be shown that the number of abatements claimed is quite deficient. There was presumptive evidence for aggregation of incomes in the intermediate region, and the super-tax statistics had tended to raise new problems rather than solve old ones. An interesting diagram showed that the super-tax classes and the abatement classes gave points lying, not at the extremes of one Pareto line, but at the extremes of two lines which were parallel, and the suggestion is that at some intermediate points, if the figures were known, a "cross-over" might be found. These intermediate points would mark the region where incomes predominantly earned would pass to incomes predominantly unearned, and, although the Pareto law may apply to either kind of income separately, it would appear that the application is not identical. Dr. Bowley's analysis is very suggestive, but it may be remarked that two possible lines of explanation or reconciliation are open: (I) Unless we are certain that the laws or rules governing the computation of income belonging to individuals in the mass are identical with those applying to the computation of incomes belonging to individuals, it may be ipat the sum of the parts can never equal the whole. (2) It may be injudicious to draw rigid inferences from a new system of "global" taxation, which may have weaknesses inherent in its nature or attendant upon its infancy.
With regard to (x), it is beyond question that the rules for computing individual total income are more lenient than those applicable to general liability, in particular relation to dividends. A partner in a firm must ccunt as income the fractional share of the full liability to which he may be theoretically entitled, even though some of it remains in the business and is not "enjoyed," but a shareholder in similar circumstances may count as income for super-tax only the declared "dividends," and the compulsory or collective
investment of a portion of the income which，though not passing into his hands and out again，is none the less his，and strengthens the capital value of his shares，does not come into his statement of total income for purposes of abatement， earned income relief claims，or for super－tax．Particular reference is here made to the remarks in Chapter VI．on ＂Reserves，＂which may affect the super－tax statistics to a marked extent．Similarly，an adequate allowance must be made for the effect of life insurance premiums in the super－ tax assessments．

Upon the second point referred to，the strong presumption raised by the application of Pareto＇s law shown above should be considered in relation to all the evidence upon the effect of an initial tax limit with an appreciable immediate burden，${ }^{1}$ and also to the general limitations of systems of global taxa－ tion which time alone can modify．
After making the necessary allowances for the＂excused＂ income under（ $\mathbf{x}$ ）and for any suppressions under（2），the total sum will approximate more nearly to the $£ 200,000,000$ which may be regarded as the minimum sum assignable to the range above $£ 5,000$ upon any satisfactory theoretic distribution of the total sum assessed to income tax．The new super－tax conditions will shortly afford further infor－ mation，giving the incomes above $£ 3,000$ ，and this elusive problem will be still further narrowed down．${ }^{\text {a }}$

The main statistics of super－tax are as follows ：－

| Year． |  |  | Total Income assessed． | Number of Persoas Charged． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1909－10 | ＊ | － | 139，664，000 | 115，348 |
| 5910－5x | － | － | 142，890，000 | II，682 |
| 19xI－I2 | 4 |  | 151，950，000 | 12，399 |
| 191\％－13 | － | － | 工58，800，000 | ［3，000 |
| 1913－14 | － | － | 170，150，000 | 13，850 |
| 79X4－15 | － | － | 230，850，000 | 28，800 ${ }^{\text {2 }}$ |

[^165]

## PART II.

## SOME APPLICATIONS OF OFFICIAL STATISTICS.

## CHAPTER IX.

## The Value of Land: Use of Schedule A Statistics.

ANNUAL VALUE OF AGRICULTURAL LAND: PROSPERITY OF AGRICULTURE.

Tre statistics for Sch. A classified under "Lands" are so closely related to the true annual value of agricultural land that they have been continuously used for the purpose of (a) showing the income derivable from this source in comparison with that from other sources, and (b) exhibiting the changes in value from time to time.

Many of the points arising in this application have already been dealt with in describing the detailed official statistics. The extent to which the movement of assessments may lag behind true values during a rise has been discussed in Chapter I. It has been seen that the truest " fit " may be looked for in the re-assessment years, and that the variations in the intervening years have little real significance. In a similar way the true extent of a fall in values may be disguised, ewon though occupiers and owners of land are able to secure reductions in the assessments in the years in mivich they occur, because reductions in rent are often effected as
permanent only after a series of temporary reductions or remissions have been granted for a number of years, and such remissions are not reffected in the gross assessments, ${ }^{1}$ while in the case of lands occupied by the owner the case for reduction must be very strong before there is any chance of successful appeal. Where the owner is exempt from income tax both the valuation for poor rate and the tax assessment may long remain over the true value-the latter because there is no incentive to reduction, and the former because the ratings are "pooled" over a limited area by owners who are all in like case, and whose rate will rise if ratings are reduced.' Again, mortgages have an influence sometimes in maintaining assessments, since the sum charged must be adequate to secure tax on the mortgage interest. These and other points bearing upon the relation between rental value and assessment are touched upon in the evidence before the R . C. on Agricultural Depression: A severe depression in agricultural land values may be masked by good accommodation land values when separate counties like Essex are under consideration, while assessments on ornamental lands, woods, game, etc., serve to maintain apparent values.
The general superiority of the Sch. A assessments over the poor rate valuations has been discussed already in Chapter 1 . It is of course a matter of importance in some investigations to know what land is actually included in the statistics. The whole question is well treated by R. J. Thompson in the Statistical Journal, 1907 ("An Inquiry into the Rent of Agricultural Land in England and Wales during the Nineteenth Century ') :-

[^166][^167]the Inland Revenue returns of the gross annual value of the property assessed for income tax (Sch. A) under the heading Lands, including Tithes commuted under the Tithe Commutation Acts.'
" The income tax figures have been relied upon by various writers and Royal Commissions as affording an indication of the rise and fall of rents, but they are subject to several qualifications, which it is well to bear in mind. In the first place, the figures refer to 'lands,' whether cultivated or uncultivated, including ornamental grounds, gardens attached to houses when exceeding one acre in extent, tithe rentcharge, and farmhouses and farm buildings. Secondly, the amount returned is to be the gross rent payable under the lease or agreement, and not the rent paid after deducting any temporary abatement or remission of rent allowed by the landlord. Thirdly, the valuation is only made every five years (formerly every three years), so that changes between each valuation are only made on appeal to the district commissioners. Fourthly, the valuation of 'lands' built on or appropriated to other uses is transferred to 'houses.'
" It will be seen that the inclusion of ornamental gardens and grounds, and the non-deduction of abatements, would tend to keep the total valuation up; the triennial or quinquennial vahation tends to refer the bulk of the changes to years not necessarily those in which they were made, while the transfer of building land produces, as far as it operates, an artificial decline in the total, which is not attributable to any fall in 'rents.' It may be noted also that a rise in 1864-5 was stated to be due to improved administrative control." ${ }^{2}$

He goes on to use the figures in the following manner:-
"For the purpose of comparing these three sets of figures with the prices of agricultural produce, I have taken Mr. Sauerbeck's index number for the articles included by him under the headings 'Animal and Vegetable Food ' (groups I. and II.), viz., wheat, flour, barley, oats, maize, potatoes, and rice; beef, mutton, pork, bacon, and butter. This list includes rice, which does not affect the farmer and omits wool, which does, but broadly it may be accepted as a fair indication of the course of agricultural prices. In the following table these four sets of figures are expressed as percentages. For the purpose of comparison with Sauerbeck's index number, the period $1867-77$ has been taken as a base, except in the case of column 2, where the year 1872 has been chosen as the mean of $1867-77$.
${ }^{2}$ Question of validity discussed in Report of R. C. on Land in Wales, p. 36I. Final Report of R. C. on Agriculture, 1896, also deals with it $\mathrm{Pp}, 26$, re uncommuted tithe. .
" Table VI.-Comparison of the Figures of Rent, Income Tax Returns, and Prices expressed as Percentages (abridged and given in five-year intervals only).

| Year. |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Rent of } \\ \text { 4on, } 000 \\ \text { Acres, } \\ 1872=100 . \end{gathered}$ | Income Tax Returns, 1867-77 = 100. | Sauerbeck't Index Number, 1867-77 $=$ 100. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1846 | 83 | - | 84 | 931 |
| 1850 | 82 | - | 86 | 70 |
| 1855 | 84 | - | 84 | 1031 |
| 1860 | 92 | - | 88 | 95 |
| 1865 | 93 | - | 95 | 901 |
| 1870 | 96 | - | 100 | 93 |
| 1875 | 102 | 102 | 103 | 1001 |
| 1880 | 86 | 92 | 105 | 95 |
| 1885 | 72 | 84 | 94 | 78 |
| 1890 | 78 | 8 I | 84 | 731 |
| 1895 | 65 | 75 | 80 | 66 , |
| 1900 | 69 | 70 | 75 | 732." |

Many writers have quoted the work of this Royal Commission upon the use of Sch. A assessments to show changes in agricultural rents. Among them may be mentioned :-

Mayo-Smith: " Statistics and Economics," p. 335, who refers to decadal changes 1843 to 1894.

Cartler: " History of English Agriculture," p. 30.
Others who quote the Sch. A assessments as sufficient evidence of value, or of change of value, are:-

Sir L. Chiozza Money: " Things that Matter," p. 283, referring to the exaggerated notions frequently held as to the value of land.
W. H. Mallock: " Property and Progress," p. 216, referring the balk of the value to small owners:-
" The gross income of the United Kingdom assessed under Sch. A for land in 1851 was $f 47,800,000$. The gross incomes of the owners in England and Scotland, of nnder 50 acres, is at the present moment more than $\mathrm{E} 51,000,000$." (In 1851 Ireland was not inchaded, and it may be remarked that the value of all hand (irrespective of acreage) in England and Scotland was $£ 45,000,000$ only at the date of the quotation.)

Dawson: "The Unearned Increment," p. 5.

Porter: " Progress of the Nation," p. 203.
Lord Eversley: "Decline in Number of Agricultural Labourers in Great Britain," S. J., 1907, p. 279 ; also "Estimate of Agricultural Losses in United Kingdom in last Thirty Years," S. J., Ig05, p. 66.

## Value of Land in Countion $\mathfrak{y}$ Value of Land por Acre. ${ }^{1}$

The official paper, C. 8300, in connection with the R.C. on Agriculture gave a statement comparing the rateable value in each union as in 1870 and 1894, and also the gross value of " lands" under Sch. A in each county in England and Wales in 1879 and 1894, with diagram maps of great interest. The income tax map was regarded by the Commissioners as giving a more accurate measure of the extent and severity of the depression. Among the explanatory notes there is one to which reference has not been made in the text with regard to " lands." "In Wales the assessments in former years were not approximated as closely to the rentals as in England, the result being that the fall has not been apparently so pronounced."

The statistics of " lands " for separate counties have been given from time to time, and have furnished material for ascertaining the average value per acre in different localities and at different periods. Lord Eversley has made county comparisons of value per acre, 1871, 1881, and Igor, at some length (S. J., 1907, pp. 294, etc.).
: Early Estimates of Value:-


[^168]Other writers who have referred to this question are :-
Professor Nicholson: "Rates and Taxes as affecting Agriculture," p. 77, refers to the increase from 27s. to 30s. from 1850-78, as given by Caird.
F. W. Hirst: " Porter's Progress of the Nation," p. 199, where R. J. Thompson's results are accepted ( 1851 - 5 26s. 9 d., increasing to 29s. 4 d . in 1875-7), and pp. 207-8, where a fall of 18 . from 1895 to 1900 is referred to and the following comment is made:" These figures do not exhibit with great certainty changes in the annual value of agricultural land, as they include income derived from gardens, and many other non-agricultural lands. They are moreover liable to fluctuations which are the result of administrative changes."

## Not Value of Land : Site Value-Economic Rent.

The campaign of the single-taxers and propaganda in recent years on the subject of the unearned increment have given rise to a considerable number of estimates of net or site value. For most of these the Sch. A assessments have been utilised, and widely different results have been obtained according to the estimated proportions and deductions that have been taken. Dealing first with land built upon (houses, etc.), we find the following proportions of gross value adopted for the sites:-

> One-fifth.
W. H. Mallock ${ }^{1}$ : "The Nation as a Rusiness Firm" (average for all).

Sir T. P. Whittaker: "Ownership and Taxation of Land" (very full : outside London).

Sir R. Giffen: "Economic Inquiries," I., p. 263.

## Onequarter.

P. Snowden: Socialist Reviaw, March, 1909.

Harold Cox: "Land Nationalisation," 1906, p. 132 (being one-twentieth for country and one-third for town).
W. H. Mallock: "Phantom Millions," Nineteonth Century, 1909, p. 165 (adopted for 15 large towns; but his combination approximates to one-quarter for all).
${ }^{1}$ Also "Socialism and Practical Politics," Nineleenth Century, April, 1912.

Sir L. Chiozza Money: " Riches and Poverty," p. 77 (probably " less than one-fourth" in provinces).
Sir T. Whittaker: " Ownership and Taxation of Land " (onequarter of net value outside London).

## One-third.

Sir L. Chiozza Money: " Riches and Poverty," p. 77 (for London).
W. H. Mallock: "Phantom Millions" (for London).

Harold Cox: "Land Nationalisation" (for towns).
J. D. Chorlton: " Rating of Land Values" (outside London-one-third rateable value).

## One-half.

Edwin Adam: " Land Values and Taxation," p. 172.
Giffen estimated the " extra ground rent " as one-fifth of the increase in house property from 1815 to 1868 , without reference to any possible change in the proportion.

Other writers approach the question from the point of view of the cost of building.
A. Hook ${ }^{1}$ adopts the average value of houses ( $£ 20$ to $£ 40$ ), takes twenty years' purchase, and deducts an average building cost of $£ 300$. For other buildings the average is $£ 15$ per annum and capital outlay froo. For the metropolis, building costs of $£ 400$ and $£ 300$ for houses and other premises respectively are adopted.

Sir Thomas Whittaker says that where land costs less than \&300 an acre it may be taken that the cost of roads will be greater than that of the land. He quotes the well-known view of the London County Council valuers that one-third may be taken for sites, and also the following authorities:-


[^169]W. H. Mallock, after taking the house rent per inhabitant as $£ 9$ in London, $£ 6$ ros. in provincial towns, and $£ 3$ 10s. in the country (differences adopted from Mulhall's Dictionary, pp. 314 and 744) says:-" Now it is obvious that such differences . . . are not due to differences in the cost of building . . . but must be mainly due to differences in the proportion borne by the rent of the sites to the total rent. Since, therefore, the total rent per head in London stands to the total rent in the great provincial towns and in the rest of the country in the proportion of 18 to 13 and to 7 respectively, the proportion borne by site rent to total rent must be taken as varying in a corresponding way." The inference is a somewhat extraordinary one, but there is no doubt as to what is meant when the further analysis is given. "If it is one-third of the total, or $£ 3$ out of $f 9$, in London, it will be a little less than one-fourth, or about $£ I$ I2s. out of $f 6$ Ios. in the great provincial towns, and one-seventh, or about 9s. out of $£ 3$ for the rest of the country." Setting this out (in shillings) we get :-

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total rent:-- } \\ & 180 \end{aligned}$ | 130 | 70 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Site rent :60 ( = one-third). <br> - ${ }^{\circ}$ Building rent is 120 ( $=$ two-thirds). | 32 ( $=$ one-fourth). <br> 98 ( $=$ three-fourths). | 9 ( $=$ omeseventh). <br> 61 ( $=$ six-sevenths). |

Thus the hypothesis, with which he starts, that the differences in cost of building do not account for the differences in the total is not borne out by the result-indeed, it cannot be, because the building value, 66 , in London is by itself greater than the whole value in the country, and the building value in the large towns is also greater than the whole country $v$ viue. It will be seen that the proportions obtained, viz., one-th/rd, one-fourth; and oneseventh, are (if multiplied by 54) 18, $13 \frac{1}{2}$ and $7 \frac{1}{2}$, or virtually those of the total rents. This may or may not be a rational way of estimating the site value, but it seems to have little to do with the constancy of the cost of building, and it assigns for that cost in the ratios 120,98 , and 6 I instead of 120,88 , and 47 respectively.

These sums as "site rents per head" multiplied by the population give the total for the country E4I $^{\mathbf{1}, 000,000 \text {, making }}$ the total, with agricultural lands, for 1905 " a little over $£ 80,000,000$. The site rents amount to about one-fifth, if so much, of the whole." It will be observed that no additions are made for land used by railways, mines, etc.

Some writers press for a figure as high as 60 per cent. as the site proportion. Shearman (" Natural Taxation ") said
it could be proved by an enormous mass of statistics; it is the average in Boston, Massachusetts and Pennsylvania. For Great Britain, and still more for Ireland, he considered 60 per cent. too low, but even if it were as low as 30 per cent., his general principles would not be refuted.

Sir Thomas Whittaker ${ }^{2}$ points out that there are three fallacious assumptions-(I) that foreign proportions hold good here; (2) that capital proportions apply to annual values; and (3) that the whole of the present taxes may be added to the total value.

Murray ("Taxation of Land Values ") refers to these foreign and colonial instances, and urges that the high percentage of unimproved value to the total value is due to the great area of vacant land included. That this aggregate method is misleading is shown by the fact that per acre the buildings in New York are $£ 1,419$ against $£ 6,000$ in Glasgow, yet they are probably ten times as valuable.

The following recent estimates have been made of the value of the sites of buildings and houses :-H. Cox, $\{40,000,000$; Sir L. Chiozea Money, $£ 51,000,000$; Edwin Adam, £ro0,000,000; J. D. Chorlton, $\{35,000,000$ (outside London) ; Sir T. Whittaker, $£ 50,000,000$.

Sir Thomas Whittaker prepares the Sch. A figures by deducting from the gross assessments the errors and overassessments, depreciation and repairs, and voids (dividing the latter equally between lands and houses-which is not in fact correct ${ }^{2}$ ). Sir L. Chiozza Money similarly deducts one-sixth repairs, charities, voids, and over-assessments from the total building values.

Even when the net value of agricultural land has been obtained before the site value or economic rent can be determined, it is necessary to deduct the improved value. The following estimates have been made:-MacCulloch, one-half for improvements; R. J. Thompson, £I2 per acre for improvements : Trustram Eve, $£ 8=$ unimproved value, or $f a$ for the worst land in cultivation: Sabin, four-sevenths; Sir I. Chiozsa Money, £ro for buildings, and half balance for

[^170]improvements ; Sir Thomas Whittaker, 15s. 5d. out of 20 . average annual value-" prairie value, nil."
The following estimates have been made of the net agricultural value :-Sir T. Whittaker, $£ 21,000,000$ (" prairie value, mil ") ; H. Cox, $£ 20,000,000$; Sir L. Chiozza Money, £35,000,000 ; Edwin Adam, $£ 26,000,000$.
The capital value of agricultural land is dealt with in connection with " The Capital of the United Kingdom," Chapter XI.
There remains then the value of land devoted to railways, mines, canals, waterworks, etc. These concerns are not assessed under Sch. A, but on their profits, like Sch. D. They are rated, but the ratings are not free from the profit element.
Some writers make an estimate of the sum which may be regarded as applicable to land value :-
H. Cox: "Land Nationalisation" ( $(10,000,000)$.

Money: "Riches and Povetty" ( $66,000,000$ railways ; £5,000,000 quarry and mine royalties). ${ }^{2}$
Whittaker: "Ownership and Taxation of Land" (Ex2,100,000).
Others (Edwin Adam, Hirsch, etc.) assume one-half the profits assessed.
There is one form of estimate that can be traced back for many years, recurring at frequent intervals. On this account, and also because of the pardy character of its fallacies, it is worth detailed examination.

A recent version by Max Hirsch is given in the Appendix to "Land Values Taxation," by C. H. Chomley and R. I. Outhwaite, and is based mainly upon the income tax figures (for 1905-6) as follows :-

## I. Pure Land Values (Schs. $A$ and D).

(a) Manors, fines, certain tithes, and certain sporting rights.
(b) Markets and tolls.
(c) Fishing in United Kingdom and sporting rights in Ireland.

[^171]II. Land and Improvement Values (Sch. A).
(d) Lands, including certain rentcharges

(d) Houses $\left\{\begin{array}{l}\text { (of which } 60 \text { per } \\ \text { cent. is pure annual } \\ \text { value). }\end{array}\right.$
III. Land and Improvoment Values (Sch. D).
(f) Railways.
(g) Mines.
(h) Gasworks.
(i) Waterworks.
(j) Canals.
(k) Quarries.
(b) Salt springs or works and alum works.
(m) Cemeteries.
(n) Tramways (net receipts) from the Statistical Abstract (not tax figures).

Fifty per cent. of $(f)$ to ( $n$ ) is given as pure annual value.
IV. Existing Taxes on Land and Improvements.
(o) Inhabited House Duty.
(p) Income tax collected (Sch. A).
(q) Income tax collected, Sch. D (Sch. A, No. III.).
(v) Local rates.

Of these items 60 per cent. is regarded as "pure annual value " of land.
(s) Land tax.
(d) Local revenue from tolls and dues.
(w) Tithe (approximate).

The whole of (s), (t) and ( $(u)$ are "pure annual value." The figures of the estimate are (in thousands) :-


In examination of this it is necessary to take the items in order, and for convenience there is some little repetition of matter dealt with in the early chapters of this work.
I. (a) Manors, Fines, "certain Tilkes" and "everain Sparting

Rights."-in the case of many manorial payments and fines (not separately distinguished in the Reports) there is a peculiarity in the law which makes it erroneous to include them in this estimate. They are already, in effect, in the totals for " Lands " under No. II., for the latter covers the rack rents out of which the fines are paid as occasional lump sums. ${ }^{1}$ No deduction is allowable in calculating the gross values for Sch. A (given under No. II. above) for these occasional payments, and assessments upon these items are in the nature of double assessments, for which there is legal sanction, but which do not correspond with an actual extra value in the lands.

Similarly, fines on renewal of leases are assessable, but, since the assessment does not stand if the money received is invested during the same year ${ }^{2}$ in practice virtually no separate liability arises under this head.
"Certain tithes" (i.e., those not subject to the regular commutation) and "certain sporting rights" may rightly be regarded as "pure land values," and the correction of the whole class ( $\{1,310,673$ ) would be met by reducing it about one-half.
(b) Markets and Tolls.-These figures ( $£ 869,635$ ) are the " assessable profits" on the basis of the preceding year, in the ordinary Sch. D sense, and it is not easy to see why they should be treated differently from ( $($ ) to ( $m$ ) under No. III.

In the case of tolls (as, for example, bridge tolls) there is generally considerable capital outlay, the interest upon which is included in the sums assessed, and it is doubtful whether more than one-quarter is " pure land value."
Profits of " markets" similarly include the interest on considerable capital outlay. Three-fourths of the total item appears in the Report under "Local Authorit $s$," and in many cases there is no connection whatever between the profits of markets and the values of the market areas excluded from the Sch. A assessments, since the markets are not necessarily for maximum profit and for purely commercial ends, and the sites are in some cases possibly worth more, as sites, than the whole of the profits. The absence of any real connection makes it impossible to set down this item, or any fixed proportions, as purely "land value."
II. The correct title of this class (d) is "Lands, including rentcharges wnder Tithes Commutation Act, farmhouses, farm buildings, edc.," and if this had been correctly set out in the estimate it would probably have saved the error under ( $\mu$ ) referred to later.

[^172]No exception can be taken to (d) and (c) being given gross without allowance for repairs, since a proportion of the total only is taken, and it may be said that this deduction is allowed for in settling that proportion.

The crux of the position is the percentage (60). This figure is supported by computations for American cities 60.59 per cent., New Zealand 68.94 per cent., and South Australia 65 per cent., to the fallacious character of which reference has been made, ${ }^{1}$
III. ${ }^{\text {Classes }}(f)$ to (m). Here Hirsch parts company from Shearman, who had placed all these items under division II., and taken 60 per cent. in a similar manner, but he adduces as a reason for taking 50 per cent. his desire to err on the side of caution !

Neither writer seems to realise that the distinction between these items and the general Sch. $\mathbf{A}$ is a purely legal one, a relic not merely of the Income Tax Act of 1842, but also dating from Pitt's income tax. So Hirsch, realising that tramways are sinilar in character to railways, but were non-existent in 1885, adds the "profits" to this section, not recognising that the ground for all these separate classes is that the annual value of the lands, etc., occupied by the subjects is excluded from the ordinary operation of the rules of Sch. A and is merged in Sch. D. Tramways are not within the scope of Sch. A, No. III., like these other classes. As he seems to have gone by analogy it is difficult to understand why he did not take "electric lighting works " as being a similar case to gasworks I He makes the curious remark about this whole group :-" With the exception of tramways, however, such undertakings where carried on by municipal bodies have had to be omitted, for the reason that no statistics are available from which their rental value may be deduced. This is a serious hiatus, as the value must be high." He was apparently ignorant of the fact that municipally owned gasworks, etc., are assessed to income tax like others.

The various properties excluded from the Sch. A assessments and assessed Sch. D are rated to the poor rate. In Chapter I. a comparison was given showing how the totals of assessments under Sch. A compared with the totals of the poor rate for the same properties.

From these comparisons we get the value of property rated, but not assessed under Sch. A, as $£ 25,500,000$ in 1880 and £34,500,000 in $\mathbf{x 8 9}$. In these years the total assessments under Sch. D on these concerns were $\{50,500,000$ and $£ 65,000,000$ respectively, so that the annual values rated are roughly less than 50 per cent. of the profits assessed, and as the values rated are "improved" values, the unimproved values must be very mach
less, probably not more than 50 per cent. of the ratings, and therefore 25 per cent. of the profits. On this computation Hirsch's estimate must be reduced $£ 21,000,000$ at least under this head.
IV. Existing Taxes on Land and Improvements.-Even waiving altogether the vital question of incidence in each case, and accepting the method, some important corrections and criticisms are necessary.

Hirsch adds to the Inhabited House Duty and Sch. A tax collected an item for tax under Sch. D on the concerns No. III. $£ 3,490,000$, but it is not clear how this sum is arrived at, as the tax at is. comes to over $£ 4,000,000$. In any case, through following Shearman, he puts 60 per cent. of it into his estimate, although he has taken only 50 per cent. of the " value" of the concerns !

The whole sum paid as local rates seems to be included in the calculation, of which 60 per cent. is estimated to be pure annual value of land. But some of the rates paid are included in the gross assessment to Sch. A (already put in the estimate in full), being allowed as a deduction before the net assessment is arrived at, as in the case of rates in Scotland, rates upon tithe rentcharge, and some drainage rates. ${ }^{1}$

Land Tax.-The whole of the tax paid over ( $£ 716,915$ ) is included as " pure annual value," but it is totally overlooked by both Shearman and Hirsch that land tax is a deduction from the gross Sch. A figures already included in the estimate. In the case of a tenant paying land tax finally its amount has to be added to the rent paid to give the gross Sch. A assessment and then properly allowed again as a deduction. The total sum so included in the gross figures and allowed as a deduction before arriving at the net assessment would not be the whole $£ 716,915$, but about two-thirds of it, ${ }^{2}$ the balance being accounted for by items so small as to be ignored in the $\leqslant t h$. A assessments, where their due allowance would not affect the income tax payable by more than a penny or two. The whole of this item should be excluded from the estimates as a donble entry.

Local Reoonve from Tolls and Dres ( $55,714,043$ ). -This is the amount appearing in the Statistical Abstract,4 for the year 1903-4. It represents gross receipts without deduction for expenses, wages, etc. 1 Moreover, the full profits from this source

[^173]are already included in the income tax assessments under No. I. (b) above. The whole of this item is wrongly included in the estimate.
"Tithes (approximate, $£ 4,000,000$ )."-Hirsch says:-" The estimate of tithes, other than in Sch. A, is taken from Shearman's ' Natural Taxation.'" It appears as $£ 4,054,000$ in this work, taken from the tithe commutation return of 1887. The whole of this amount is wrongly included in the estimate, since all the commuted tithes are assessed to Sch. A and included in the gross figures (No. II. (d) above), while a few other tithes are included in No. I. (a). The tithes " other than Sch. A" are a figment of the imagination. In any case, if the commuted value was £4,054,000 in 1882-3, it could not be $£ 4,000,000$ in 1905-6 (since the commutation dropped from f 92 IIs. Iod. to $\mathrm{f} 69 \mathrm{gs}$.7 d .), but would have been $£ 2,800,000$ only.

Hirsch stops at this point, and, even with the highly disputable principles involved, the necessary corrections upon the above lines would reduce the total by over $£ 40,000,000$. But Shearman ${ }^{1}$ takes 60 per cent. of the taxes upon land (as the part applicable to "ground rents ") from the gross British taxes (" because the landlords bear this already and receive the ground rents net "), and finds the balance $f 89,298,000$ as the amount " to be collected from British rents, if all taxes were levied upon them . . . exactly 59 per cent. . . . All British taxes could be paid out of existing rents and yet leave to the landlords a clear income of f6r,487,000, besides their house rents, etc., amounting to at least as much more."

The following are some of the astimates of site value :-
G. Gunton : Forwm, March, 1887, £ $131,468,288$.

Professor Harris: Formm, July, 1887, $£ 65,442,000$.
W. H. Mallock : "Property and Progress," $£ 99,000,000$.
H. Cox: " Land Nationalisation," $£ 60,000,000$ (on 1902-3 assessments).

Thomasson: "Land Nationalisation," Westminstar Roview, August, 1900, $£ 200,000,000$.

Sir L. Chiozza Money: "Riches and Poverty" (p. 77), fro0,000,000 (on rg02-3 assessments).
E. Adam: "Land Values and Taration" (p. 172), Ex 70,714,000 (rg04-5 assessments).
J. D. Chorlton: " Rating of Land Values," $£ 55,000,000$ (England and Wales).

*" Natural Taration** P. 144

W. Williams: "The World's Work," 1909, $£ 80,000,000$.
P. Snowden: Socialist Revicw, 1909, $£ 105,000,000$ (uses 1906-7 assessments).
Sir T. Whittaker: " Ownership and Taxation of Land," ட91,000,000.

Concerming the estimates by Gunton, Harris, and Mallock, Shearman remarks :-" All absurdly erroneous, . . . all used tables excluding every penny of rent in the city of London, also valuation of railways, canals, mines, etc.," and that Mallock excludes Scotland and Ireland, while Harris omits all lands not used as farming lands. Edwin Adam refers to the same estimates, and their author's "crushing confidence."

The following writers deal with the site value of London :-
Dawson: "Unearned Increment" (p. 15) (quotes estimate by Sidney Webb and W. Saunders).

Chorlton: "Rating of Land Values" (quotes Webb, Harper, Gomme).

Some writers express themselves in terms of the annual increase in site value :-
A. Hook (Economic Review, April, 1906) gives the capital decrease on agricultural land, and increase on urban land, in :quinquennial periods. London's annual increase is $£ 7,000,000$ and urban increase $£ 40,000,000$-capital value.

Mallock (" Phantom Millions," Nineteenth Contury, 1909, p. 765) : Annual increment due to sites $\mathbf{£ 9 8 0 , 0 0 0}$, gross(annual values) England and Wales.

Chorlton (" Rating of Land Values ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ ): $\in 1,300,000$ annual value, England and Wales, $£ 300,000$ in London.

Other references to writings upon site value not already given are :-
A. MacCallum Scott : The International, February, 1909.
G. M'Crae: Chambers' Jowrnal, January, 1901.
" Whig and Tory" : Westminster Revicu, June, 1899.
J. Hyder: "The Case for Land Nationalisation," p. I19.

## CHAPTER X.

## Income Tax Statistics and the "Taxable Capacity" of Ireland.

One of the most important practical uses to which the income tax statistics have been put has been in connection with the long controversy about the relative taxable capacity of Ireland. The evidence before the R. C. on the Financial Relations between Great Britain and Ireland, 1894-6, is very largely given up to an examination of these figures and to a discussion of their value as a criterion of taxable capacity in comparison with other tests. They had been used for this purpose by the 1864-5 Commission on Taxation in Ireland, ${ }^{1}$ but nothing like the same importance was attached to them. In the Final Report (1896) the chairman and four others, " after a careful consideration of the various standards," came " to the conclusion that none of them have much value, taken separately, except two-(I) assessment to death duties: (2) assessment to the income tax ; but that, taken collectively, all more or less support each other."
The reports by Lord Farrer and others, Mr. Thomas Sexton and others, and Mr. Childers laid similar stress upon their importance, while various writers have used the income tax figures since the Commission reported. Lord Castlereagh would gladly have availed himself of such a standard if it had existed, for in his speech on the Act of Union in 1800 he was of opinion that "the best possible criterion of the relative means and ability of two countries to bear taxation would be the produce of an income tax levied on the same description of incomes in both, and equally well levied in both." It is not within the scope of this book to consider the results of the various investigations, and reference to the reports must be made for that purpose, but the technical handling of the

[^174]material and the general considerations that arise from the use of aggregated incomes to test taxable capacity are the two subjects for treatment here. As regards the first subject, it is quite certain that an uninstructed comparison of gross figures may contain many pitfalls for the unwary.
(I) Aggregated Gross Assessments (all Schedules)_-It has been a common practice ${ }^{1}$ to use the " total income reviewed" for purposes of comparison, and, although it has been adequately criticised, quite recent writers have continued the method, viz. :-
The figures given by Erskine Childers, Irish Fiscal Auto nomy," in "The Fiscal Relations of Great Britain and Ireland," p. 65, are for 1909-10:-

$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { Ireland, } £ 15,872,302 \\ \text { Scotland, } £ 96,204,055 \\ \text { England and Wales, } £ 275,604,479\end{array}\right\}$ (together, £371,808,534).

They are described as " gross income reviewed for income tax." The source of these figures in the Report cannot, however, be traced, and the actual figures are, for 1909-10 :-

> Ireland, $£ 40,191,827$.
> Scotland, $£ 93,020,03 \mathrm{I}$.
> England and Wales, $£ 877,888,487$.

Professor Oldham, in his essay on the "Public Finances of Ireland " 2 quotes the gross sums correctly $£ 1,011,000,000$ for the United Kingdom, $\mathrm{f40,190,000}$ for Ireland, showing a ratio of 25 to x .

The comparison of "gross sums leviewed" is a very crude one, because while Schs. C, D. and E gross figures exclude most of the " exempt" income (i.e., it is not dealt with in the assessments), Schs. A and B cover the whole gross income from land and property. Now if the proportion of exempt income to liable income under Schs. A and B differs greatly in the two countries, and if gross Schs. A and B bear a much higher ratio to the total in one country than in the other, the comparison of gross figures in this way is worthless. Schs. A and B in Ireland account for nearly half the total, but in Great Britain for 27 per cent. only. The Irish Schs. A

[^175]and $B$ income includes 47 per cent. exempt, while that for Great Britain has 14 per cent. only. Combining the two results, and deducting exemptions (Schs. A and B) from both totals to get the figures as comparable as possible, we haveUnited Kingdom $£ 964,100,000$, and Ireland $£ 33,700,000-2$ ratio of 29 to .

Giffen expressed this reason for rejecting the gross figures in the following terms :-" The gross happens to include the total annual income from certain kinds of property, which kinds of property, or some of them, happen to be the principal kinds of property in Ireland, and are not the principal kinds of property in Great Britain, whereas the net assessment is the assessment of all incomes above a certain amount ; therefore the net assessment in both countries is exactly on the same footing " (R.C. on Financial Relations, Q. 7,821).

But even the elimination of exempt income from Schis. A and $B$ does not suffice, and the result of the above adjustment is not a true comparison of net assessments such as Giffen desired. The figures are not pure for purposes of comparison, because the Schs. C and D gross income includes many exempt amounts upon which tax is repaid (dividends from companies, etc.). Table II6 (53rd Report) gives the total exemptions in respect of small incomes (by repayment or otherwise) included in the gross amount reviewed for the United Kingdom, millions $£ 5^{8} \cdot 2$. The corresponding amount for Ireland may be collected from the separate totals for the schedules (except Sch. C, where it is not distinguished, but this may be neglected), and totals to $\mathbf{f} 9.2$. Thus the net aggregates are: United Kingdom, £953; Ireland. $\mathbf{6 I}$; and the ratio is 3 I to I . But this adjustment has not always been possible.
(2) Aggrogated Not Assessments.-It will be clear that the use of net assessments is much closer to a true comparison of like objects than the use of the gross; but, owing to the change in the form of the statistics in 1900-1, even this is now quite a different thing from the numerous comparisons made before the Royal Commissions of 1865 and 1894. It was then only possible to compare the provisional
net assessments, whereas now we can deal with the actual net assessment ${ }^{1}$ upon which duty is paid, after allowing for repayments, etc.

It is doubtful, however, whether this comparison is of real utility, because it is after allowing personal abatements (which are devices to obtain graduation), and it is clear that if we really wish to compare, in Giffen's phrase, the total of " all incomes above a certain amount" the figure to be taken is the aggregate gross assessments less all exemptions, as indicated in the concluding part of paragraph ( 1 ) above.
(3) Sch. A and True Values of Property-If the aggregate gross assessments are used, it is obvious that any difference in the relation between official values and true values in Irand as compared with Great Britain is of great importance, as it may seriously invalidate the comparison. Even if net assessments are used, it is still material. In 1894 and prior years the proportions of Sch. A exempted in Ireland (representing ownership of property by persons whose total incomes do not exceed $(160$ ) was small, and even now, though considerable, it is not large enough to make this question insignificant.

The relation between official values and true values has already been dealt with at some length, ${ }^{2}$ and it is clear that at the present time Ireland is seriously under-valued, and no comparison of taxable capacity should be made without allowance for this difference. Moreqver, even when the true Irish rental value is known, it nithst be borne in mind that it is a met rental, and to that extent also differs from British rentals. ${ }^{4}$

The influence of this factor was very exhaustively discussed before the Royal Commission of 1894. The 1865 Commission had come to the conclusion that Ireland did not in this respect enjoy any important advantage, but of course the fall in Irish land values after $\mathbf{1 8 8 0}$ was a great inducement

[^176]to the Irish witnesses to represent the valuation as excessive in I894, despite much expert evidence to the contrary. Dne witness wished to deduct one-quarter to allow for the agricultural depression, but of course this was on the tacit assumption that the valuation was correct when that depression began $1^{2}$ There was much counter-argument on the deficiencies of the British Sch. A assessments, and mansions were said to be badly under-assessed in England compared with over-assessments in Ireland. ${ }^{8}$ References were made to the considerable value of the vacant "unrated" land in London. The same witnesses in their eagerness sought to prove that railways and collieries were badly rated in England, ${ }^{\text {i }}$ in ignorance of the fact that, even if proved, it would not affect the question, as these concerns, though rated, are not included in the Sch. A assessments which were under consideration. ${ }^{4}$ There was also much play upon the prime facio probability that 2 valuation made by a single central authority, like Griffith, would be more stringent than one made by the host of small inexpert local bodies in England, and when it was pointed out that the Government surveyor of taxes "revised" the latter valuation for Sch. A it was sought to prove that his revision amounted only to occasional interference; but this suggestion was refuted by expert evidence, and also by the comparison between income tax assessments and poor rate values.

Unfortunately, even the last-named clear comparison was hopelessly misunderstood, ${ }^{6}$ and false arguments were based on the misunderstanding. From the total rated property is deducted the property that is rated but not assessed to Sch. A in order to arrive at the rated value of property which is both rated and assessed; this deduction includes the ratings on railways, etc. The adjustment amounted to one-ninth in England, but only one twenty-eighth in Ireland (where collieries, mines, etc., are few), so an equal proportionate

[^177]adjustment was claimed! The deduction had nothing whatever to do with the relative comparability of ratinga and assessments upon the same body of property.

There was much dispute as to whether tenant right was included in the valuation in Ireland, ${ }^{1}$ but what has already been said ${ }^{2}$ will suffice. Any right existing at the time of the valuation may be regarded as theoretically included, but nothing created since can in theory be covered, although where judicial rents are below the valuation the difference may now be wholly or partly set against such tenant right. Many frail thatched houses having no letting value (for maintenance would exceed rent) were said to be included in the valuation and to swell it unduly. ${ }^{2}$

There was also a suggestion that the Griffith method involved a double rating on farm buildings not practised in. England :-" First you value the land as an equipped holding, and then value the house again " ${ }^{\text {; }}$ but it was definitely negatived by Sir John Barton.

The statistical transfer of the value of farmhouses from "messuages" to "lands" affected comparisons between the nineties and the sixties, and led to some misunderstanding. ${ }^{5}$

The plea that Irish valuation was not deficient, in the case of houses, was forcibly urged by some witnesses, one even going to the length of stating that a revaluation in Dublin would not result in any increase. 1 was stated as a rejoinder that in many cases English ratings were kept above the depreciating values by local authorities. ${ }^{7}$ The fact that the British gross assessment represented rent before charging repairs, and that the Irish gross assessment was after charging repairs had insufficient notice considering its importance. ${ }^{\text {s }}$
${ }^{2}$ Qs. 6,029-36, 6,289, 6,944, etc.
${ }^{2}$ P. 156.
${ }^{2}$ Appendix IL., infre.

- Q3. 6,107, 6,200.

Qx. 6,073-80, 7,363 (vide p. 491, infra).

- \$. 6,35I.
" Vide my article on " Land Valuation and Rating Reform," Ecomomic Jowrnal, July, 1911. This over-sating still obtains to some slight extent: but its effect opon income tax assessments, made independently, is ahmost wil.
-Q.7.137.

Against any possible comparative deficiency in the Irish Sch. A many witnesses set an alleged English deficiency under Sch. D; and in summing up on this point six Commissioners regarded the two elements as balancing each other, three put the question aside as unsolved, three insisted that not only was the Irish case prejudiced by its comparative excess under Sch. D, but also by its excess under Sch. A, while two Commissioners ignored the comparison.

It is clear that Sch. A alone could not be taken as a test of taxpaying capacity unless its proportion to the whole were the same in the two countries. ${ }^{1}$
(4) Sch. B and True Values-Sch. B Assossmonts and Sch. B Incomes.-As Sch. B is also based upon the valuation, all that has been said on Sch. A as regards lands equally applies. But exemptions have, of course, always been of greater importance, and the difference between the use of gross and net assessments is by far the greatest under this schedule.
We are of course now used to the Sch. B statistics being given as one-third of the Sch. A value; ranking (however conventionally) as income, on equal terms with the figures in the other schedules. But in the 1894 and 1865 inquiries strangely enough, despite the close examination and criticism of the figures, it was never pointed out that the Sch. B figures represented annual values, not incomes, and these figures were added to the others on equal terms without question. ${ }^{2}$ Of course, as a matter of fact, a Sch. B assessment represented three times the taxable income from the farm in question, and whenever incomes were in question the Sch. B assessments had to be divided by three. The practical effect, in liable cases, was obtained by charging the assessment at onethird the ordinary rate of tax, but if a farmer were filling up his total income claim he would insert as his income from the farm one-third of the annual value (the proportion in England was then one-hal). Giffen was quite misled on this point in criticising Baxter's estimates. ${ }^{9}$
${ }^{1}$ 8. 8.029: Appendix II, P. ${ }^{383}$.
Pide computations by Gifition and Sidgwick in Appendix to the Evidenca
9. 9.72 m .

It is clear that, Sch. B being relatively of great importance in Ireland, this correction will reduce the Irish proportion of the total appreciably. But the difficulty no longer exists when recent figures are under consideration.
(5) Schs. A and B as a True Test of the Incomes of Landowners and Farmers-It was contended that Sch. A assessments, even if correctly based on rents under the same nominal conditions as to rates and repairs in each country, are not necessarily comparable, because what is taken as rent from the total produce may differ in the two countries owing to economic friction or the force of custom. Mr. OBrien said that the Irish landlord took one-third of the produce, and the English landlord one-fifth. ${ }^{1}$ Sir J. G. Barton agreed that this fact would affect comparison, while for dairy farms the valuers were said to assign two-fifths of the value to the owners. The argument was typically stated thus:-
Q. 6,313. "On the question of principle, if it were found that the Irish landlord takes a larger proportion of the produce for rent than the English landlord, and that consequently the English tenant, after paying the cost of production, has a larger balance of the produce than the Irish tenant for subsistence, that consideration would of course affect the value of the yield of income tax as a measure of the capacity of the whole population in each country to bear fiscal burdens, would it not ? "-A. "Yes, it would seem so."

But no one saw that " what is lost on the swings is made up on the roundabouts." For Sch. A was never really to be a separate test of capacity; all the tax schedules were taken together. Schs. A and B together in theory make up the net produce of the land-the owner's share and the farmer's share; and if one is too large by comparison with England the other must be pro tanto too small. There was really nothing of importance in this contention.

When we come to the difficult question as to how far Schs. $A$ and $B$ together really approximate to the income, the

[^178]evidence is inconclusive. For land that would be worth $£ \mathbf{I}$ rent in England, one witness said in Ireland 33 per cent. must be deducted for cost of buildings and equipments by the tenant, then 15 per cent. for repairs and maintenance, ro per cent. for remoteness of markets, and 5 per cent. for the greater cost of manures, so that the Irish farmer would only afford 8 s . $6 d$. assuming he is to make the same profit. ${ }^{2}$ This witness was certainly pro-Irish, and it is interesting to see how the assessments properly made according to rule on his data (ignoring rates) would really compare.

Prior to 1894 (no repairs allowance, and a different Sch. B " fraction ") :-Ireland : A 8s. 6d. + B 2s. Iod. = 1 Irs. $4 d$. (or assuming tenant right is included, 20s. 8d.) ; England: $\mathrm{A} f \mathrm{I}+\mathrm{B}$ ios. $=$ zos.
Since 1894 :-Ireland : As above, ris. $4 d$. - 1 of $A$ (repairs) $=$ ros. 4d $^{\text {. (or, including tenant right, 18s. 9d.) ; England: }}$ A $1 \mathrm{I}+\mathrm{B} 6 \mathrm{~s} .8 \mathrm{~d} .-1$ repairs A 2s. $6 \mathrm{~d} .=24 \mathrm{~s} .2 \mathrm{~d}$.
These comparisons represent the assessment results for identical produce (it being understood that interest on maintenance expenses has to be included under Sch. A), and certainly do not support the witnesses' contention that they favour England.

One witness said that a tillage farmer could not live unless he made six or seven rents. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

Dr. Grimshaw ${ }^{3}$ made an estimate of the income of Irish agriculturists in 1885 :-

| Total value of crops and live stock disposed of , | $\underset{62,000,000}{E}$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| Expenses : Seed, food, etc., $155,300,000$; labour |  |
| £8,200,000 ; rent and taxes, £x1,000,000 | 34,500,000 |
| Net income |  |

This was somewhat reduced in criticism, though not materially. The total Sch. B, which is all there is in the tax

[^179]assessments to deal with this profit, was in 1885 one-third of $£ 10,076,000$ 1 $^{1}$ No particular attention was, however, drawn to the discrepancy. Giffen made the landlord's rent, the labourers' wages, and the farmers' profits together $£_{40,000,000,{ }^{2} \text { so that there is no great disagreement with }}$ Grimshaw's estimate. The bearing of this on the question of relative taxable capacity obviously depends upon the corresponding figure for Great Britain, ${ }^{3}$ but the official figures clearly favour Ireland.
(6) Sch. D as a True Test of Income in each Country,The point was repeatedly made that the evasion under Sch. D was relatively much less in Ireland than in England, Irish income being more " narrowly," "stringently" assessed,4 because the liable income was all obvious and clearly visible. England was said to have relatively much more of the classes of income in which evasion or legal avoidance was possible, and particular reference was made to foreign investments, ${ }^{5}$ which was described as the weak spot of the tax, not only because liability was more difficult to check, but also because no tax was payable unless the income was actually remitted to the United Kingdom. The point as to relatively less evasion was not without expert contradiction,' and far too much stress was laid upon early and isolated instances of gross evasion in England which had been instanced by Gladstone.? Giffen showed some confusion of thought upon this question when he remarked: "I should say the part of the United Kingdom which is most strictly assessed is neither England nor Ireland, but Scotland, where you really have a scientific system thoroughly and logically applied," 'for he was evidently thinking of the valuation system under Sch. A. There is no such difference between the Sch. D system in Scotland and England. The point is not capable of complete proof, and although it was mentioned in several of the reports, in the opinion of most official

[^180]experts there is no ground for thinking that evasion in Ireland is relatively less than in England.
(7) Place of Aasessment as a Proper Test of Origin of Income.-Owing to legal or administrative methods it is possible that income may not be assessed where it really belongs. Thus, a bank whose profits have been assessed in Dublin and have figured in Irish income becomes amalgamated with a London bank; no change of customers or of shareholders takes place, but the Dublin assessment disappears and a combined assessment is made in London. Or again, some Irish stock is assessed for convenience under Sch. C in London. Official "corrections" of these various items have been made for some years in the periodical "Financial Relations" return. The adjustments were the subject of discussion and criticism before the Commission, the particular return in question being that for 1893-4 (314 of 1894 ). ${ }^{1}$ Under Sch. A the whole of the net receipt in each country is assigned as the true contribution. "There is no means of ascertaining . . . where the persons live who are in receipt of the income derived from such property, and there is therefore no alternative but to assign these items in accordance with the figures of collection. As to Sch. B the assessments are made on the actual occupiers of the land, who almost universally reside where those lands are situated; it is therefore shown as collected." a "It is under Sch. C that the necessity for some correction of the figures as collected is most obvious, no portion of the amount being assessed in Scotland, and only a small proportion in Ireland. . The great mass of the securities are assessed in London, but they are held by persons domiciled in all parts of the three kingdoms." In default of a better criterion the statistics of property assessed to Probate Duty were used. They indicated "with tolerable accuracy " how much English property is held by persans domiciled * elsewhere, and how much Scotch and Irish property, respectively is held by "absentees." The information was obtained from the records of "resealing."

[^181]A table was given showing the percentage adjustments on this basis for 1889-90. ${ }^{1}$ England had to receive $\mathbf{r} \cdot 6$ per cent. and Scotland and Ireland to give 1.4 and $\cdot 2$ per cent. of the total gross Probate Duty respectively, i.e., Scotchmen and Irishmen held "more property in England than is held by Englishmen in either Scotland or Ireland. . . . If these percentages may be accepted as fairly accurate where capital is concerned, which is the case with the Probate Duty assessments, it is not unfair to apply them in the case of income of a corresponding character; . . . incomes derived from such property are mainly comprised in Schs. C and D (public companies, foreign dividends, coupons, etc.), and only a small portion of them are comprised in that part of Sch. $D$ assessed as trades and professions." " "The remainder of Sch. D (trades and professions) is shown as collected, for as the assessments are made at the place where the trade is exercised, it may be taken that the tax is borne by persons resident in the country where it is paid." So the table under Sch. C ${ }^{3}$ and part of Sch. D attributed the collection of $£ 4,775,949$ England, 6396,925 Scotland and $\mathrm{E} 553,659$ Ireland as sollows:-


Similar adjustments were made for one-fifth part of the trades and professions, while under Sch. E $£ 82,000$ out of £ 936,284 in England was attributed to Imperial sources. The table contains, of course, adjustments for other branches of revenue, with which we have no concern.4

[^182]It will be seen that the principle was to assign real property to the country where situated, and personal property where the owner is domiciled. In discussion Lord Milner described the method as "ingenious," but admitted that " satisfactory " was too strong a term. ${ }^{1}$ There were points in which " net receipt" differed materially from assessments-the concession of charging income tax, Sch. A, in Ireland on rent as received, instead of upon the rent receivable or the valuation, began in 188r, ${ }^{2}$ and there were great arrears for some years. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Pensions paid from Indian revenues, all in London, wherever the pensioner might be domiciled, were an example of the kind of correction required. Giffen did not encourage these minute adjustments, and thought they made little difference in the end. It is obvious that whereas for one part of income an attempt had been made to attach it to the recipient, for a large part (Sch. A), the place of derivation alone was considered, and the inconsistent principle was criticised at some length. The principles in opposition were :-What is a country capableof producing ? and what are the inhabitants of a country capable of paying? Lord Milner was inclined to lay all the stress on the former, doubtless in defence of the official return, and when asked whether debts should not be deducted he said that the time element was important, and if there was a permanent drain a deduction might be made. The income tax was a good test of the capacity of a country, but not of its inhabitants. ${ }^{\text {a }}$

Absonteciam.-This question arose as a direct result of the discussion as to whether taxpaying capacity was to be judged by producing power or spending power." Lord Milner estimated that one-third of the Irish rental went to England, and that one-third of the value of Irish land represented money from English companies and lenders. What with absentee landlards, both English and Irish, and tenants paying interest to the Treasury or to English mortgagees,

[^183]neither the yield nor the assessment was a good measure of capacity. ${ }^{1}$ The following estimate of absentee rental in Ireland at various dates was quoted from Dalton's " History" :-1691, £136,000; 1729, $£ 627,799$ (prior) ; 1782, $£^{2,223,222}$; 1804, $£ 3,000,000$; $1830, £^{6,000,000}$ (also £3,000,000-Bryan) ; $\mathbf{x 8 3 8 ,}$ £5,000,000.
Mr. O'Brien's figures were based upon a parliamentary return in 1872 , which gave $£ 2,470,816$ as the rental paid by Ireland to absentee landlords of rural properties, to which was added, in proportion, $£ 960,900$ for urban property, interest on mortgages to British insurance companies (computed by Sir R. Giffen in 1886 at fourteen millions) at an average of $4 \frac{1}{1}$ per cent., $£ 630,000$ per annum, with repayments to Church funds, Treasury loans, quit rents, land purchase annuities, and remittances of savings bank deposits, reckoned at six and a quarter millions in all. He thought that half the valuation of the country was subject to mortgage. ${ }^{3}$
Swift in his day had said that one-third of the rents of Ireland were spent in England, and that with other remittances a full half of the income of the kingdom went there. ${ }^{3}$ Mr. T. Lough thought that five millions, or one half the rents, went abroad, ${ }^{4}$ and another Irish witness estimated four millions at least. ${ }^{\text {b }}$
Giffen was reluctant to admit that absentee transfers made much real difference, and when argum its were based on the economic effect of transferring spending power bodily from one country to another he referred to the immense difference between the static and the dynamic points of view, and showed that, as in the case of Australasia and the United States, the remittance of a very large sum is quite consistent with the highest state of prosperity.

[^184]In the Final Reports the chairman and four Commissioners agreed with Mr. Erskine Childers that the " economic drain " should be deducted from the income tax figures, but Lord Farrer and his two colleagues replied that "the tax is taken before the money is spent," and there are also counterremittances to Ireland, that the two cannot be brought to any numerical test, and that they are not of sufficient importance to invalidate the statistics as a test of taxpaying capacity.
The reconciliation of the two contentions is really quite simple, although never clearly brought out in the Report, and it does not involve abstruse considerations of the time element. As will be observed in the pages to follow, all the Commissioners agree-as a principle though not in detailthat taxable capacity measured along the lines of income is really referable to an aggregate of individual capacity. Therefore we may postulate that aggregate at this point. Now debts and interest payable form no part of individual capacity, and in judging what individuals can pay these charges must be allowed. Suppose the income assessed in Ireland and England respectively to be $c$ and $b$, the drain to be $x$, the rate of tax to be $\frac{f}{y}$, and that the whole revenue is to ${ }^{\prime}$
be raised by this tax. The $t_{a x}$ apparently paid by (i.e., collected in) Ireland is $\underset{y}{9}$, but since by the process of deduction (as by every doctrine of incidence even if open deduction were not allowed) Ireland recovers the $\operatorname{tax} \underset{\boldsymbol{y}}{\mathbf{y}}$, her actual burden is $\frac{\frac{e-x}{y}}{y}$, which is the proper tax on her true net income, while England bears $\frac{b+x}{y}$. But in fact the whole revenue is not raised by the income tax, and if part is raised by expenditure taxes and taxas which are not on produces and shiftable to absenter consumers, the relative taxable capacity for such taxes must not be $a: b$, but $e-x: b+x$. That is, the drain must be allowed for in judging of taxable capacity
for all taxes except income and produce taxes, but for income tax the system automatically adjusts itself. If you take the charges from the apparent income you must deduct the tax on the charges from the apparent tax burden: you may adopt either method, but must adhere to it consistently in computing both the subject and the object.

All the foregoing considerations relate to corrections of the bare tax statistics which are necessary, or which must be taken into account, before the figures are really available for use in a direct manner for this problem. They appear to be much more formidable than they really are, the only serious item being the correction of the Sch. B convention.

But when the tax figures are purified, how far can rules as to taxable capacity be scientifically based upon them? Further considerations arise, which may be briefly reviewed.

The Population exempt from Income Tax-If the income tax were so levied that no exempt person could bear taxation of any description, its figures would be final. But its exemption limit is not an absolnte one for all taxation-it is merely convenient relatively, and is only approved because this tax forms part of a system, and those who escape it are reached in other ways. No one would assert that no taxes at all should be paid by persons with incomes under $£ 160$. Therefore the non-income tax paying class is important when total taxation is being considered. If this class bears a constant ratio to the taxpaying cla then the difficulty is solved, since results and variations applicable to the latter will also be correct for the whole. Lord Milner in evidence remarked :-" Of course, the income tax assessments cannot possibly be a test of the capacity of the multitude to pay anything ${ }^{1}{ }^{1}$; and the suggestion that if the ratio of income tax to total revenue in the two countries was the same the two communities were in an analogous condition, was too remote from the facts to require consideration. The high exemption limit made it an improper test. ${ }^{2}$ Giffen was disposed to

[^185]belittle the importance of any slight difference in the proportion; it would have to be widely different to make the application of the income tax ratio of capacity to the countries as a whole really wrong. ${ }^{1}$ Sidgwick could not follow this contention, because there was obviously a much greater proportion of Irish income below the exemption line. ${ }^{2}$ The familiar expedient of doubling the income tax assessment to get the total income was not considered wholly applicable to Ireland, although it was freely used." On this basis Giffen took the aggregate income for Great Britain as $£ 1,424,000,000$, against $£ 76,000,000$ for Ireland. ${ }^{*}$

It is not, however, within the scope of this chapter to deal with the actual methods of ascertaining the income below the income tax limit.

Aggregated Individual Incomes as a Test of Capacity: Tho Subsintonce Minimum,-It needs very little progress upon lines of proportional taxation tempered by the deduction of a subsistence minimum to make one realise that the average individual income is an important feature, for a small number of rich men having the same aggregate income as a large number of poor persons will certainly have greater capacity to pay taxes; and the aggregate by itself tells us little. Mr. Lough put the average English income at $£ 39$ and the average Irish at $£ 15$, and adopted the subsistence minimum incapable of taxation at Giffen's figure, $£ \mathrm{r} 2$, so that the tarable balances were $£ 27$ and $£ 3$ respectively. These balances multiplied by the population gave the "capacity" for the country." Giffen took the average income per head as £4I 10s. and £16 5s. respectively, ${ }^{6}$ or, on a basis of comparative wages, man for man, in considering

[^186]the wage earners alone, $£ 60$ and $£ 33 .{ }^{2}$ It was accepted that Giffen and Levi agreed that the English individual taxable capacity was twice that of the Irish. ${ }^{2}$ The Irish were said by one person to have really "no residue for bearing taxes at all.":

The question arises as to whether the subsistence minimum should be deducted from all incomes. Can it be taken to be the average of a high minimum for some with a low one for others? It was not considered to be an average in theory, but it was admitted, so far as Ireland was concerned, that $£ x 2$ might be more than the whole income (per head) in many homes, and that therefore a margin was left which gave a higher minimum for others. ${ }^{4}$ But in principle it seems best to regard the minimum as being applicable to all, as it really is in fact, having regard to plain physical necessities, and one need not be misled by the machinery for digression in actual taxation where "abatements" cease at a certain point, for such abatements do not represent a non-taxable minimum at all. ${ }^{6}$
A more important point is whether the same minimum mast necessarily be taken for Ireland as for England. Giffen would not countenance a different figure " taking advantage" of the poorer country, although he admitted the minimum in Ireland was de facto lower. Sir E. Hamilton considered that the relative standard of life there must be taken into account ; and necessaries were much cheaper." VIt would seem hardly fair to the poorer country, however, if revenue is being taken for a common pool, to take advantage of a lower standard of life, and to act in the direction of preventing its improvement. But having adopted the same nominal minimum, it is advisable to adjust it by reference to the comparative index number for prices for the necessaries usually obtained for it, if there is any substantial difference; the minimum should
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be reckoned by an equality of goods as far as possible. One might imagine that the whole net balance should be thus adjusted to prices, but on the whole, unless the tax to be taken ultimately is also adjusted, this refinement seems to be confusing the issue. Bastable, however, argued against taking the same minimum, and turned rather away from minimum necessaries for life to minimum necessaries for production. ${ }^{1}$ He quoted Marshall:-" The income of any class in the ranks of industry is below its necessary level when any increase in their income would in the course of time produce a more than proportionate increase in their efficiency," ${ }^{2}$ and, following this line, his criticism of Giffen's result was somewhat searching. He appreciated the diffculties of determining the disposable net income for comparison, deprecated the refinements, and considered that, on the whole, comparative gross income was the " fairest rough test, and no test can be looked upon as more than an approximation." For my own part I think that although the adjustments may be criticised, they contain a much smaller net error than the unadjusted figures, and give a closer approximation to the truth. Circumstances can readily be conceived in which the gross figures would lead to an unjust result.

The Progromive and Difforantial Capacity of Individual Incomen.-In 1864 and 1894, when the income tax was a simple proportional one, tempered with digression, the theory of comparison stopped short at a deduction for subsistence minimum. Bastable hinted at progressive capacity, ${ }^{\text {a }}$ and Giffen replied specifically on the point, to the effect that as a considerable body of opinion, particularly in France, was against the progressive idea, it was inexpedient to apply it. ${ }^{4}$ Taxation was not progressive in fact, and that was of course a. sufficient answer.

But to-day we have a full progressive system, and would not readily assent to the suggestion that two countries with the same number of inbabitants and the same net incume

[^187](after the subsistence minimum was subtracted) had necessarily the same capacity. For the distribution and " spread" might be very different, although the average was the same. ${ }^{1}$ It is a mathematical corollary from the marginal and progressive principles that the capacity of wide extremes is greater than that of the same average distributed more evenly as a modal type. Various factors could be applied to the totals to give effect to this principle, such as the use of the quartiles in the distribution, or multiplication by the reciprocal of the Pareto index a. ${ }^{2}$ But there is no better test than the income tax actually paid, because this expresses automatically the effect of the current ideas about progressive capacity. It applies, however, only to the income above the exemption limit, and it might be well, therefore, to calculate comparative capacity for the exempt and liable groups separately, and then bring the results together. The adjustments for income due to other countries would give trouble. On the whole I think the best adjustment would be to divide the total gross assessed income by the total duty paid in respect of it and obtain a factor which will be low if there are many rich people and high if there are not. The reciprocal can then be used as the multiplier for the adjusted totals.

Incomes differ in capacity, not only by amount, but also by kind. Other things being equal, a predominance of " unearned" income would indicate a higher capacity. This, again, is accurately expressed in the duty, and the adjustment in respect of it would be fully effected by the above method. ${ }^{3}$

Some economists consider that incomes capable of expression in money terms do not exhaust the true conceptions of income. ${ }^{4}$ It may, in some circumstances, be necessary to

[^188]consider the value of wives' household services, but ordinarily speaking no adjustment under this head could substantially change the general ratio.

Earl Dunraven quotes the 1903-4 " net' receipt" for each country and also gives " net produce of a $1 d$. rate in the $f$ (about) -United Kingdom, $£^{2,772,768 ;}$ England and Wales, $£ 2,435,139$; Scotland, $£ 243,244$; Ireland, $£ 94,384$." It will be seen that this is a mere division of the "net receipts" by the rate (IId.) and differs from the official figures, which are based on net produce. He emphasises the fact that Ireland pays only just over one-twenty-seventh of the total ("Ireland's Financial Burden," Nineteonth Century, July, 1905).

## Miscellaneous Documents on Financial Relations and Division of Assessments.

H. C. $163-1893$; H. C. $305-1893$; H. C. $334-1893$. Financial relations: Allocations of revenue collected.
H. C. 344-1893. Financial relations: Death duties.
H. C. 356-1893. Five years' statistics of collection, 1888-9 to 1892-3.
H. C. 118-1894. Death duties.
H. C. 313-1894; H. C. 182-rgor. Explanations of financial relations returns.
H. C. 313-1898 ; H. C. 317-1899. Collection and contribution.
H. C. 377-1900. Collection and contribution (figures for each ten years).
Cd. 6897. The true Irish contribution.

Hansard (52), 24.4.13; 21.4.13; and 16.7.14. Income tax and super-tax contributions of Great Britain and Ireland separated :-1910-Ix, $£ 60,608,000$ and $£ 2,164,000$ : I91I-12, $£ 42,370,000$ and $£ 1,504,000$; 1912-13, $£ 42,770,000$ and $\{1,463,000$ : 1913-14, $£ 42,031,000$ and $£ 1,374,000$.

Hansard (35), rogs. The available information does not permit of a statement of the estimated income per head of the population in Great Britain in 186I and r9ro-II.

Hansard (25), rg82. No reliable estimate of proportion of Irish to British gross income is known.

## CHAPTER XI.

## The National Capital.

The accepted method of ascertaining the national capital wealth is the capitalisation of the income tax statistics so far. as they cover the ground, supplementing the results by estimates for the remaining items. Although used by others before Giffen, notably Baxter and Newmarch, ${ }^{1}$ it is generally associated with the name of Giffen, because he elaborated it in his well-known work "The Growth of Capital," and instituted a decadal comparison. No worker in this field can afford to be ignorant of Giffen's study, and it would be idle to recapitulate here all his conclusions. These comments are by way of supplement to what may be found in his writings, and relate mainly to the methods and limitations involved in the use of the income tax reports.
It is generally agreed that national capital wealth can be stated with less certainty than national income, because everything depends upon the number of years' purchase, or rate of interest, employed to capitalise the annual profits. The method has the merit of continuity and also of being practically the only one available to present a comprehensive historical test of accumulation of weath. ${ }^{5}$
Giffen was careful to point out that this mode of valuation had no reference to accumulated capital outlay, which might not amount to so much. Nevertheless, the values were stable and not transitory, and they represented facilities for production and distribution, which " must be equal all in all to the facilities existing anywhere else, because they are constantly tried in the furnace of free trade and

[^189]are not sustained by adventitious means." The value must be that of a " going concern "-in itself a " violent hypothesis "-and the profits for that purpose he considered to be more reliable thas any statement of actual capital outlay, with its risk of including wasted savings and improvident investment. But he recognised that his method does not necessarily register true accumulation, for increase may be exhibited where no actual outlay has been made.

Valuation as a "going concern" means the capitalisation of future prospects. W. J. Harris ${ }^{2}$ remarks that this is not what we want when comparing inventory wealth: "The figures have been used by the public as representing the actual wealth of the United Kingdom without this qualification, and they give an exaggerated idea of it to the ordinary mind." He refers to the fact that Bismarcls brought against the French their own valuations of national wealth when treating for the evacuation of Paris, and what M. de Foville called "improvisations malhewreuses" may, on occasion, prove disadvantageous and should warn us against exaggeration.

But what other value can be assigned than is furnished by the prospect of immediate and future achievement? No degree of usefulness in the past, and no amount of actual outlay in the past, can weigh against lack of such present and future utilities as men generally are willing to estimate and pay for in the common measure and medium. The value of a capital asset is not in what it has "cost " in the past, but in its stream of production of economic satisfactions (whether material or immaterial) for which men will give effort and sacrifice. The capital value of such a stream or "income" for any given moment is meaningless; it is the income itself for that moment: capitalisation must mean a consideration of the stream and its entire possession over a period of time, and that period must be from "now" onwards. It must therefore involve a consideration of the possibility of the strean diminishing or expanding in volume, i.e., it must take into account future potentiality for which an immediate market value is assignable, even
though the stream has not yet begun to flow. The attempted distinction of an "inventory" value cannot be carried through logically ; all that really emerges from the attempt is the warning that the wealth estimated in one complete way must not be assigned or applied to a purpose for which wealth in one of its particular forms is alone applicable. If I have to decide how much tea I can buy at any moment when $I$ am at the grocer's door, and if it is a law that $I$ can only command tea by the tender of certain round pieces of metal, it is no use for me to reckon upon the "value" of a stock exchange option, the documentary evidence for which is in my pocket.
Although wealth is conveniently converted into a common term, it is well not to disguise the fact that wealth itself expresses little convertibility, and its essential feature as wealth largely depends upon its being allowed to take part in production along its own lines. Because a nation's wealth is found to be $£ 10,000,000,000$, and because also it is found that it may wage a certain war by expending shot and shell "costing" $£ 2,000,000,000$ per annum, it is idle to assert that it can "afford" a war for five years. Comparisons of that order, even if not of that degree, are constantly being made. A nation whose wealth is in cocoanuts is limited in its ability to wage war against a nation whose varied wealth includes mines, by the value which the rest of the world sets on cocoanuts, and the readiness with which it may be satiated by them. Therefue two nations equally "wealthy" by a capital valuation in ordinary conditions may be very different when compared for any specific purpose. Although remarks upon some of the difficulties arising from the general conception may be more conveniently deferred until they appear distinctly in the detailed examination of sections of "wealth," it may be well to refer briefly at this juncture to considerations applicable to the whole valuation.
(x) Changes in valuation may be masked or exaggerated by secular changes in gold values-the general measure of the valuation. This thesis needs no elaboration here. ${ }^{1}$

[^190](2) Changes in valuation may be due to the emergence of wealth not susceptible of money measure into a category which may be so measured, the social enyironment being the changing factor rather than the wealth itself. If a right to wealth is not exchangeable it has no market money value, but as soon as it is exchangeable it is "quoted " in the money market, and we know what it is worth. From this springs another and a more serious difficulty. Progress in social organisation may facilitate the methods for making rights exchangeable, particularly by the invention of legal forms, legal entities, and corporations. A great vocalist may have derived $£ \mathrm{I}, 000$ a year from his talents without the capital value of his powers appearing in the national valuation, and those powers are not "exchangeable." But let a company be formed to "acquire" rights in his work, with a capital of $£$ I0,000, which they pay over to him on an agreement ; they then "earn" the $£ x, 000$ profit and pay a dividend of 10 per cent., and the vocalist's powers at once appear in the national valuation at a substantial figure. While we refrain from taking any stock of personal values and personal goodwill, we are open to the danger that " progress " in the national valuation may be a mere transfer from such a category to the category of the sama elements held corporately and in a state which is negotiable. An extreme instance has been taken, but the difficulty is seen acutely when we consider the capitalisation of public companies' profits, to be discussed shortly.
(3) In a broad view of wealth, gain in the forms which may be measured by money valuation because transferable from one individual to another may be offset by loss in forms of wealth attached to individuals and not so transferable. "Personal capital" may strictly be the highey form of wealth, and it might well be that the course of progress is to satisfy human physical needs by the production of commodities with continually greater economy and freedom, so that more and more human effort is emancipated to produce non-tangible wealth as the capacity for physical enjoyments is satiated. One community of mill hands may save $£ 300$ per head for their children by investment in savings banks,
and be content that they shall continue to serve the mill. This "saving" appears as an increase in the national valuation. Another community may save $£ 300$ per head and invest it in the education of their children, who become doctors, teachers, prophets and preachers, and a true increase in the national "wealth " does not come out in the "valuation." The inferences and satisfactions to be drawn from any increases in the "Giffen valuation" must wait upon a consideration of this aspect, not only before the whole answer, social, ethical and spiritual, can be given, but even before the total economic result is announced. A very real step forward in the national well-being may take place while the Giffen measurement is stationary.
(4) Associated with, but somewhat different from, the foregoing, is the consideration that the Giffen valuation postulates a certain constant co-operation of labour, management, and risk-taking with the fixed or material capital, and that, in so far as the remuneration arising by the association of these elements is included in the profits, it is also included in the valuation, although a very considerable part of the "living capital" is excluded. Professor Nicholson has developed this conception, ${ }^{1}$ and criticises the adoption of fifteen years" purchase for " house rentals" ; it is " perfectly plain that houses would not yield 6 and 7 per cent. unless a certain portion was actually earned by constant expenditure of labour." He finds the difference between the net rate of profit upon the capital, $5 \frac{1}{2}$ per ceif., and the 3 per cent. pure interest, to be mainly due to the labour involved in maintaining and employing capital, the risk element, from a national point of view, being of little importance. So, too, with regard to furniture, its proper use involves a large amount of labour; the value of the "greater part of movable property would vanish, but for acquired abilities of the inhabitants," and the value of a paint-box is given by way of example. He considers that no sufficient reason has been given for the precise figures used for turning income into capital, and for ascertaining what is derived from capital proper and what from management. By valuing ordinary

[^191]labour at thirty years' purchase, adding remuneration for management of dead capital $£ 8,000,000,000$, for domesticated humanity $£\{0,000,000,000$, and $£ x, 000,000,000$ for professions and officialdom, he reached $£ 47,000,000,000$ (in 189r) as the value of living capital, or mearly five times the value of dead capital.

Except as a warning that the Giffen valuation cannot give the full story of national welfare, these considerations of an ultimate character are of doubtful value in relation to the practical aims of that valuation, because they complicate and diffuse the ordinary issues.

The separate sections of the valuation may now be considered in so far as they involve an interpretation or application of the income tax gross assessments.

The chief estimates to which reference will be made are those by :-

Giffen for 1865 and 1875 ("Essays on Finance," ist Series, and S. J., 1878), and for 2885 ("Growth of Capital," 1889).

The Treasury in "Paget's Return," 1883-4 (H. C. 3451885).

Lord Milner for 1893-4 (R. C. on Agriculture, 1895-6).
W. J. Harris for 1892-4 (S. J., 1894).

Sir L. Chiozza Money for rgo2-3 (" Riches and Poverty," 1905) : and for recent estimates,

Ecomomist (18th February, 16th August, 25th November, 19II).
E. Crammond (S. J., July, Ig14).

Others have been made, but these are representative and cover the period.

## Lends (including Tithe Rentoharge).

Giffen took thirty years' purchase for 1865 and 2875, reduced to twenty-six for 1885 (the result of capitalising lands in Ireland at fifteen and in Great Britain at twentyeight years' purchase). He was at same pains to justify the reduction and to find a "safe mean in the transitional
circumstances " of 1884-5. The loss in capital represented over $3 \mathbf{x} 6$ millions, or 15 per cent., which was apparently less than the general impression, for he draws attention to (1) the lagging of the change in assessments behind the real change; (2) the stationary valuation in Ireland; (3) the large amount of " residential" value, which did not change as much as agricultural lands; (4) the fact that Enclish tenants were not rack-rented and had virtualy a beneficial interest, so that the loss had not fallen exclusively on rent.
There is no doubt that ( I ) at that time was important, and was masked by rent abatements, which ended, reluctantly, in becoming permanent: (2) was not always fully understood. Major Craigie, in 1878 , referred to the " small rise in Ireland " compared with the 21 per cent. and 26 per cent. elsewhere. ${ }^{1}$ It would have been better if a real estimate of Irish rental could have been made, before capitalisation, because it represented such a large proportion of Irish capital, and was important if the three countries were being compared.
Giffen's reduction in the number of years' purchase was justified by events. The opinion was expressed in 1852 that land yielded 4 per cent., ${ }^{2}$ but thirty years' purchase was given with equal authority. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ In 1869 Baxter took twentythree years for lands, houses, and mines, but until the eighties thirty was generally recognised.4 In 1885 the Treasury adopted twenty-five for Paget's leturn "after careful inquiry . . . in various parts of the country." In 1894 Harris was urging the necessity for lowering the English figure from twenty-eight to twenty-five, and that upon a more stringent valuation. By $\mathbf{1 8 9 6}$, when the values and the methods were carefully considered, eighteen years' purchase of the gross assessment was frankly accepted,'

[^192]and the fact that it involved a " loss " of over $\mathrm{I}, 000$ millions, or 50 per cent., in a few years, was very widely quoted. Eighteen was adhered to for some years, ${ }^{1}$ but not without dissentient voices, ${ }^{\circledR}$ which have recently gathered in strength. Edgar Crammond uses twenty-five years, ${ }^{4}$ and the Economist ${ }^{4}$ recently gave a comparison for $\mathbf{~} 885,1895,1905$, and 1909, using Giffen's basis for 1885 throughout, which seems rather to burke the difficulty.
These great changes in the "values" of land reveal in a striking manner the limitations of the whole method. In what sense was $\mathrm{I}, 000$ millions " lost " in fifteen years, or in what sense has the value diminished from 2,000 millions in the seventies to perhaps $\mathrm{r}, 000$ millions at the present time ? In the national sense the land and its potentialities are still there. It is clear that if a country became half-derelict, its producing or feeding power in bushels practically halved, the result would be no worse by this method than if, with produce maintained, it changes in esteem as an investment and alters when compared with other sources of income through great secular movements in prices or in the rate of interest. It seems that no comparison of results could be satisfactory without recourse to some index numbers of purchasing power. Without an additional penny being invested, the value might rise to great proportions, with consequent encouraging inferences. It may be said that it does not represent the national utility of the land, but the aggregate of individual values, and shows at any rate the limit of value as a mortgage security. Such a description is not, however, quite justified. Valuation is besed entirely upon current productivity at the market rate of estimation for security for a continuance of that rate. Therefore it ignores potential increase of productivity entirely. The Sch. A assessments take little or no account of potential building values

[^193]in land near towns, and valuable vacant sites are omitted altogether. It may be argued that such values are not wanted in a national valuation of existing wealth, and it would vitiate results to anticipate the future. But the point is that just as it is hardly a real national value, so at the same time it falls short of an aggregate of individual market values, expressed as the limit of mortgage securities. ${ }^{1}$ Minor points may be mentioned :-
(I) Rates should be deducted before the capitalisation in Scotland.
(2) Harris criticised Giffen, ${ }^{2}$ and said that 10 per cent. should be allowed from the gross rental, and that land was worth only three-fourths of the Sch. A value. To the total so reduced he added two millions for undiminished fancy land, and one million for accommodation land, making a deficiency of 670 millions in 1894 compared with 1885 . But this is all a matter of arranging the number of years' purchase upon gross or net values, and in taking twenty-five years instead of Lord Milner's eighteen he arrived at the same result.
(3) Woodlands are not fully covered by the tax assestments. ${ }^{3}$

## Hoases and Mescuages generallys

In 1878 Giffen considered twenty years' purchase might reasonably be taken, but he adopted fifteen as a safe

1 Vide S. J., July, 1915, where it ha / been remarked that the valuation of property under the Finance (1909-80) Act, 1910, for the sew land taxes will certainly show a result far in excess of the Giffen capitalisation. Of courso-it should do so. This method only values the nsea of existing buildings and occupation, based on present rentals; it takes no account of future improved nsee, whereas the market values must reflect such future nses and different occupations. It is not inconsistent to say that the Giffen method should be pupplemented by the capital value of vacant boilding lands, witheut going 50 far as to include personal anticipations of particular monopolies of futare development, attaching to premises now in use. The Giffen method should not anticipate future additional activities. Therefore it should consider the value of each property on its present atility, and the present utility of a building site may not unreanonably be takea ca its value for immodiate building-the fact that it is being held up for some future development is beaide the mark
${ }^{2}$ S. J., 1894" Comparion af Growth of Wealth in France and Enghand.
${ }^{2}$ Vide p. 24.

- For early extimates gide S. I. 1002. D. soc:-Becke (1800).
multiplier. In $\mathbf{i} 885$ he adhered to fifteen years' purchase on the gross assessment in England and Scotland and twelve years for Ireland. Except for Paget's Return, with sixteen years "after careful inquiry," fifteen years has been consistently maintained since Lord Milner regarded it as the same as eighteen years' purchase of net values. This valuation includes very diverse elements; not only houses, but also factories, mills, stables, and business premises. Bcing based on "annual " value, which fails to reflect the capital value (in the sense of investment) for some classes of property, such as country mansions and town halls, it falls. short of the true "accumulation" of capital in such cases by applying a severely commercial or competitive test.
Harris ${ }^{1}$ comments that higher rents should not be considered an advantage, because this class does not represent " productive property." This again depends upon the point of view. It would seem that whether rents fell, as for lands, or rose, as in this class, we were in evil case ! He allowed for void property and then took fifteen years' purchase of the result. This is fallacious, because the number of years' purchase takes into account the ordinary risks of empty property already. It is true, however, in so far as there are always in assessment a number of properties which are practically unsaleable, being untenanted and waiting the day of demolition when the owners are sufficiently convinced or when time is ripe for other developments. On the whole there is no sufficient reason for adjusting these figures. Sir L. Chiozza Money points out that a considerable amount of trade capital is included, and much that is only fit for destruction is valued in such figures.


## "Othar Profiss " ondar Sch. A.

Giffen took thirty years, Paget's Return and Lord Milner twenty-Give years, which has been adhered to since. Having regard to the miscellaneous character of the items

included, this multiplier is too high. The sporting rights would hardly justify the rate of interest chosen, and the net result of analysing the several parts is nearer twentyone years. Some items are merely legal duplication of income.

Sch. B (Farmers' Profits).
Farmers' Capital_-It has long been recognised that the Sch. B assessments offered little assistance in estimating the capital employed by farmers in agriculture. ${ }^{1}$ A good summary of the question may be found in Mr. R. H. Rew's paper on "Farming Revenue and Capital." ${ }^{2}$ He quotes Caird's estimate of $£ 400,000,000$ (or about six times the rent) as the first serious attempt. Giffen in 1878 (for 1875) had taken ten years' purchase of $£ 66,752,000$ " farmers' profits" under Sch. B.
" The resulting total is rather less than $£ 700,000,000$, which again is less than the value of three years' gross produce, which is estimated by the best authorities at $£ 250,000,000$ annualiy. Whether this figure is sufficient for farming capital as distinguished from that of the landlord, it will be for those well acquainted with the subject to judge. I have been desirous again to take a low figure." ${ }^{8}$
The reason for taking the whole gross assessment, and not half, was not made clear." The estimate was strongly criticised as giving $£ 14$ per cultivat ${ }^{( }$acre. ${ }^{5}$ In 1890 Giffen defended the use of the gross, but adopted eight years instead of sixteen (although he inclined to ten), and discussed the objections, "and particularly Major Craigie's views, at some length. He urged the necessity for accounting for ( 1 ) the value of a year's crops; (2) the value of the live stock; (3) the value of machinery and tools; (4) unexhausted improvements and beneficial occupation; and (5) the value of woods and plantations not included in the

[^194]Sch. A values. ${ }^{1}$ He quoted the estimates by Howard and Turnbull- $\{200,000,000$ for crops, $£ 150,000,000$ for live stock, and $£ 50,000,000^{2}$ for implements-and adhered to $£ 520,000,000$ for their 1885 estimate.

In 1894 Harris gave a detailed estimate, putting live stock at $£\{97,000,000$, cereals and produce at $£ 172,000,000$, and implements, etc., at $£ 46,000,000$. He deducted one-tenth of the value of live stock because the enumeration was as at 4 th June instead of the end of the year, and one-quarter from the produce because a great part of one crop is often disposed of before another is ready. This method of valuation by primary produce, feeding-stuffs, etc., rather than by secondary produce, or sale of live stock, was criticised by Major Craigie.

A writer in the Westminster Review in 1906 put the value of machinery and " movables" at two years' purchase of the land, and made the total value $£ 293,000,000 .^{8}$ The Economist recently gave $£ 368,000,000$ for $1895, £ 340,000,000$ for 1905, $£ 348,000,000$ for 1909, and altered Giffen's figure of eight years' purchase to sixteen, without referring, however, to the altered basis.

## Estimates of Farmers' Capital (in millions).

1869: Baxter, $£ 300$ (animals alone are $£ 170$ ).
1874 : Turnbull, $£ 440$ (R. C. on Agriculture, 1896, Appen$\operatorname{dix} A$ ).

1878: Caird, $f 400$ (Journal of the Royal Agricultural Society, Vol. XIV., p. 2).

1878: Craigie, $\{376$.
1884: Loss of $£ 73$ between 1873 and 1884 (surveyors' Institute Journal).

1885 : Paget's Return, 1300.
1887: Craigie, £300 (S. J., June, 1887).
1893: Turnbull, $£ 3667$ (Farmers' Club Journal).
1894 : Harris, $£ 352$ (S. J., 1894).

[^195]1895 : Rew, f319.
1896: Milner, $£ 200$.
1897 : Turnbull, $£ 330$ (R. C. on Agriculture, Appendix A). McConnell, $£ 320$ (" Agricultural Notebook ").
1905: Money, $\mathbf{E 2 8 5}^{28}$ (" Riches and Poverty ').

## Estimates of Tenants' Capilal per Acre.

1846: $f$ ( 10 (vide evidence before $S$. C. on Real Burdens affecting Property, Qs. 1,900, etc.).

1874: f9 6s. 9d. (R. E. Turnbull, R. C. on Agriculture, Appendix A).

1878: $£^{8}$ (Craigie).
188I : $£$ Io (Caird, S. J., p. 633. This is where the owner wants $£ 50$ per acre for the freehold. The tenant expects Io per cent. on this capital).

1894: $£ 6$ (Harris).
1896: $\mathrm{f}^{6}$ 17s. 9d. (R. E. Turnbull, R. C. on Agriculture, Appendix A).

1896: $£ 7$ to $£ 10$ (R. C. on Agriculture-Evidence, Qs. I,439, 21,515-7, 21,931-4) ; $£ 6$ or $£ 6$ to $£ 7$, formerly $£ 10$ (R. C. on Agriculture-Evidence, Qs. 13,345, 14,875-6, $\mathbf{1 5 , 5 8 0}, 30,596,60,709,61,897$ ) ; $£$ ro on good farms (R. C. on Agriculture-Evidence, Qs. 24,383, 24,862).

1905: $£ 6$ (Palgrave--" thought by Craigie to be too low", adopted by Money, "Riches and Povefty," 1905).

## Seh. C : The National Deft.

This item was given by Giffen as "Public Funds less Home Funds." The deduction represents "the permanent charge of our own National Debt." The Indian and colonial Government loans formed a large part of the item, and the average rate of interest was taken at 4 per cent.; Paget's Return and Lord Milner's valuation continued this estimate. Recently Mr. Crammond lowered it to twenty years' purchase. It is not an item calling for much comment, because the rate of interest is capable of fairly exact verification from periodical articles in the Economist and other financial papers.

The question of the inclusion of the National Debt is a more difficult matter. Giffen considered that the effect of capitalising the whole of Sch. C would be to reckon the debt "twice over":-
"The National Debt is a mortgage upon the aggregate fortune of the country. As we may assume it to be practically all held at home, we may reckon up our whole estate without deducting the debt, whereas we should have to deduct it if it were held by foreigners; but while we do not deduct the debt from the total of our estate, neither can we add it without falling into error." ${ }^{1}$
He emphasised this in 1889, correcting the words "twice over " as a slip, and added :-
" Of course, to each individual holding a portion of the National Debt, the holding is property. . . . On the whole the reason assigned is a good one. But I should not censure very much any one who included the debt as a part of the capital of the community . . . the money expression of all the other capital of the community is less than it would otherwise be by the amount of the debt ; . . . if there were no debt, lands, houses, etc., would exchange for rather more than they now do. The debt in this view represents a certain distribution of part of the capital of the country, and we do not get a complete view of the capital unless we include it." ${ }^{\prime 2}$

He admitted that in comparisons with other countries, or in considering different periods over which the debt had greatly changed, the point might be important, but on the whole preferred to exclude it. Lord Milner included it at thirty-three years' purchase. Sir L. G. C. Money deducts National and Local Debts from the value of public property (giving a net $\{450,000,000$ ), and includes them under the general statement of capital; the Ecomomist and Mr. Crammond apparently ignore them, but have a higher figure for Government and local property, $£ 630,000,000$ and £750,000,000 respectively.

If we raised money individually for war, by borrowing

[^196]from persons with loanable resources, on the security of our possessions, the position would be that there would be an annual interest charge upon our incomes, from which we should deduct tax, and the recipients would bave no " income" to return for taxation. Thus the capitalisation of our property values would cover the capital of the lenders. If the capital lent had not been blown away in shot and shell, it would be represented by additional capital, goods, and permanent expenditure, which would come into the national valuation, but, as it has disappeared, no such additional capital appears. So if a nation's savings are accumulating at the rate of $£ 300,000,000$ per annum, and a war breaks out which is just financed by these savings for three years, the total valuation should remain constant for those years. It would remain constant by the method indicated. But in fact we do not pay this interest as such-we pay taxesand to capitalise the interest received out of those taxes is to add to the national valuation where there is no real addition; unless the value of all incomes (or the number of years' purchase) has pro tanto fallen, the result will be too great. Giffen rather suggested as his view that such a depression in value exists. If our values were settled by a foreigner, with catallactic brain, seeking an income in Britain or elsewhere, the existence of this non-beneficial or onerous charge would lower his estimation of possibilities here relatively to countries with no suc \$burden, other things being equal; but as most eligible competitors would have similar drawbacks the difficulty is minimised. However, values are mainly determined by internal competitive considerations, and although a differential burden upon ownership of capital with no burden upon earnings might alter their relative positions, the fact that this burden is fairly distributed on both classes with no possibility of shifting leaves the relative values unaltered. Values as a whole, however, might change relatively to the general price medium, gold; but, even there, credit facilities have such a much larger bearing upon that issue that a depression could be easily offset by a more highly developed credit system. Altogether it appears probable that any effect of a long-
standing debt, like in character and amount to those generally found, would be, if existent at all, in the direction of depressed values, but certainly not pro tanto with the debt involved. It is therefore duplicating values almost to the entire extent toadd Consols to the full fee simple value of national property.

It must not be forgotten that Consols are a mortgage upon earned income as well as unearned income, both being subject to tax for payment of interest. Sir L. G. C. Money's method rather suggests to us that, in a valuation of property, although the loans themselves are undoubtedly property to the holders, it is only necessary to reduce the valuation of real property by the proportion of Consols secured thereon instead of by the whole debt. However, his method is clearer than Giffen's, and probably meets all that is really required.

The question is further touched upon under the heading " Interest secured on Rates."

## Quarries and Mines.

Giffen put four years' purchase in 1875 and 1885, Harris adopted four, Lord Milner seven (after Paget's Return in 1885), Money five, and Crammond four ; the Economist adopts eight. The two official returns employed seven years, because they recognised what the other writers appear to have consistently overlooked, viz., that the "profits" being capitalised include all the royalties, which are a first charge, and to which a much higher figure than would be proper to the remaining profits is applicable. If the profits generally were worth five and the royalties at least twelve, the multiplier for the whole would be about seven and a half. But these profits are worth more than five years' purchase.

The Economist rejects Giffen's "surprising assumption," not upon this ground, but because "a review of the reports of such companics shows that the market estimate . . . is far greater than four years' purchase . . ." 1 The companies quoted in the Investor's Mouthly Manmal alone gave twenty

[^197]millions more than the total value of mines, etc., on Giffen's assumption. The Economist does not take the point that the factor arrived at on one set of figures is being applied to another set which are not wholly of the same order. If eight years' purchase results from the investigation, the factor for the whole income tax figure should be nearer nine and a half years.

Ironworks.
Years' purchase: Giffen and Harris, four ; Milner and Money, five; Economist, eight ; Crammond, four.

## Gasworks.

Years' purchase : Baxter, twenty-five ; Giffen, twenty for 1875, twenty-five for 1885; Paget's Return, twenty; Milner, twenty-five ; Money, twenty ; Crammond, twenty; Harris in 1894 thought twenty-five too high.

## Waterworks.

Years' purchase: Baxter, twenty-five; Giffen, twenty; Paget's Return, twenty; Harris, over twenty; Milner, twenty-five; Money and Crammond, twenty.

## Canals, ete. 1

Years' purchase: Giffen and Baxter took twenty-five; Paget's Return, Milner, Money, and Crammond all take twenty, but Harris regarded it as low.

## Fishings.

Years' purchase: Giffen and Paget's Return, twenty; Milmer, eighteen; Money and Crammond, twenty.

[^198]Railways in the United Kingdom,
Years' purchase: Baxter took twenty-five; Giffen, twenty-five for 1875 and twenty-eight for 1885; Paget's Return, twenty-five; Milner, thirty; Harris, twentyeight : Money and Crammond, twenty-five.

## Railways out of the Unitod Kingdom.

All writers take twenty years' purchase.

## Foreign and Colonial Securition.

Years' purchase: Giffen took fifteen for 1875 (followed by Paget's Return) and twenty for 1885 ; other writers have also adopted twenty since.

## Other Interost : Intorest paid out of Ratos.

Years' purchase: Giffen and Milner, twenty-five ; Money and Crammond, twenty.

## Othar Profts.

This small item has generally been taken at twenty years' purchase.

## Trades and Profossions.

Baxter said: "Trades and professions require working capital, the interest on which, in the opinion of competent judges, amounts to one-fifth of their gross income"; and Giffen's comment was that he regarded this as a minimum. ${ }^{1}$ "By speaking of a fifth of trade and professional income as being interest on capital we in fact imply that only a usual or legal rate of interest is considered to be derived from capital . . . and we are therefore moderate in capitalising at fifteen years' purchase only."

Milner followed Giffen, although he regarded the figure as very doubtful, and Harris criticised it severely in relation to the method of dealing with companies

[^199]Since 1900-I the statistics have not been presented in the form "trades and professions" and "public companies," but employments have been separated, and the general class remaining, made up of persons, firms, and companies, has been called "Businesses not otherwise detailed."

Recent writers do not, therefore, distinguish the " ownership."
Sir L. Chiozza Money assumes one-half of the net profits (after adding for evasion) are from capital, and takes ten years' purchase, which gets over the difficulties in Giffen's method when there is transition from private to company form.
We get in consequence rather divergent results. Taking companies and trades together, Milner gives $£ 2,043,000,000$ for 1894, and the Economist, ${ }^{1}$ following with twelve years' purchase instead of fifteen, $£ 1,500,000,000$ for 1895, $£^{2,458,000,000}$ in 1905, and $£ 2,727,000,000$ in 1909, whereas Money gives $£ 1,750,000,000$ on 1902-3 figures.

There is no trace of any genuine investigation into this question, and it is probable that if Baxter had put the proportion at one-sixth or one-fourth, it would have been as readily accepted, without challenge, down to the present time. It is clear that for the inquiry to be of any use it must be undertaken on a considerable scale and the sample results properly weighted in relation to the industries affected. Thus, for example, it is almost certain that over one-third of the profits of "persons and firms" as distinct from companies relates to wholesale and retail distributive trades. It would be necessary to exclude all return upon capital in real property assessed Sch. A, and to consider capital in book debts, stock-in-trade, business fittings, fixtures, and machinery. Baxter's one-fifth, applied to the present "persons" and "firms" statistics, gives well over 40 millions, whereas if these items are taken roughly from the Estate Duty statistics, even with a high multiplier, such a figure cannot be approached. The " employments" carrying no capital element must serve to reduce the general average proportion. Indeed, if one

[^200]excludes them, the average assessment on " persons" for " businesses, etc., not otherwise detailed " is about $£ 300$, and an average capital, on Giffen's method, of $£ 900$ seems rather high.
This matter is becoming increasingly involved with public companies, and is small in relation thereto. Sir L. Chiozza Money's plan of taking the whole profits together has much to recommend it. If ordinary business aggregates to 200 millions and company business also to 200 millions, the Economist estimate at twelve years' purchase would be 2,880 millions, and the criticism to be urged against it is that the " jump" from one category to the other is so great that companies must certainly be valued too high if ordinary business capital is not absurdly low at one-fifth. Sir L. Chiozza Money's would give 2,000 millions, and by valuing only half the company profits at ten years' purchase a very drastic reduction has been made for all the non-physical capital elements, but an over-generous estimate is given to ordinary business capital. It must be remembered that the ordinary business profits include all salaries and management earnings by the owners, whereas such elements are excluded from assessments on companies, and it is quite certain that the capital involved for equal amounts of assessment under the two heads is much less in the case of private management. On the whole I am of opinion that the truth is certainly between the two extremes or methods.

## Public Companies.

Baxter took twenty-five years' purchase: Giffen fifteen for 1875 (which was also adopted by Paget's Return in 1885). twenty for 1885; Milner, twenty; Crammond, fifteen: Economist, twelve.

Giffen originally took fifteen years in 1875 fon miscellaneous public companies, "which would include banks, telegraph companies, insurance companies and the like," and in altering the figure for 1885 he paid regard only to the change in the average rate of interest. No writer seems to have inquired into the change of comlent. Joint-stock enterprise now
covers the whole field of industry and commerce, and not merely the classes indicated by Giffen, in which there was but a comparatively small section under private control. One has now to consider whether the method of ascertaining the capital, say, of the grocery trade, or the cotton industry, under joint-stock control is comparable or compatible with the method adopted for the capital under private control. In 1894 Harris pointed out the absurd result following from the registration of an existing business as a company :-
The firm A. B. have been assessed at $£ 15,000$ a year profit. One-fifth would be $£ 3,000$, multiplied by $15=£ 45,000$, at which they figure in the national wealth while they continue as a private firm. "One fine morning they register themselves under the Limited Liability Act. Their capital and profits are not altered in any way, but their value to the national wealth is immediately raised to $\{300,000$, namely, twenty years' purchase on $£ 15,000$. How can it be possible that this simple act on the part of A. B. has increased the national wealth by $£ 255,000$ ? " He also refers to a purely brokerage business, land agency business, or other "professional " business where there is no capital in the business, but the wealthy partners keep their property invested in mortgages, or houses, or railways. They register for family reasons, and a like result is exhibited, by which he shows " what a very incorrect factor the income tax is for founding upon it any fundamental law for pscertaining capitalised wealth therefrom."
We are here facing the difficulty to which reference has already been made. The same producing capacity, by a mere transfer from the personally negotiable to the publicly negotiable class, alters in its character as national "wealth." The legal organisation for joint-stock control and the provision for limited liability are valuable "ingredients" which the State supplies, and their addition to personal elements of wealth convert the latter into legal and negotiable forms capable of being the subject of public subscription and exchange. Hence the rapid conversion of private business into joint-stock business turns potential capital into real capital and makes a striking, but unreal, advance in
national " wealth." When Giffen wrote, "private business" represented 180 millions and "companies " only 40 millions, whereas at the time of the Economist estimate they stood more nearly equal, say 200 millions each. Adopting ten years' purchase only, the Giffen method gives an increase from 760 millions to 2,400 millions, whereas Sir L. Chiozza Money's method would show 1,100 to 2,000 millions, and is much more successful in avoiding the fictitious advance due to mere change of legal form, although it probably exaggerated the earlier capital.

As shown in Chapter VI., there are certain trading losses to which no effect is given in the tax assessments. It is a matter for consideration whether these should be deducted from profits before capitalisation, ${ }^{1}$ or whether we are to regard the number of years' purchase taken as already allowing for the risk of such loss. The market quotation for any stock taken individually always allows for the risk of loss in that stock, and one can apply such a rate to aggregated profits only where the risk still exists. But a net national profit is a riskless profit because realised losses have been already deducted, and the market rate of estimation should therefore be somewhat higher. On the whole, therefore, if the estimate used for capitalisation is derived from business values, it is sufficient to ignore the loss to which reference has been made.
Moreover, looked at from another point of view, the valuation included only profitable undertakings, and busi§nesses which are losing money do not appear therein. But the fact that a loss has been made during the past three years does not make a concern valueless: the invested capital will generally command a price, though heavily depreciated, in the hope of recovery under different management, etc. No credit is taken for this asset. It is hardly necessary to go still further, and capitalise a loss as a deduction from realised profit.

[^201][^202]holdings of securities of other companies as investments leads to duplication of the total capital " (Report on Census of Production, 1907, p. 36).

This explanation fails on a point of fact. If a company has income from investments such income is taxed at the source, and is excluded from the profits of the company assessed to tax and capitalised on Giffen's method.
"The item 'houses' also . . . includes those premises held by public companies, . . . and therefore the value of these is counted twice in the estimate."-Bernard Mallet, C.B., and H. C. Strutt, "The Multiplier and Capital Wealth," S. J., 1915.

This is erroneous, for a similar reason. The houses are taxed under Sch. A, and the assessment is deducted from profits before the latter are taxed under Sch. D.

## Income of Non-income Tax paying Clacses derived from Capital.

This is one of the most difficult and unsatisfactory of all the items. Giffen refers to it as " incomes of trading and professional persons below the income tax limit. . . . I have been guided by Mr. Dudley Baxter, who explained in his ' Essay on National Income' his mode of estimating the two kinds of income which lay intermediate between incomes comprised in the income tax assessment on the one side and the working class incomes on the other." Giffen includes a special addition in 1885 for income which escaped assessment when the limit of exemption was raised in 1876 : one-fifth $=£ 960,000 .{ }^{1}$ Now Baxter, in the work quoted, takes his assumed number of taxpayers from the total upper and middle classes and estimates income at $£ 60$ per head, and also describes one-quarter as from capital, ${ }^{2}$ or $23 \frac{1}{2}$ millions, but the following year in his estimate of national capital he gives 200 millions for this class. ${ }^{2}$ Giffen remarks that Baxter "considered this capital so small that it might be disregarded. Perhaps this would be going too far, consider-

[^203]ing the large amounts which must be invested in workmen's tools, and also the large number of small retail dealers there are throughout the country, the costermongers, greengrocers and the like, who have all some capital. ..."1 He then takes the income of the non-taxpaying class as 600 millions, and reckons a tenth as derived from capital, capitalising at five years' purchase.

So in 1875 the figure rose from $£ 200,000,000$ to $£ 300,000,000$ and in $1885 £ 335,000,000$, with $£ 14,400,000$ for the $\AA 100$ to $£ 150$ class now exempt. In 1885, Paget's Return followed Giffen's figure for 1878 without special comment.

In 1894, Harris referred to the $£ 67,000,000$ income capitalised at $£ 335,000,000$, and alleged that fully one-third of it was investcd in Consols, which it had been proposed to exclude.

In 1896 Lord Milner added 25 per cent. to " trades and professions " for this class, and claimed to follow Giffen, referring all inquirers to him. ${ }^{2}$ The Ecomomist estimate in 1911 continued Giffen's 335 millions (not 349) of 1885, and made it 380 in 1895, 420 in I905 and 450 in 1909, the changes in the exemption limit being ignored. Mr. Crammond recently gave 500 millions, being 100 millions at five years' purchase, so that the guesswork goes steadily upward, and one wonders whether the true nature of this item has not been lost sight of. Sir L. Chiozza Money is the only writer who has shown any reasonable restraint, and his estimate is 100 millions ${ }^{6}$ as a "liberal figure."

It must be clearly understood that this item does not really refer to the savings of the exempt classes. These savings are in savings banks and provident societies, all of which make investments, or in building societies which have a gross income from real property, and there is hardly any channel of savings which has not been fully represented in the gross income tax assessments already capitalised. Sixty

[^204]millions of exempt income has already been accounted for at various rates, from fifteen years' purchase upwards, or say over $\mathrm{r}, 000$ millions. What remains is the capital value of the stock in trade, implements and utensils, etc., of small shopkeepers, and workers like blacksmiths, etc. Any one familiar with the prices at which small businesses are taken over will hardly quarrel with an average capital of $£ 200$ for the shops and $£ 100$ for workshops. If we take the table on p. 63 of the Statistical Journal, 1910, giving the British Association Committee's estimate of the amount and distribution of income (other than wages) below the exemption limit, we shall find that working capital of this description is confined mainly to classes 25 to 28,30 and 3 r. On the most liberal estimate of average capital for the numbers given in col. 4 it is difficult to account for more than $£ 200,000,000$. Approaching the matter in another way, we have in England and Wales about 534,000 shops and licensed houses, of which, speaking generally, those over $£ 40$ only will contain income tax payers, leaving 370,000 under $£ 40$. Adding for Scotland and Ireland, we may thus account for $\{80,000,000$. Then 400,000 cases of workshops, etc., at an average of £roo, and a million workers with tools, etc., of an average value of $£$ ro, bring the total to $£ 130,000,000$. There may also be some forms of investment which escape the gross income tax assessment, but altogether $£ 200,000,000$ is a sufficient estimate.
> " Furnituro, Works of Art, ote." (" Movable Property yielding no Ineome ").

For 1865-6 Baxter put the value at $\{300,000,000$, but Giffen adopted half the capital value of houses and gave $£ 500,000,000$, and for $1875 £ 700,000,000$, because there had been an advance since Porter, in "The Progress of the Nation," estimated one-third. Giffen regarded his figure as "under the mark," and for 1885 he continued the proportion, making the value $£ 960,000,000$.

Both Lord Milner and W. J. Harris considered this figure very high. The former preferred $£ 600,000,000$. The

House Duty figures were used by Harris ${ }^{\mathbf{1}}$ in detailed classes, to estimate the value:-
$\geqslant$
 and so on, giving a total of $£ 599,000,000$, including £20,000,000 for Ireland.
Sir L. Chiozza Money used a general fraction-one-sixthgiving $\{500,000,000$. He considered Giffen's figure unreasonable, because the messuages included business premises and land values. The Economist, though considering the figure too high for 1885, continues it for each valuation to the present time.
It has been brought into comparison with the Estate Duty classification. Chorlton remarks " that the amount passing in 1905-6 was six and one-third millions, and "unless the Commissioners of Inland Revenue are content to accept a merely nominal valuation, it seems to show that value is much over-estimated at 1,000 millions." Lord Milner considered the probate valuation of very little assistance in the matter, in view of the great under-valuation. ${ }^{3}$

Foroign Investmonts not inoluded in Sch. C or Sch. D.
Giffen's misconceptions under this head have already been referred to. If allowance had been made for the "hidden " income from abroad the actual evasion might have been included here at a much lower figure. His figure really includes three items:-
(y) Income from abroad unidentified, but included in

Sch. D assessments.
(2) Income from abroad, remitted and escaping tax.
(3) Income from abroad, not remitted and not liable. The general question of evasion has been dealt with in ${ }^{2}$ S. J., 1906. : Rating of Land Values" ${ }^{\circ}$ p 36 - R. C. on Agriculture Qa. 6,3115-8. - Vide pis 23 .

Chapter VIII., but it is convenient for purposes of estimating national wealth to make a separate valuation for ordinary trades, and for (2) and (3) separately.

Under ( I ) Harris estimated that one-sixth of profits of public companies working from London might be taken as income from property abroad, which gave nearly six millions in 1885, and eleven millions in 1894.

The employments under Sch. E are of course not included, Giffen certainly considered the propriety of deducting the capital value of pensions and annuities " on the same principle that we omit the capital value of the interest of the debt," but concluded that as they were actually payments for services they were not a mortgage on the national resources.

## Value of National and Local Property.

Giffen said that there was no property which ought more properly to come into the valuation. ". . . It includes the value of the land of dockyards and other Government establishments, the plant employed in them, the public buildings and furniture, and the waterworks, gasworks, public parks, embankments, and other possessions of local authorities." In 1878 he placed the municipal and local improvements at $£ 300,000,000$, and Government property at $£ 100,000,000$ ( $£ 400,000,000 \mathrm{in}$ all). Ten years later he added the increase estimated during the period, without re-examining the basis, petting the total al $£ 500,000,000$.

The Economist continued this for 1905 at $£ 605,000,000$ and for 1909 at $£ 630,000,000$.

In 1905 Sir L. Chiozza Money estimated public property at £ $500,000,000$ and local property at $£ 1,150,000,000$, but the National Debt and local loans being included as income elsewhere they were deducted from these items, giving a net value of $£ 450,000,000$. The estimate in detail included the navy (at a written-down value), fir4,000,000, and works, $£ 80,000,000$; army works and military arsenals, £120,000,000; telegraphs and telephones (at fifteen years' purchase), $£ 60,000,000$; Suez Canal shares, $£ 28,000,000$, etc. ; local property included $2,000,000$ acres of common land,
£50,000,000, 22,000 miles of main roads and 97,000 miles of minor roads, $£ 600,000,000$; parks, bridges, sewers, lighting, etc., electric light works, gasworks, trams, waterworks, reservoirs, at a conservative figure, $\{500,000,000$.
In so far as Giffen included waterworks, gasworks, and other industrial undertakings in this value, he had already included the greater part of their value, for he had capitalised the frofits assessed to tax in his main valuation under Sch. D, and he had furthermore capitalised the "interest secured on rates." There could certainly be little, if any, more value to include separately. Sir L. Chiozza Money makes a similar double entry when, in addition to including the net value and also the full mortgage on the property, he capitalised the full profits under Sch. D for gasworks, electric light and power, trams, and waterworks, ${ }^{1}$ but he rightly excluded the interest on rates.
It will be observed that there is a considerable difference between the two methods. It can be argued with great force that the greater part of the value of roads is already included in the value of the adjacent property. In so far as the property is directly served, it is enhanced in worth by the present value of the services rendered by roads which have been made and paid for in the past. One need not belong to the school of thought which expects a cheaper "hair-cut" to work out into an increased ground rent, before one admits that, so far as minor roads are concerned, their value must be mainly in the rents paid for the houses, etc., served. There is very probably a surplus or national value over and above the individual values in main roads, taken as a system, and an estimate is permissible on this account. Of course, it is open to argument that all individual values are improved by common wealth, such as parks, but it is improbable that the connection is so direct and full as in the case of sewers, for example. In the case of recent expenditure (for the sake of argument assumed to be outright). where rate of interest on outlay is a controlling feature, the tenant's rent must cover streets and sewers as much as it does the brickwork of the house itself. In the case of

1 Vile the discussion on Mr. Mallet's paper, S. J. July, 1915.
expenditure long past, where actual outlay has ceased to command a rate of interest, we may consider a streetless, sewerless house with poor situation as upon the economic margin, for which no site rent is payable, and contrast it with a similar structure fully equipped, commanding a superior rent and a distinct site rent. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that a large part of public expenditure serving specific properties must be valued in the valuation of those properties.

On the whole, with this reservation, Sir L. Chiozza Money's estimate is probably the most reasonable that has been made, and further consideration of the matter is beyond the scope of this book, as it is in no way determinable from the official statistics.

## A New Valuation on the lines indieated (1914 Figures).

 Source of Income.

|  |  |  | Capital Value (million $f$ ). | Range of Doubt. + or - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Brought forward |  | 12,919 | 1,517 |
|  | Income of non-income tax classes derived from capital | paying | 200 | 50 |
| (18) | Movable property, etc., not income (furniture, etc.) . | yielding | 800 | 200 |
| (19) | Government and local property | - - | 400 | 10 |
|  | Total valuation |  | 14,319 | 1,867 |
| or, | in round figures | - | 14,300 | 1,900 |

The following notes on the several items (figures in thousands of $£$ ) will serve to indicate briefly the computations involved (1914 statistics) on reference to the several relevant parts of this work:-
(I) Gross, $52,284-500$ rates in Scotland $+2,400$ further value in Ireland $=54,200 \times 2 I \mathrm{y} . \mathrm{p}$. per Estate Duty valuations
Nei, similarly $\times 25$ y. p.
Add 30 for building lands, per Estate Duty statistics $\times 30$.
(2) Gross, $228,639+4,000$ inter-quinquennial increase
$-\mathbf{2 , 2 0 0}$ rates in Scotland $+2,200$ under-valuation in Ireland
$=232,600 \times 14$ y. p. |per Estate Duty valuations.
Net, similarly at 17.4 y . p. Take mean result $\pm 150$.
(3) $2 x y . p . \pm 20$ (on restricted figures-vide p. 45).
(5) and (6) 25 y. p. 士 I y.p.
(7) 20 y. p. $\pm$ I y.p.
(8) $9 \frac{1}{1} \mathrm{y} . \mathrm{p} . \pm \mathrm{I}$ y.p. (after deducting wear and tear allowance).
(9) 9 y.p. $\pm$ I y.p.
(10) and (Ix) 20 y. p. 士 2 y. p.
(12) $22 \mathrm{y} . \mathrm{p} . \pm 2 \mathrm{y} . \mathrm{p}$.
(13) $20 \mathrm{y} . \mathrm{p} . \pm \mathrm{Iy} . \mathrm{p}$.
(14) Interest (approx.), $12,000 \times 22$ y. p. $\pm 2$ y. p. Other profits $5 \mathrm{y} . \mathrm{p}$.
(15) 483 millions gross - employments, wear and tear, and overcharges, ror + evasion 17 (Money's method), one half at 10 y. p.
Division into public companies $\times 15 \mathrm{y}$. p. and persons and firms $\div 5 \times 15$ y. p. (Giffen's method)
(16) See chapter on "Evasion."
(17), (18), (19) Not within the income tax (see text).

## List of Valuations.

Some of the chief valuations ${ }^{1}$ that have been attempted are as follows:-


Separate valuations for England and Wales, Scotland, and Ireland have been attempted on similar lines by Giffen and others, and by E. Crammond quite re Ently. They are subject, of course, to those serious limitations and difficulties which arise through attempts to assign income to the place of its actual assessment. ${ }^{3}$
${ }^{1}$ For comparisons with Germany, vide J. Ellis Barker, Forlvighly Redice, May, 1909 ; Edgar Crammond, S. J., July, 1914.
: Giffen (Quarterly Review. July, 1909) quotes this figure, and also Mr. Lloyd George's speech re $\mathbf{E 3 . 5 0 0 , 0 0 0 , 0 0 0}$ increase since the 1894 Bodget:-" He gave my own name as the authority for the \&3,500,000,000 without indicating, however, that my estimate of an annual growth of capital amounting to $(250,000,000$ was a very old one and may no longer be correct when applied to the latest period." Such an indication was, however, hardly necessary; it was a plain inference from Giffen's estimate. This figure bas been widely quoted (Cannan, Qworterly Journal of Ecomonics, May, 1905, etc.).

- Vide p. 237, and Chapter X. generally.

Branford ${ }^{1}$ assumed $£ 270,000,000$ for Ireland in $\mathbf{1 8 0 0}$, and suggested a " plutometric unit":-


Estatr Duty Statistics: the " Multiplier."
The statistics of Probate and Succession Duties and, since the complete scheme in 1894, also of the Estate Duties are available as an alternative means of computing the national capital. Analysis of these statistics is beyond the province of this work, and the matter is considered only so far as an attempted reconciliation of results with the other method is concerned, accepting the figures at their face value.

The initial presentation of the question took the form : How often does a given estate " pass" for duty? And the answer supplied the multiplier for the property passing in any one year to furnish an estimate of the whole.

In 1869 Baxter wrote :-"' Personalty has often been estimated from the Probate Duties which are paid by property passing under wills or intestacies, amounting, in 1867, to £r,770,000, which at 2 per cent. average duty represents \& $88,000,000$ of property passing under probate in that year. Taking the Inland Revenue calculation of an average cycle of thirty years for each devolution of property, we obtain a total personalty subject to Probate Duty as $£ 2,640,000,000$." Having arrived at $£ 4,000,000,000$ as the total personalty, mainly from income tax data, he remarked that $£ 5,360,000,000$ was left "for the personalty in settlement, or below Probate Duties, or which evades them " (" The Taxation of the United Kingdom," p. 164).

The fact that the Estate Duty statistics have often appeared almost stationary has been commented upon from time to time: A stationary sum is not, however, necessarily

[^205]inconsistent with increasing national wealth, if the death rate is becoming continuously lower, for the " multiplier" is continually changing. This fact leads towards the second form of the question: For each estate passing, how many are in existence which are not passing ? It is obvious that for a satisfactory answer to this question some detailed examination of the death rate at different ages is necessary, for while at one stage, say infancy, the amount left is inconsiderable, the death rate may be comparatively high, and the number of estates not passing smaller than at another stage where, though estates are large, the death rate of that section is small.

In the American Statistical Association's reports (December, 1894) G. K. Holmes used the comparative death rate method for Massachusetts, and also accepted the French multiplier as 36 .

In 1894 Mr. W. J. Harris, in a paper on " National Wealth and Economic Policy of Great Britain and France," ${ }^{1}$ computed the multiplier at 36 , " because there was at that time no student of the subject in England, and the eminent economist in France, M. de Foville, had fixed on that rate." M. de Foville subsequently reduced it to 32 for France.

In 1896, before the R. C. on Agricultural Depression, Lord Milner proceeded on the hypothesis that the interval for succession was forty years, ${ }^{2}$ but this was rather by way of escape from the difficulty of reconciling results than from any reasoned process. About this Ime, however, Giffen had used 45, derived apparently from the death rate for persons over twenty-one years of age.

In 1899 M . Coste and M. Besson, in a detailed treatment of the subject, put the French multiplier at 33. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ At a later date, however, M. Colson used 35 for France and also applied it to English estates. ${ }^{4}$

In 1905 Sir L. Chiozza Money, in " Riches and Poverty," adopted 30 as a multiplier, but did not pursue the subject

[^206]very far. In Igo6, however, before the S. C. on Income Tax, the question was discussed at some length. ${ }^{1}$ Sir Henry Primrose considered the figure applicable to the large estates as nearer 25. Sir L. Chiozza Money again employed 30 as the " ordinary multiplier" used by statisticians, and referred to the deficient result. Dr. Bowley assumed a thirty-two years "succession interval." Sir T. A. Coghlan examined the theory of the multiplier, and suggested that, if the data existed, the value of the estates left at each age should be examined and combined on the lines of his Australian experience.

In 1906 Mr. W. J. Harris and the Rev. Kenneth A. Lake dealt in detail with the Estate Duty returns for the purpose of estimating the realisable wealth of the United Kingdom, ${ }^{2}$ and adopted 29 as the multiplier. This was obtained by comparison with M. de Foville's figure for France, 32. Sir T. Coghlan, in criticism, did not consider their data for this result sufficient, and the discussion ranged around the rival points of view-length of inheritance and death rate. It was urged that the multiplier on the death rate might even be as much as 651 Mr. Bernard Mallet touched firmer ground when he defined the problem as the average survivorship of children over parents, or the " duration of a generation."
Mr. Harris hinted at an independent method, which consisted in finding the capital value of land by the income tax assessment, and dividing the result by the average value of land passing per annum, the quotient being for Great Britain 28 and for Scotland 26. It is quite clear that in so far as the estimates from estates are to be brought into comparison with those from incomes this method is not permissible. It was subsequently defended ${ }^{2}$ on the ground that, when the multiplier was obtained for one small section of private wealth, it was reasonable to use it for other sections where the data were not on such a comparable basis. The

[^207]fallacy of taking the death rate even when restricted to persons over twenty-one was shown, and the necessity for paying regard to the death rates at particular ages at which the average value of the estates differed was also indicated.

In 1908 Mr. Bernard Mallet came really to grips with the subject. ${ }^{1}$ After briefly reviewing former work, he approached the matter along the lines indicated by Sir T. Coghlan's criticism, and, with the assistance of new classifications provided by the Estate Duty Office, applied the actual death rate in five-year age groups to the actual estates passing in 1905 and in 1906 in each group. The estates were multiplied by the ratio of living to dead, and then the sum of all the classes divided by the sum of the estates of the year. The quotient was 24.06 for 1905 and 23.78 for 1906. He defined the problem as the ascertainment of "the length of the average period during which a unit of property is held by one person," and his results were curiously confirmed by an examination of 272 " succession duty " cases, taken in chronological order, which gave 26.9 for amounts and $24^{\circ}$ for persons. There was an immediate recognition of the fact that, even if Mr. Mallet's multiplier was not right, all other previous multipliers were wrong. The trouble was, however, that it was unexpectedly low, and the resultant capital wealth for the United Kingdom was farther than ever from reconciliation with the results of Giffen's method. As Dr. Bowley remarked, they felt that somebody had robbed them of at least $£^{2}, 40,000,000$, and they were in full quest to find where it had gone. Several suggestions were forthcoming:-(I) That the new units of property or accretions continually being made do not come quickly into the multiplier, being practically a generation behind; (2) that very large sums passed inter vivos and avoided duty; (3) that estates were not valued at the full market value; (4) that the evidence of two years' estates was too narrow ; (5) that there might be a fallacy in applying the general mortality tables to the property-owning classes; (6) that the Giffen estimates were exaggerated.

[^208]Suggestion (I) did not survive examination ; (4) and (5) were held not to account for very much difference in result ; (3) was not pursued. It is obvious, however, that if we are careful to use for the factors in the tax capitalisation the same number of years' purchase for each subject as have on the average been employed for ascertaining estate values, there can be no discrepancy due to this cause, and both methods, if wrong, will be wrong to an equal extent. ${ }^{1}$ With regard to (6), Giffen defended the estimate, and called for more evidence as to the amount of property which is not in individual hands, and for the establishment of a direct multiplier by this method for one clear species of property if the statistics could be obtained.

The general estimate of the present position may be given as in the recent edition of Porter's " Progress of the Nation," ${ }^{2}$ where the discrepancy between the two capitalisations is discussed:-

[^209]comparison of the distribution of estates in France and the United Kingdom, ${ }^{1}$ using recent details given by M. J. Seailles, from which it appears that the multiplier in France is about 39 .
"Even, however, if we reduce it by 3 or 4, and take the multiplier as, say, 35, we are still faced with the enormous discrepancy between the respective multipliers for England and France, especially if we consider that both may (for the moment) be regarded as the measure of the movement of a unit of property from one person to another by reason of death. In spite of differences in institutions, in laws, and in customs, it is impossible to believe that across the Channel each franc of ' fortune 'created or inherited remains on an average in the possession of one person for thirty-five years, while on this side each pound made or inherited to form an estate passes by death from one person to another in twenty-four years. In order to explain this discrepancy, let us adopt the hypothesis that the English people have the habit of behaving in the same way as the French do, and trace the consequences . . ."

Mr. Strutt then adjusts the computation for the "dotation" custom, altering the figures by the supposed donationes inter vivos, and the multiplier comes out at 35. He concludes that in a country where no inter vivos giving is practised the multiplier is much more than is implied in the previous definition ; it is a real physical constant, but in a country like France it "ceases to represent the number of years during which a unit of property is held by one person."

It is therefore a striking corollary from Mr. Strutt's work that the leading explanation of the problem-gifts inter vivos -is no explanation at all. If they exist the total estate coming for duty is indeed lessened, but the effect disappears into the multiplier, which is increased in such a way that the total wealth by this method is unaffected. This is brought out in the paper by Mr. Mallet and Mr. Strutt in 1915 and is put to the test of exact mathematical demonstration and much elaborated. Its soundness is, however, not beyond question. It is based upon the assumption that the practice

[^210]of making gifts inter vivos proceeds indifferently among the whole of certain age groups, and that of receiving such gifts indifferently among the whole of certain lower age groups. Death takes its toll impartially in each group, and among its victims givers and receivers are found respectively in the proportion they bear to the whole groups. But in fact the death toll in any age group is taken from two sections-those who have been in failing health and almost expect the event and those who are cut off by accident, or otherwise, unexpectedly in health. Now if, as it is quite reasonable to suppose, the habit of giving inter vivos is mainly confined to those who are failing, and they give generally to those in the lower age group who are not failing, then there is a diagonal distribution, and the upper section most affected by the death rate is giving to a lower section least affected. In other words, the fundamental assumption is not absolutely sound, and more fortune is going out of the multiplier computation at one stage than is coming into it at the other. The habit of giving inter vivos designedly to avoid death duties is therefore still to be urged as one of the solutions of this vexed question. ${ }^{1}$

Another line of inquiry that has proved of value, and that had until recently hardly been touched upon, is the property upon which selltement Estate Duty has been paid. This furnishes a measure of the property which is being diverted from taking its normal place in the estates frequency, and therefore affects the multiplier. It is a matter for expert opinion as to the length of the respite it gives, and if it is sufficient to carry over two normal periods on an average its effect must be important.:

There must be a full deduction from the income capitalisation on account of all income which is taxable but not specifically assignable to individuals (although it attaches to them), as in the case of the discrepancy between aggregated assessments and the aggregate of individual income returns. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ In purchase value the ready, full dividend may

> IVide discussion on the paper before the Royal Statistical Society, S. J. July, 1915.
-Vide paper by Messra. Mallet and Strutt, S. J. July, 1915.

- Vide p. 337.
be more highly esteemed than the dividend which is as great actually, but part of which is reserved and used as an invested protective covering. For example :-A profit of $£ 100$ is made and distributed. It will sell, say, for $£ 1,000$, or ten years' purchase. If this factor is used alike for computing the Estate Duty value and also for capitalising the income tax assessment on $£ 100$, the results of the methods agree. But suppose $£ 20$ is reserved and $£ 80$ distributed ; the value of the $£ 80$ may not be $£ 800$ only, because of the reserve " backing," and it may not rise to the full $£ 1,000$ value, but it may sell for $£ 960$, or twelve years' purchase. Then the utmost that comes into Estate Duty figures is $£ 960$, but if a like factor is taken for the tax assessment it will give $£ 1,200$. Although it was all rightly regarded as profit, it has not been all assigned as income, and one must beware of assigning the dividend valuation to the whole income tax profit.

Then, again, corporate income must be liberally allowed for from the Corporation Duty returns and in other vays, and proper allowance should be made for the capital exhaustions not regarded in the assessments. ${ }^{1}$ It is not within the scope of this book to examine the possibilities of the Estate Duty valuations, but it is quite certain that the whole matter is not yet at a deadlock. ${ }^{2}$

[^211]
## CHAPTER XII.

## The " National Income."

It is outside the scope of this work to consider the meaning and true significance of the term "income," and still less to define " national income." The widest possible differences are found in economic conceptions in this respect. Professor Marshall calls the national income or dividend " the net sum total of things and services produced," ${ }^{1}$ and he also defines " social income." "Social income may be estimated by adding together the incomes of the individuals in the society in question, whether a nation or any other larger or smaller group of persons. But to reckon it directly is for most purposes simplest and best. Everything that is produced in the course of a year, every service rendered, every fresh utility brought about, is part of the national income. Thus, it includes the benefit derived from the advice of a physician. the pleasure got from hearing a professional singer." Obviously, no known money or statistical measure can really give all this; only things which are exchanged, not merely produced, count. We omit the immense productive services of wives in household duties, of amateur gardeners, of all who spend any effort, outside their main business of moneyincome or earning, in performing services or making things. If I get the services of a shoeblack, I add twopence to the national income, but if I black my own shoes and he gives me some tangible article or service, the money measure is the same as before, but the national wealth is greater. We are often told we must not reckon things twice, and this warning certainly covers all payments made to earn and keep income intact. If a man pays a housekeeper fr a week for her services out of his income of $f 200$ a year, they figure together in the national income at $£ 252$, but if he marries

[^212]
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her and continues bis payment of $£ \mathrm{I}$ the national income shrinks by $£ 52$. It is imperative that this limitation of the income tax statistics as a representation of the " national dividend " be borne in mind.

The general and prevalent conception of income is that which is very closely measured by our statistics, viz., the products and services that are actually exchanged for money between individuals; it excludes the home services just as rigidly as it excludes "consumer's rent." A "consumer's rent" may be a very real conception for any one item of a man's expenditure, but it disappears when aggregated, and there is no such thing as an effective "consumer's rent" upon the expenditure of one's whole income.

A narrower conception limits the " income" to material production, and the sum of added values, which is very much the idea involved in the Census of Production term, " net output." A still narrower connotation treats it as produced not for man, but by man, so that true "income" is only to be found after deducting the income consumer's subsistences of various kinds. ${ }^{1}$ This conception is very difficult to utilise and has little practical value.

Others, for particular purposes, like to consider only "home produced income," on which labour in the country itself has been expended, the receipts from abroad for interest, etc., being eliminated.

When all the different conceptions have been studied, we come back to the fact that the sum $t$ thal of wages, salaries, profits, and interest presents a fairly comprehensible idea, free from important ambiguities, for ordinary comparative purposes.

Dr. Bowley has remarked that "it is doubtful whether a perfectly definite meaning can be attached to total national income; . . . the total is more correctly a total estimated value of services rendered to, or commodities consumed by, the members of the nation, together with the addition for savings. . . . In such a total are included the services of an agricultural labourer at $\mathfrak{£ 3}$ per month, and of a physician at

[^213]the same price for a short visit, the value of a day's sojourn at an hotel, an equal value of sixty quartern loaves of bread, or eighty ounces of tobacco. It is doubtful whether the same unit, $\notin$ r sterling, can in any real sense be used to measure such diverse and non-interchangeable services and commodities. ${ }^{1}$

Sir L. Chiozza Money criticises this " confusion of thought" on the ground that it denies the function of money as a standard of value, ${ }^{2}$ whereas money is daily used to measure diverse commodities. These are the values which in fact are measured by promiscuous exchange, and therefore it appears to be idle to talk of them as not " real," or as theoretical. But Sir L. Chiozza Money's criticism, though forceful and pertinent to a certain point, perhaps misses the subtlety of Dr. Bowley's statement.

The aggregate value of these products and services is only an aggregate of them in their existing relationships. These components have not an unchangeable value inherent in them, so that they will always total to the same amount however they may be arranged. Every value is merely a point of equilibrium, and if all the factors are rearranged the points of equilibrium may be totally different. If rich people took to eating ten times as much bread and the poor to eating none at all, if physicians were never wanted save by the poorest classes, if tobacco were only smoked by millionaires, the total of the services rendered might be quite changed. The fact of it is these services are not exchanged against each other freely-they move in cliques or layers and never meet for comparison. The marginal significanceof $£$ I to a rich man is different from what it is to a poor man; therefore it is fallacious to say that a service that is vondered only to rich men is equal to and exchangeable for a service that is rondered only to poor mon, simply because each costs EI in money.

So Sir L. Chiozza Money, in his exposition of Dr. Bowley's fallacies, rather misses the point when he says: "We all of us receive our incomes in diverse commodities, but all those

[^214]
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commodities are interchangeable." The answer is that they are not interchanged. When he suggests that we "can elect to transmute our incomes " indifferently into all the forms of wealth, goods and services, the answer is, "We don't."

The real significance of this appears if an aggregate value of services under present distribution is assumed to remain the same aggregate when quite differently distributed. Sir L. Chiozza Money has complete faith in the indestructibility of this aggregate. The existing total is often socialistically re-divided amongst the population per head with great assurance. But it is rather like saying that the same number of bricks must always make a building of the same cubic space.

Sir L. Chiozza Money elects to prove his point by the example of old age pensions: $£ 12,000,000$ is transferred from the well-to-do to the necessitous-" a part of the national dividend in goods and services has changed, while its expression in money has remained the same." Of course, because the measure of the transfer is in money, and each buys the services it wants to that value. But are the services equal ? Suppose the transfer is not made in money, but the well-to-do sacrifice a number of doctors' visits which they value at this sum, and the poor receive these doctors' visits, which they value at a far less sum: the services (and dividend) remain the same. One really masks the true position by varying the services.
Giffen deals with socialistic divifons of the "income assessed to tax." "What is perhaps still more important, the classes engaged in this highly paid production very largely exchange among themselves." The income is not counted twice, but what we get is "merely the addition of the sums at which the different classes of the community exchange their services with each other": there is no general fund of production which can be divided; "it pleases those concerned to count them for so much." ${ }^{1}$ Sir L. Chiozza Money remarks:-" It is sometimes argued that if the national dividend were better distributed part of it would disappear, since it consists of the valuation of

[^215]services rendered to the well-to-do. This is another form of the fallacy which was entertained by Mr. Bowley."

It is obvious that if a ring of people like to call their services any given " value," there is no real obstacle. A., the great surgeon, performs an operation for B., the prima donna: B. goes to sing at a social function for C ., the leading barrister ; C. takes a brief for A. in a lawsuit. Each one is in the habit of selling the particular service to the community at froo, but on this occasion each sends in a bill for $£ 1,000$, which is paid, and up goes the national income by $£ 2,700$ above its true figure upon any reasonable exchange basis.

Sir L. Chiozza Money's exposition of the "fallacy" is on these lines :-A rich man may be a malade imaginaire, and pay high fees to a physician for doing nothing. If, however, the rich man had not drawn income in fractions from a number of poorer men, those poorer men would have had a larger purchasing power corresponding to the purchasing power wasted by the rich man; this they might equally have wasted. This ignores the vital point that exchanges are going on between people upon one plane for services at a valuation belonging to that plane and never brought into comparison with values on a lower plane. If there wese equal redistribution, that plane of values would not exist. Professor Pigou considers that estimates of money income tend to exaggerate the higher ones. ${ }^{1}$
W. H. Mallock and others make a deduction from the assessed income for "fancy values" of this character. Probably the change concerns commodities only to a very small extent and parsonal services to a much larger extent. But it is difficult to see at what point this process should stop, since values are dependent on the means of the "rings" that exchange them, right down the scale. It is true that some services must always be worth more to the community than others, and they will settle their own relative values. If, however, we had a redistribution of existing capital wealth, socialistically, many services would alter in value; no physician would get differential fees for identical services.

[^216]But it is a mistake to suppose that the only change would be a reduction of certain values and therefore a reduction in the aggregate. Certain services would rise in value because of the wider effective demand. No one can say what the new equilibrium would be-it is an insoluble problem, because only " broken arcs" of the demand and supply curves are known to us.
It is, however, as well to remember that we cannot divide up the aggregate and rearrange it to the same total, like a box of bricks. It is rather more like the cells of an organism. At the same time it is clearly possible to exaggerate the importance of this point, ${ }^{1}$ and the figures we have are sufficiently stable and homogeneous in component exchange values for all ordinary purposes.
It may be well, nevertheless, to touch upon one or two peculiarities of our current conception.
(I) Houses are commonly rented by us, and even when not rented their value is expressed by "rentals." Therefore it is instinctive to us to regard a residence occupied by its owner as a part of his income. Every one must have a residence, and A., with $£ 400$ a year salary and his house £40, keeps $£ 400$ intact, whereas B., who pays a rent, has only £ 360 to start in the same position as A. ; it is only consistent to regard A.'s income as larger. But one has only to read current American literature upon taxation to see that it is by no means selfevident. Where houses are not so commonly rented but are generally owned the outlook is different-even ideas of valuation do not proceed primarily upon a capitalisation of rentals. "It is safe to say that not I per cent. of the assessing officials is familiar with the concept that capital value depends upon annual value. There is practically no tenant class in the United States." ${ }^{2}$ We do not regard the "annual value" of our furniture as part of our incomes, but if it were a general custom to hire

[^217]furniture by the year and a few people owned their furniture we should probably look at the matter differently and wish to take into account the value of it in their taxpaying capacity. If A. at Reading lets his furnished house to B. from Brighton, and takes a furnished house from C. at Torquay, who in turn lives in B.'s house, the real position is not changed, and yet the taxed "incomes" go up by the three rentals of furniture 1 Houses, park lands, etc., are the one form of enjoyment income (from things owned) that enters into our income conception, as statiatically expressed.
(2) It is often said that when a rich man with $£ 20,000$ a year employs a secretary at $£ 500$, and the secretary employs a gardener at $£ 50$, it is fallacious to reckon the aggregate income at $£ 20,550$. If the $£ 500$ is disbursed in spending the income, and not in order to get it, and if the $\mathcal{f} 50$ is one way of spending or enjoying the income of $£ 500$ and it is not impossible to get the $\{500$ without spending it, then in neither sase should a deduction be made. The only true case for a jeduction is when the disbursement is made to secure getting the income. In this instance the services of all three exist and are measured in money terms at these values. ${ }^{1}$ One might as reasonably urge that there is only one Japanese box because all the smaller ones fit inside it, one within the other.
(3) The line between income and capital is often not very distinct. The tax statistics measure " annual profits and gains," and although one transaction or two or three may not give an income, but only an isolated or capital gain, it is merely a question of degree as to when "income " arises. A stamp dealer gets an income for performing services as a distributor, which appeal to a certain section and which they pay for: but the vendor of a single stamp makes a " profit " which is hardly for "services " in the same sense. It is fortunate that the distinction does roughly correspond with what the community regards as "services "in a national agsregate.
(4) The aggregation of individual incomes has no reference to "family " incomes, but it treats the income of husband
$$
\text { 1 Money. "The Nation's Wealth " p. } 120
$$
and wife as one, except where personal labour is involved. A teacher with $£ 150$ per annum whose wife receives rents of $£ 150$ per annum is included as $£ 300$ in all, but if his wife had $£^{150}$ from teaching they are both in the " exempt" class. It was stated in Parliament in 1908 that to allow the separate property of married women would involve a loss of $£ 1,500,000$ in duty. ${ }^{1}$

## " Taxable Income."

The figure that is required perhaps more often than any other for general comparative purposes is the true taxable income of liable persons, i.e., the sum reviewed for tax purposes, deducting all sums not belonging to persons with incomes over the exemption limit, and also all the proper expenses of "gross" income, but before deducting the allowances which are merely taxing devices.? The official tables have of late years been adapted to exhibit this important figure, but for the provious sixty years of the tax it cannot be obtained by inspection, and can be doduced only by eareful research. Table G4 is designed to give a true comparison from 1842, linking up with the present official figures.

When the true taxable income has been obtained it is still necessary for many purposes to make deductions for income not distributable to individuals (as distinct from income not distributed to individuals).

Sir Henry Primrose dealt with the question on these iines:-
" $£ 728,000,000$ is the aggregate disclosed. . . . The whole of that is by $n 0$ means income enjoyed by individuals, which is what really concerns the Committee at the present time; you have to make rather large abatements for certain things. For instance, there is a large amount of income that is never distributed to individuals. Obviously, the very first thing is the income from the (a) investments of mutual life and fire insurance companies, with their reserve funds. That is somewhere about $£ 10,000,000$ or $£ 12,000,000$ a year. Then there are (b) all the reserve funds of companies which are put aside in order to equalise dividends. Then there is (c) the income of municipal property, (d) the income of

[^218]Chancery funds, ( 0 ) of trust funds, ( $f$ ) funds set aside to accumulate pending some contingency and so on, (g) the property of clubs, ( $h$ ) institutions, ( $i$ ) co-operative societies, and there is (j) the amount of income that is paid away to foreigners, because that would not come in. Taking all those things together and adding also-which I think we should have to do for this particular purpose- ( $k$ ) the annual value (which we can tax, but which is not money) of freehold property in the occupation of the occupier which would probably not be treated as entering into the income on which the graduated rate would have to be paid . . . you get to at least $£ 50,000,000$. . . . That leaves us $£ 678,000,000$ as the income of individuals " (Q. 65, S. C. on Income Tax, rgo6).

This was obviously a stringent elimination directed provisionally towards a certain object, and even for this object it did not receive universal acceptance. It is clearly not a sacrosanct estimate of non-personal income for all purposes, though the tendency is so to regard it.

Even for the purpose to which it was directed, in the event it proved that $(k)$, the annual values of residences, were not excluded from the tax. This item alone is a considerable part of the whole. Then (b), the reserves, which ax hypothesi emerge later as dividends and are only temporarily held up, are strictly personal income, even on an individual basis. ${ }^{1}$ Clearly, too, (d), (c), and ( $)$ are only " in the reservoir," so to speak, and if income is continually going in so also it is continually emerging to individuals; the only real sum to be deducted is the net increase in the sums held up. When the income of a class as a whole is under consideration it is hardly necessary to exclude (a), the investments of mutual life and fire insurance companies, the collective investment being a substantial addition to their wealth. It has been observed elsewhere ${ }^{\text {a }}$ that, although the bonuses and other payments to insured persons in excess of their actuarial death risk have not by law to be included in individual income statements, they are nevertheless a return of taxed interest, accumulated, and paid out in lump sums ; and, except for a particular tax system, it is economically unsound to regard them as

[^219]" non-personal." The income of municipal property which remains in municipal ownership and is not used as a set-off against liability upon interest paid to individuals and insurance companies is very small in relation to the whole. ${ }^{1}$

The income under ( $g$ ) and ( $h$ ), though belonging to a class, can hardly be regarded as personal. It must be remembered, however, that many so-called "clubs" have shareholding companies behind them, so that taxed income frequently emerges to individual use, while many institutions of a semiphilanthropic type or for the advancement of learning, etc., are exempted from tax, so that no great body of non-personal income remains to be deducted. The operations of industrial co-operative societies " except under Sch. A in respect of lands and buildings owned by the societies . . . do not result in the payment of any considerable amount of income tax into the Exchequer." ${ }^{2}$ The income from abroad paid to persons not resident in the United Kingdom should be deducted (under $£ 2,000,000$ ), and for some purposes the income produced here but paid to persons abroad may also be a proper deduction. We have little guide to the latter figure, but in the Financial Relations Returns the duty is officially estimated at $£ 369,000$ for Schs. C and D, equal to about $£ 6,500,000$ income, and $£ 127,000$ for Sch. E, largely for army and navy officers abroad, equal to another $\boldsymbol{f}^{2,000,000}{ }^{2}$

It will be seen, therefore, that the sum deductible as "non-personal" depends upon the particular use for which the figures are destined; for "class" comparisons, or " national income" statements, it should be very small, but for inquiries into distribution in comparison with super-tax and abatement returns it may quite reasonably be larger. But the deductions given in Chapter VIII. for losses and other reasons should be made, of the order of $\{30,000,000$, for practically all purposes, and when an addition is made for

[^220]evasion the net deduction from the " taxable income" is small enough to be almost negligible.

The lead given by Sir H. Primrose is followed by Sir T. Whittaker, ${ }^{1}$ who sets the deductions off against evasions, and is "disposed to think they do about balance." He deducts " local authorities" evidently under a misapprehension, for the profits and interest included under this head are distributed for the most part, like those of companies, and there is only a small proportion of property which is really deductible. Actually he adds $£ 2,000,000$ as a net difference on 1907 figures. He criticises W. H. Mallock and Sir L. Chiozza Money and takes a mid point. The former cuts the total down by "renewals" on a false basis, which is clearly indicated, ${ }^{2}$ and the latter expands it by adding £85,000,000 for evasions and not subtracting over-assessments, depreciation, capital exhaustion, charities, etc. There is little doubt Sir T. Whittaker's method is very close to the truth.

Dr. Bowley has continued the deduction of $£ 50,000,000$ recently ${ }^{\text {a }}$ in connection with the problem of distribution, where it is of course necessary to make a full allowance. Messrs. Mallet and Strutt ${ }^{4}$ deduct $£ 60,000,000$ for 1913 for "impersonal income" when contrasting unearned income with capital wealth estimated from estate duty-a very legitimate case if the two figures are to be strictly comparable. The amount is intended to cover investments of insurance companies; a proportion of companies' reserve funds; municipal profits, such as those of waterworks, gas and electric light works, and tramways; the annual value of parochial and municipal buildings: Crown lands let to tenants; the investments and property of co-operative societies, clubs, monasteries, etc. In view of what has already been said as to some of these items, the allowance made, even for this purpose, errs, in my judgment, on the side of liberality.
"Home-produced" income. -Sir Thomas Whittaker

[^221]deducts $£ 240,000,000$ for 1907 from $£ 2,040,000,000$, making fr, $^{1} 000,000,000$ " home-produced ' ' W. H. Mallock deducts $\mathrm{fl}_{180,000,000}$ for 1910, as a net sum.

It is obvious that where these deductions are made nothing should be subtracted from taxable income in respect of income paid to foreigners, unless the object of inquiry is home-produced income retained at home.
> " The better method is to exclude income drawn from without when we are thinking of the productivity of a country. . . . On the other hand, if we are considering the number of personal incomes of various amounts, we ought to include income from abroad and exclude income paid to non-residents, even though taxed in this country. I am not aware of any estimates as to the amount which should thus be excluded."-Dr. Bowley, " The Measurement of Social Phenomena," p. 202.

Persons not resident in the United Kingdom are strictly speaking liable on all income arising here. Under the original practice from 1842 any who claimed exemption (and later abatement) in respect of such income were required to declare their total income from every source, and the granting of relief was dependent on the amount of such total income being within the statutory limit. In 1866 this practice was altered in consequence of an opinion of the Law Officers, and foreign residents were not required to include foreign income in their claims. It was thus possible for a millionaire to claim exemption on a small British dividend. This grant of exemption $m$ abatement by reason of smallness of income was abolished in r9ro, following a recommendation by the D. C. on Income Tax, 1905. There are certain exceptions in favour of Crown servants, missionaries and others, who may claim upon a statement of total incomes. ${ }^{1}$

The following very useful summary is quoted, with some additions, from Sir Thomas Whittaker's "Taxation and Ownership of Property " down to 1907 inclusive. It requires the warning that the " exemption limit" has varied, so that the figures down columns 3 and 4 respectively are not comparable throughout, and this has been added to the table.

[^222]
## Estimates of the National Income.



- Exemption limit $415 a$

Examption limit $/$ roo
Exemption limit Zx60.
\& Revised estimate in 1913 before Report of Census of Production was publishod.
$甘$ Including (32,000,000 income of Charities, Friendly Societies, and Local Authorities, which is excluded from the sub-divisions into which the total income is afterwards divided.

It is not within the scope of this book to discuss the methods of estimating the income of the classes below the income tax line, and readers are referred to the considerable literature upon this special subject.
A comman rule-of-thumb method for estimating the
total income has been to double the income tax assessments. It is usually attributed to Baxter, ${ }^{1}$ but was actually in use much earlier. In 1852 Farr assumed that " all the other people possess at least as much more income ; and allowing for Ireland, and deducting for the interest of the National Debt, the income of the United Kingdom must be about $£ 440,000,000$, possessed by a population of $27 \frac{1}{2}$ millions . . . if we capitalise at twenty-two and twenty-three years' purchase, it will make $£ 10,000,000,000$." (He estimated Ireland at $£ 40,000,000$ income, without detailed data. ${ }^{2}$ ) The rule has been applied by most writers without regard to the exemption limit changes from $£ 150$ to $£ 100$, back to $£ 150$, and then to $£ 160$.

## Tests of Prosperity.

(1) Wage Comparisons.-Dr. Bowley uses the gross income figures (taxed and untaxed) for a comparison of its movement with that of wages (basing the latter by index numbers upon Dr. Giffen's figures for 1886) with a logarithmic graph; and then corrects for the change in money values by using Sauerbeck's index numbers, showing in the result that between 1860 and 1891 average wages have nearly doubled and average income has more than doubled, the actual difference not being very great ("Changes in Wages in the United Kingdom between 1860-1891').
G. Yale reproduces Dr. Bowley's index number (from Economic Journal, 1904), uncorrected, and also corrected by Sauerbeck, as test of prosperity, and to give the influence of economic factors ("Changes in Marriage and Birth Rates during the Past Halfcentury," S. J., 1906, p. 104)-
(2) Use of "Eational Income" to Letermine " Savings,"" Members of the Government in recent speeches have placed the figure of annual savings of people in the United Kingdom at from 350 to 400 millions.
" I believe that these figures are obtained by first taking the aggregate of all money incomes of all individuals, now estimated to add up to $£ 2,000,000,000$, and then deducting from this the total estimated value of annual consumption of commodities in this kingdom, whether produced at home or imported. The difference between these two figares is erroneously, in my opinion, supposed to be the amount of annual saving.
"The fallacy in this is that the two figures are not in pari ${ }^{2}$ Eg., Gifien, " Economic Inquiries," II., p. 362. ${ }^{2}$ S. C. on Income Tax, 1852, ©s. 4,940, 4.952.
materia. The aggregate of individual incomes is not the national income for the year, but the annual national income is something very much smaller. This is because in the aggregate of individual money incomes the same real incomes are counted again and again os they circulat: from hand to hand within the year. On the principle which I am criticising, viz., the addition of all individual incomes to find the national income, it would follow that the larger the interest on the National Debt the larger was the national income, which is absurd.
"The real national income-that annual flood of consumable commodities on and by which we all subsist-is much more near to be measured by the money value of goods produced and consumed within the kingdom plus the goods imported for consumption, which figure is immensely less than $£ 2,200,000,000$.
"Therefore, the amount of annual national savings has been very seriously over-estimated " (letter in the Economist, July 15. 1915).

This method would be roundabout, and certainly risky, because of the difficulty of determining the value of capital goods as distinguished from consumption goods produced in a year. Direct methods of estimating savings from the increase in new buildings and from public subscriptions are much more reliable than the difference between two totals, both large in relation to that difference.

## CIIAPTER XIII.

## The Distribution of Income and the Number of Taxpayers.

The distribution of income is one of the most difficult but interesting practical problems for which the official statistics are utilised, and a great deal of work has been done to establish the number of taxpayers in different classes, or the changes in distribution, from time to time. The earliest income tax was assessed upon individual incomes as a whole, and, though inefficient as a taxing machine, yielded statistics which, so far as they were adequate, were thrown into an ideal form for this purpose (vide Appendix IV.). Since 1802 we have possessed no official statistics presented in this way until the super-tax, similarly assessed on the aggregate income of each person liable, gave details for incomes over $£ 5,000$ in 1911-12. ${ }^{2}$ For in 1803 the "schedule" system was introduced, and the only tables then published bearing upon this problem were classifications of the separate assessments under Sch. D up to 1815. After the re-introduction of the tax in 1842 these classification tables were rendered annually in one form or another. ${ }^{2}$
In his "Thoughts on the Principles of Taxation with Reference to a Property Tax " ( $\mathbf{1 8 4 8}$ ) Babbage deplored the absence of any criterion of distribution, and used Board of Trade figures, which showed the numbers of persons receiving incomes from funded property. He took a statement of the dividends of various amounts paid to 265,218 persons (arranged cumulatively) and divided a million "voters" in the same proportions, from which he concluded that 850,000 voters had incomes of less than $\mathrm{Er50}$ per annum. He
${ }^{1}$ Vide p. $33^{8}$.
2 Vide p. 238. In 1852 it was oficially stated to be impossible to give the number of tarpayers meder all schedules (S, C. on Income Tax, $\& 5,136)$.
remarked naively :-" I am by no means disposed to accept this as the real law, or even as any very near approximation to it. I have employed the only data at present known."
In evidence before the S. C. on Income Tax, 1852, William Farr made a computation based upon the r8or statistics, ${ }^{1}$ accepted as adequate although the 1803 system was so much more productive. The average income for all taxpayers over ${ } \mathrm{E} 50$ was ${ }^{6} 55 \mathrm{I}$ from that table, and he assumed that the same average was applicable to 1848 ; then dividing the total income assessed by that average he found 340,773 taxpayers "over $£ \times 50$. " " His diagrammatic presentation of the grades was an interesting anticipation of Pareto's law. ${ }^{\mathbf{3}}$ If this method were continued forward to 1868 , the number at that date would be about 460,000 . In accepting such results we have to consider :-(I) the doubtful reliability of the I80x figures even in 180r, and the possibility of general under-statement of income; an examination of the remarkable differences in the original gradation from $£ 150$ to $£ 200$ does not inspire confidence, and since all except the poorest were taxed, it was not so much a question of omission of taxpayers as of under-statement of taxable income. Correct assessment of the smaller simple incomes was easier than any check upon the larger incomes derived from various sources, and the incentive to evasion was probably less. It is likely, therefore, that the greater part of the under-assessment was in the upper classes, and yet at the same time there was an wndus accumulation of the taxpayers just above the $£ \times 50$ line, pointing to the fact that, so far from correct returns bringing a number of payers from below, this was probably an artificial or common assessment to which many were not really liable. We should have, in that way, a taxable income incraased by perhaps 20 per cent., with no corresponding increase in the payers. On such a reckoning the 1848 number would have been 292,000 only. (2) The assumption that the ceverage held good fifty years after.

[^223]Writing in 1857 on " The Pay of Ministers of the Crown," ${ }^{1}$ Farr estimated that there were 4,000 persons with incomes over $£ 5,000$, including 192 in Ireland. This also was based on the 180 figures.

In 1868 Mr. Dudley Baxter (" National Income," Chap. III.) made an examination of the available income tax statistics for $1865-6$ to ascertain the total income of persons with incomes over $£ 100$ per annum (the exemption limit at that time), the number of taxpayers, and their average income. He relied largely upon the classification of Sch. D assessments, and, although he stated (p. 30) that "the average income of each person in the United Kingdom who paid duty under Sch. D in 1855 was $£ 288$; in 1864 . . . it had risen to $£ 314$," the context shows that he was fully aware that these were only average assessments, and were not necessarily the average Sch. D income for each person coming under that schedule (some of them being assessed for several separate sources), and still less the average" income" of those persons. After obtaining a gross sum by additions for evasion, etc., he assumed that the proportion in the several stages of the classification for Sch. D would obtain also for the aggregate of all the schedules, as follows:-

| Incomes | Assesements. | Amount. | Number of Aseessments. Eagland and Wales. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| £5,000 and upwards | 8,500 | $\stackrel{f}{126,157}$ | 7.500 |
| f1,000 to $£ 5,000$. | 48,800 | 83,324 | 42,000 |
| ¢ 3000 to $\mathrm{E} 1,000$. | 178,300 | 87,723 | 150,000 |
| fi00 to $\mathfrak{E 3 0 0}$. | 1,026,400 | 110,950 | 850,500 |
| Total | 1,262,000 | 408,154 | 1,050,000 |

He pointed out the disturbing element, viz, the presence in the incomes above 65,000 of 400 companies with
$£ 30,000,000$ income, and " if distributed to the individuals to which they belong a considerable number of persons would be raised out of each class into the next above, so that the $£ 5,000$ class would be enlarged in numbers more than suffcient to compensate for the loss of the assessments of companics. Partnerships, on the contrary, raise incomes into higher classes than the individual partners would reach." So far as England and Wales are concerned, he regarded the general correctness of his results as confirmed by a return of houses assessed to House Duty in 186I-2,1 summarised as follows :-

| £200 (and upwards) rental | 9,800 |
| :---: | :---: |
| ¢100 to $\mathrm{E}^{200}$ | 32,800 |
| ¢50 to $£$ 100 . | 102,000 |
| $£^{20}$ to ${ }_{5} 50$ | 375,400 |
| ¢ 10 to $£ 20$ | 590,000 |
| Total |  |

The total was obtained by deducting from the total number of $£$ ro houses in boroughs and counties in the electoral returns of 1866 ( $x, 300,000$ ), 50,000 for difference between rating and rental in the counties, and 140,000 occupied by the manual labour class, leaving $1,110,000$ for occupation by upper and middle classes. The $£ 10$ to $£ 20$ class is therefore the balance unaccounted for. He considered that the 9,800 houses confirmed the 7.500 large incomes; "the 32,800 houses from $£ 100$ to $£ 200$ rent appear to tally with the $\mathbf{4 2 , 0 0 0}$ incomes from $£ 1,000$ to $£ 5,000$ and with the smaller houses occupied by the highest class." In the incomes below Ex,000 the number of lodgers, ladies, and inmates of family houses increases rapidly, so that the proportions of the houses below froo-viz., 102,000, 375,000 and 590,000appear to confirm the number of incomes below $£ 5,000-$ vix., $150,000,850,000$, and $1,000,000$.
It will be seen that the chief weaknesses of this very broad treatment of the subject are: (I) the omission to ascertain or estimate the number of houses under $£ 10$ rental

$$
\text { IH. C. } 428-1 \mathrm{SO}_{3} .
$$

in order to see whether they corresponded with the estimate of the manual labour class and verified the assumed correspondence between the $£$ roo exemption limit and $£$ Io rental ; and (2) the rather easy transference from "assessments" (arrived at upon a very doubtful basis) to actual " incomes."

He dealt separately with the number of taxpayers in an appendix, " the substance of which was communicated by Mr. Gripper, of the Inland Revenue, the highest authority in all statistics of that department." As this has been of some importance in subsequent literature, it is quoted here :-

## " Number and Average Income of Income Tax Payers (England and Wales).

" In calculating the number of income tax payers, it is necessary to remember that those who appear as paying on less than $£$ roo a year have other income for which they appear in other schedules; and that only one of these appearances ought to be taken into account.
"The information respecting the numbers charged is not given in all the Annual Reports, and the proportions must be taken from different years.
"Sch. B is given for 1858-9 in the Commons return, 300, $\mathbf{1 8 6 0}$. The income charged to duty was $£ 26,000,000$; and the persons charged on incomes above $£$ roo was 54,000 ; below $£ 100,207,000$.
" Sch. C was found to be paid in 1850 on $£ 27,000,000$ by 204,000 persons. But examination of 21,000 accounts in Consols showed that only one-fourth were above $£ 100$ a year. Assuming this proportion for the rest-
"Sch. E in 1864 was charged on $£ 17,487,000$, paid $1 / y 97,000$ persons, of whom 67,000 had more than $£ 100$ a year.
"Sch. D in 1864 was charged on $£ 95,600,000$ and paid by 297,000 persons, of whom 246,000 had above $f 100$ a year.
"Sch. A is paid in the first instance by the occupiers, and no means exist of ascertaining the actual number of owners who ultimately bear it. The income charged in 1864 was $£ 125,000,000$, and this on the same scale of individual income as Sch. D would be paid by 379,000 persons, of whom 314,000 would have $£ 100$ a year.
"The total income for these schedules and years was $£ 292,000,000$; and the payers with more than $£ 100$ a year were 731,000.
"The number of payers under $£$ roo a year was 504,000 , of whom one-third at least appear also among the first 731,000, and
half the remainder, or one-third of the whole ( 169,000 ), will be the net number to be added.
" Hence the total number of taxpayers for the $£ 292,000,000$ will be 900,000 , giving an income of $£ 323$ each, being nearly the same as the average for Sch. D.
"But, in consequence of the number of English companies, I have taken the average for England and Wales at only $£ 306$.
" In the net number so obtained there will be, besides those just mentioned, a large number of persons who appear twice or oftener, such as merchants and professional men assessed under Sch. D, who also pay more than $£ 100$ under Sch. A as landed proprietors or owners of houses; or under Sch. B on a farm; or under Sch. C as fundholders in British or colonial stocks. It is roughly estimated that these duplicate and triplicate appearances balance the number who are omitted through their assessments being made upon their partnership."

In his Report on "Wages and Earnings of the Working Classes " (1885) Professor Leone Levi comments on this as follows :-

[^224]And again:-
" Mr. Gripper . . . arrived at the conclusion that the number of persons charged under Sch. D being then 297,000, the total number of income tax payers could be taken at 900,000 , or three times as many. Adopting this method we come to the conclusion that the 110,000 persons charged with income tax under Sch. D in 1850-1 with incomes of 1150 and upwards would represent 330,000 as the entire number of income tax payers; and that the 353.000 similarly charged in $\mathbf{1 8 7 9 - 8 0}$ under Sch. D would represent $1,059,000$ as the whole number of income tax payers " (p. 54).

One more progressive stage in the history of this legend may be given. Mr. W. H. Mallock ${ }^{2}$ remarks :-

[^225]Professor Leone Levi, about thirty years ago, to a statement by Mr. Gripper in $\mathbf{1} 866$ to the effect that the total number of individuals paying tax at that time, so far as the department could ascertain, was as a matter of fact about three times the number of assessments of ' persons ' made under Sch. D. If we suppose that the same proportion has been maintained. . . . But owing to changes in the classification of incomes, . . . the total number must during recent years be considerably more than three times the number of separate assessments Sch. D under the heading of ' persons.' "

I have italicised some of the more significant improvements. The tendency to stress departmental authority is marked. Mr. Gripper, who seems to have had access to very little more in the way of statistics than what was then public property, apparently gave Mr. Baxter, in an unofficial way, a tentative basis of computation which, as a guess, was as likely to be right as any other, but not much more likely. The remark that, on the same scale as Sch. D, Sch. A would be paid by 379,000 persons becomes, with Professor Levi, " may be taken to be divided in the same proportion." The note does not comment upon the chance numerical relationship " three times," but this is put into the reference by Professor Levi and embellished by Mr. Mallock regardless of the changes in the relative importance of the schedules, and also of the fact that while Mr. Baxter dealt with the incomes above $£$ roo, Professor Levi referred to those above $£ 150$, and Mr. Mallock to those above $£ 160$. Moreover, while in the original note the total happened to be three times the total Sch. D assessments, Professor Levi applied the factor to the number of assessments exceeding £r50 only. Both have ignored the fact that Baxter's computation was for England and Wales only, and also that Sch. D assessments have since included all the concerns under Sch. A, No. III. ${ }^{1}$ Other considerations affecting the application of an old factor to recent years are given elsewhere. ${ }^{2}$

Professor Levi set out to compare the numbers in 1850-I with those in 1879-80 and 1882-3. Incidentally (p. 6) he

[^226]compares, in tabular form, the gross taxed income in 1866-7 and in 1882-3 with the percentage relationship to the total income of all persons, but he ignores the exemption limit change ( $£ 150$ from $£ 100$ ). Then (on p. 48) he institutes a comparison between the classification of Sch. D assessments 1850-1 with that for 1879-80 (referring to the important differences, in the omission of companies, in the latter). The ordinary classification for 1879-80 published officially would have been of little value because it was one of net assessments, but he was specially furnished by the Inland Revenue Department with a classification of gross assessments similar to $1850-\mathrm{I}$ and to the present time-a return which is valuable for reference. The percentage borne by each class to the total number and total amount is given with a result which may be summarised as follows :-

|  | 1850-8. |  | 1879-8a |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Por Cent. of Number. | Per Cent. If Amount | Per Cent. of Number. | Per Cent. of Amount |
| Incomes fi50 to f500. | 8r.67 | 38.8 | 85.89 | 4375 |
| *) f 500 to $[3,000$ | 16.58 | 327 | 12-68 | 27.67 |
| " above $\{3,000$. | 1-75 | 28-5 | 1.43 | 28-58 |

The inclusion of companies in 1850-1 must necessarily have affected the relative distribution, particularly in amownts: the $1850-1$ average was $£ 470$, against $£ 424$ in 1880, but it hardly indicated "greater diffuseness of incomes" (p. 49) uniess this factor is taken into account. On the basis of Mr. Gripper's information, referred to above, he then finds the number of taxpayers for eech class $£ 100$ to $£ 200$, £200 to $\{300$, etc., by multiplying the assessments therein by 3 and reducing the result to a proportion of the population, from which he concludes that " it is a significant fact that whilst the number of persons in the receipt of incomes from $f 150$ to $f 500$ increased at the rate of 136 per cent., the number of persons in the receipt of incomes of $\mathbf{6} 3,000$
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and upwards increased only at the rate of 86 per cent." ${ }^{1}$ The method is so doubtful, and the disturbing factors are so important, that this comparative result is, in my judgment, valueless.
Professor Levi proceeds to ascertain the average income per " family" (which he treats as equivalent to a " taxpayer") in 185 r and $1879-80$, arriving at the numbers as 330,000 and x,060,000 respectively, by using the multiplier 3. "Now place against these numbers the income of each class at the respective period, adding 6 per cent. for the probable assessable income for Ireland in 185 r. ." He adds nothing, however, to the number, as divisor for Ireland, and gets the income per family 1824 , ( 44 per cent. of the whole). In 1879, by a similar process, the number of taxpayers in Great Britain is divided into the total gross income for the United Kingdom, with a quotient of $£ 544$ per family, or 49 per cent. of the total. He concludes that the incomes of taxpayers diminished 30 per cent., while those of the lower middle classes increased 37 per cent. and of the labouring classes 59 per cent. Such a method cannot, of course, give the actual average income, and, in so far as it may be urged that it gives a comparable result (having a common error), it may be pointed out that Ireland (omitted in the divisor) is a relatively constant figure in the income, and the disparity is therefore increased. If we employ these numbers with the actual net assessed income for Great Britain we get averages of $£ 630$ and $£ 470$ respectively.
Mr. Mallock builds upon Levi' 4 analysis:-" While, during the thirty years thus dealt with, the total income reviewed for assessment purposes had increased in the proportion of 100 to 212, the number of persons subject to income tax had increased in the proportion of 100 to 320 , the result being that, while the average assessed income in 1851 had been more than ${ }^{8} 820$, it was in 188I not so much as £550." ${ }^{2}$
Professor Levi made no use of the House Duty statistics,

[^227]and relied solely upon the classification of assessments and the rule-of-thumb method of multiplication by 3.

It will be seen that even when Baxter wrote, the proportion of one-third as applied to the Sch. D assessments resulted from the assumption that Sch. A duty was paid by as many taxpayers as Sch. D. But there is one fact that rendered this highly improbable. When the differential rate existed, only I per cent. of the liable Sch. A fell between $£ 100$ and $£ 150$ in the assessment, ${ }^{1}$ whereas one-seventh of Sch. D and one-sixth of Sch. E came between these limits; and when abatements were introduced the income abated under Sch. A was far less than under Sch. D. The inference is of course that, given equal sums under each schedule, Sch. A was distributed amongst payers with the higher incomes to a greater extent than Sch. D, and therefore the number of payers was far fewer in proportion. Baxter's underlying assumption made the total numbers too high. . Then in later years the total Sch. A sank relatively to the total Sch. D, and the assumption became still further removed from the facts. Reasons for the multiplication of assessments under Sch. D in recent years have been given in connection with the general classification tables. It is true, of course, that the number of liable owner-occupiers of houses has grown greatly, but the great majority are already taxpayers under Schs. $D$ and $E$, and the incomes solely or predominantly under Sch. A, in the lower ranges (as judged from abatements), are still much smaller in proportion to the total Sch. A than those under Schs. D and E are to the totals of those schedules respectively.

In 1887 Goschen wrote upon the increase of moderate incomes, making comparisons merely for the ten years to 1885. He showed the relatively larger percentage which the lower Sch. D assessments had in the classification, and he also used the House Duty figures to show the greater increase in the medium-sized houses at that time.

So far as I am concerned, the chief utility of their investiwations is that they obtained certain tables from the Inland

[^228]
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Revenue which are not published elsewhere, and which furnish us with intermediate observations.

Another possible means of getting information as to the numbers at different times is to examine the effect of a change in the exemption limit ( 1853,1875 and 1894 ) as to the amount of assessment affected and the number of taxpayers between certain fixed limits. An attempt at an approximation on these lines is given below:-

Number of Incomes, from $\mathbf{8 1 5 0}$ to $\mathbf{8 1 6 0}$ inclusive in 1894-5.
(I) The number of abatements claimed was (in thousands) :-

| - |  | 1893-4 | 1894-5. | 1895-6. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| In assessment By repayment By schedule . | - | 455 | 381 | 396 |
|  | . | 40 | 40 | 42 |
|  | - | 14 | 15 | 11 |
| Total | - | 509 | 436 | 449 |

Number of incomes $£ 150$ to $£ 400,1893-4$. . 509
Add average annual increase
13
Estimated number in 1894-5 . . . . 522
Less number of incomes $£ \mathrm{x} 60$ to $£ 400$. . 436
Difference, number of incomes $£ 150$ to $£ \mathbf{1 6 0}$. 86
Add increased incentive to cla in in 1894, I per cent. of total

4
90
Add general failure to claim abatements, 5 per cent.

But if no repairs allowance had been given in 1894-5, a number whose incomes were over $£ 160$ in 1893 did not exceed $\{x 60$ in 1894-5, and thus no abatement was claimable (say)
(2) 39th Report, p. ro5. Cost of concessions under the Finance Act, 1894, estimate for the change of exemption limit $£ 133,800$. If the average duty lost for each person is put at $8 d$. on $£ 35$, the number of persons is r14,000 ( $£ 35$ was an average assessment of fi55, less $£ 120$ abatement in 1893-4, which disappeared in 1894-5). As a fact the divisor should be rather larger owing to failure to claim some portions of the abatements.

Second result . . . . 110,000
(3) Appendix I. shows the loss in the gross assessment (thousand $£$ ):-


Under Sch. A, by a comparison of the total exemptions 1892-3, 1893-4, and $\mathbf{5 8 9 4 - 5}$, and allowing for the
repairs deduction • $\quad . \quad \frac{750}{12,330} \pm \frac{200}{\mathbf{1}, 200}$

At an average income $£ 155$ this represents $79,500 \pm 7,740$, to which must be added the repayment claims (on dividends, mortgage interest, etc.). The increased duty repaid (under exemptions (vide P. II7, 44th Report) between 1893-4 and 1895-6 was $\{89,000$ at 8 d . $=\{2,600,000$ income. Repayments vary from the duty on a few pounds to the full limit, and an average of $£ 80$ would give 32,000 cases.

Third result . . . . 111,000
Avarage result, 106,000 persons.
Namber of Incomen from $\mathrm{E100}$ to E150 inclusive in 1876-7 (thousand $f$ ).
Sch. A exemptions increased by about 1,140 ) (from re-
\(\left.\begin{array}{ccccr}" \& B \& " \& " \& " <br>
" \& C \& 1,500 <br>
" \& D \& " \& " \& " <br>

I \& " 800\end{array}\right\}\)| ports by |
| :---: |
| inspection). |

At an average income of $£ 120$ this represents 247,800 persons.
$\because \quad \% \quad 6125 \quad \infty \quad 237,600 \%$

## 442 BRITISH INCOMES AND PROPERTY.

(Note.-In the statistics of repayments, 28th Report, p. 258, there is a difference indicating some 7,000 or 8,000 increased claims at least, so that the total is 245,000 to 255,000 persons.)

The 20th Report (p. 52) gives the number of Schs. D and E assessments as 244,000 fewer.

By the abatements $1875-6,1876-7$, and 1877-8 the number of incomes $£ 100$ to $£ 300$ was 160,000 more than the number from fiso to $£ 400$, so that we get the following result :-

by calculating from abatements and allowing for repayments and a 10 per cent. margin of unclaimed cases.

The incomes $£ 100$ to $£ 150$ represent 5.4 per cent. of the total income at this period.


In 1855-6 we find the income charged at the lower rate Eroo to $\mathrm{EIFO}^{150}$ was (thousand $£$ ):-


Under the pressure of the very high rate of duty it may be assumed that there was no great failure to claim the lower rate. At an average of $£ 120$ this is equal to 147,200 persons, and it may be said that at least 8,000 must have been allowed by schedule and repayment $=155,000$ in all

There is a good deal of evidence that the assessments were
almost stationary until 186I-2; the classification of assessments shows that the smaller incomes moved but little, and we may say that at 1860 there were 160,000 income tax payers in this class. At this date I estimate the number of incomes $£ 100$ to $£ 200$, by carrying back the 1863 abatements three years, in the same proportion as the assessments, at 221,000 as a maximum, and 200,000 as a minimum. The $£ 150$ to $£ 200$ incomes were therefore 50,000 to 60,000 in number. This is so few that an ordinary ratio of distribution fails to give the number that other methods indicate for the total number of taxpayers. We have two explanations (alternative or combined), viz. :-(a) administration was weak; and (b) there were actually fewer at this level.

With regard to (a), all the indications are that the temporary character of the tax and the lack of statutory powers in connection with wage returns served to keep down to a minimum the numbers in the lowest ranges. But it is quite possible, and the indications of house distribution and assessments support the view, that there were at that time actually a smaller proportion of the whole with medium incomes.

Having arrived at these results for certain fixed points, it remains to be considered whether they throw any light upon the total number of taxpayers or upon other parts of the scale of incomes. Pareto's formula ${ }^{1}$ is not perhaps seen at its best in this task of furnishing the aggregate from a small section at the extreme end, because it is at the ends that the modifications of the main index are most necessary. Applied to the classification of Sch. D assessments (with all its limitations) down to the exemption limit, the following are fairly
 1874, $1 \cdot 4$ (estimated) ; 1860-1, r.3I; 1850, I•38. Everything considered, the changes are not great, but the indication is that in I860 there was a smaller proportion of lower incomes.

The abatement index is higher than the assessment index at present, and it appears to have been higher throughout. If we relate the two, and adopt the same ratio for $\mathbf{x} 860-\mathrm{I}$, applying the resultant index to the 60,000 incomes $£ 150$ to f200, we get only about 250,000 taxpayers (above $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{I}} 150$ ) in
all. But of course, if there is a considerable error in the 60,000 and the number should have been, say, 20 per cent. more, the total number of taxpayers might reach 300,000 . The method is, however, a very risky one. Applied to the ascertained numbers $£ 150$ to $£ 300$ in $1875-6$, we get as the total number of taxpayers (over $£ 150$ ) from 500,000 to 540,000.

Another method of working upon the problem is the use of the statistics of houses, Sch. A and House Duty. They furnish practically the only uniform and continuous record approximating to income distribution. It has been seen that Baxter attempted a rough " fit" for houses and incomes, and what Dr. Bowley has described as the " fascinating game of fitting taxpayers into houses " has been carried on in late years with enthusiasm by Sir L. Chiozza Money, Mr. Ireson, Mr. W. H. Mallock, and others. Mr. Mallock's work is voluminous and reiterated, but it shows such a definite bias in one direction that it is robbed of its value.

These figures may be used in two ways and for two pur-poses:-
(I) By reasoned examination of the house values for any given year to ascertain, absolutely, the number of taxpayers in that year either as a whole or in grades.
(2) By comparison of years, using houses as an index number to get the relative number of taxpayers over a long period.

In order to continue the investigation commenced above, I propose to deal with the second method first. So far as I am aware, it has not previously been used.

Classified House Duty statistics are available for about twenty years, prior to which we have-(I) figures for 188I given by the Reports; (2) a table for 1874-5 obtained by Goschen from the Inland Revenue Department ${ }^{1}$; (3) a return of ratings for electoral purposes, $1866^{2}$ (all the foregoing relate to private houses) ; (4) a parliamentary return for $1860-\mathrm{I}$, giving all houses, including shops, etc. ${ }^{3}$ As the

[^229]value of shop premises has no direct relation to the incomes of the shopkeepers，and their distribution is actually quite different，they must be ignored ；we are here concerned，not with the total number of houses occupied by taxpayers，but with a number that will reflect the number of taxpayers．It is necessary，therefore，to split the 1860 figures into private houses and shops，etc．，charged at the lower rate．This has been done by reference to（a）the known average value in each class in 1860 and in 1874，and（b）the percentage change in those averages and the average of all houses，so that the 1874 private houses have been written back to the 1860 basis in such a way as to give the required aggregate and average value．

The result is as follows ：－
Houses（all kinds）（in thousands）．

| － | 1874－5． |  | 1891－2． |  | 1900－1． |  | 1915－2． |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 3,000 \cdot 4 \\ 590 \cdot 4 \\ 331 \cdot 3 \end{array}$ | 二 | $3.286 \cdot 3$ <br> 1，122．7 <br> $599 \cdot 4$ | 二 | $\begin{array}{r} 3,230 \cdot 5 \\ x, 568 \cdot 7 \\ 77 \times 4 \end{array}$ | － | $\begin{array}{r} 3,242 \cdot 3 \\ 2,151 \cdot 5 \\ 985 \cdot 6 \end{array}$ |  |
| Total House Duty （ 200 and over） | $\begin{array}{r} 3.922 \cdot 1 \\ 864 \cdot 3 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 81.9 \\ & 18.1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5.008 \cdot 4 \\ & 1,269 \cdot 8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 79 \cdot 7 \\ & 20 \cdot 3 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 5,570 \cdot 6 \\ & 1,630 \cdot 2 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 77 \cdot 4 \\ & 22.6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,379 \cdot 4 \\ & 2,008 \cdot 6 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 76 \cdot 1 \\ & 23.9 \end{aligned}$ |
| All ． | 4.786 .6 | － | 6，278－2 | － | 7，200－8 | － | 8，388－0 |  |

Private Houses oharged to House Duty（in thousands）．

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline \& 3860－2 Eati－ mated \& Prat \& 2854－5． \& Port． \& 8边1－2． \& \[
\begin{aligned}
\& \text { Por } \\
\& \text { coent. }
\end{aligned}
\] \& r890－ 1900. \& Prer \& 1909－20． \& For \\
\hline \multirow[t]{5}{*}{\[
\left.\begin{array}{l}
800-650 \\
800-850 \\
800-\$ 50 \\
\$ 50-\$ 100 \\
\text { Over Sr90 }
\end{array}\right\}
\]} \& 1280 \& 569 \& costz \& 35 \& 1343 \& 359 \& \(480 \cdot 7\) \& 489 \& 6499 \& 457 \\
\hline \& 1444 \& 33 \& rear \& 18 \& 065 2 \& 344 \& \(400 \cdot 1\) \& \(34 \cdot 7\) \& \({ }^{3836}\) \& 1598 \\
\hline \& 693 \& \(\pm\) \& 9318 \& \(\left.\begin{array}{c}167 \\ 43\end{array}\right\}\) a \& 134．3 \& \(10-3\)
39 \& 1544 \& \begin{tabular}{|c}
23.4 \\
88 \\
8.9
\end{tabular} \& 3875
89 \& 186

-6 <br>
\hline \& 35 \& 12\％ \& 56 \& \& 789 \& 95 \& \& 7 \& 37 \& 5 <br>
\hline \& 346 \& 100 \& 5693 \& 200 \& \％ 35 \& 200 \& 3， 2195 \& 200 \& 1687 \& 8 <br>
\hline
\end{tabular}
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Average Value of Private Houser (over $\mathbf{£ 2 0}$ value).


The year r874-5 is the first for which we possess statistics of houses of all values. Taking a $£ 30$ dividing line, r909-10 shows $56 \cdot \mathrm{I}$ per cent. as compared with 6 I I per cent. in 1874-5 above that value for houses assessed to House Duty, but of all houses the percentage above $£ 30$ in $1909-10$ was 13.4 as compared with $1 x .05$ in 1874-5. It is clear, therefore, that there has been a great movement from the class below $£ 20$ into the $£ 20$ to $£ 30$ range to bring about this result.

For the purpose of an index number the aggregate number of private houses of $£ 28$ value and upwards has been adopted. It is found that the above statistics for " over $£ 30$," treated as equivalent to incomes by Pareto's formula, answer perfectly and exhibit a constantly rising index-1860-1, $1 \cdot 52 ; 1874-5$, 1.57; 1881-2, 1.62 ; 1899, 173 ; and 1909-10, 1.86 , indicating that an increasingly large proportion of the whole number of taxpayers is found in the fanges near the limit of exemption. The limit of $£ 28$ is adopted for the following reasons:-
(1) From a practical point of view it is believed to be about the limit corresponding with the exemption limit : £27 was adopted by a close observer, Mr. G. H. Blunden, with wide practical experience as a Revenue official, as long ago as 1896. Bearing in mind the large proportion borne by the figures for the metropolis to the whole country, 1 think the true figures cannot be much less than $£ 28$. It is not the value below which we may cease to find income tax payers that matters, but the value at which taxpayers and nop-
taxpayers would be found in equal numbers that is significant. ${ }^{1}$
(2) As an index number the result is not widely different from what might be found if $£ 27$ or $£ 29$ were adopted. Any error in estimating the number from $£ 28$ to $£ 30$ by working Pareto's formula from the known numbers at $£ 30$ is less than the error at a lower limit. It is for this reason also that the year 1909-10 is adopted; the classification became $£^{20}$ to $£ 4 \mathrm{I}$, without any intermediate step, in the succeeding years, and the difficulty of estimating the number over $£^{£ 28}$ is correspondingly great.
(3) This limit, looked at absolutely, gives results closer to the number of taxpayers, estimated officially by other methods, than any other limit.
(4) If a Pareto curve for incomes (by abatements) is superimposed upon a similar curve for houses, their directions may be different, but it will be found that on equating them at a point known to be reasonably probable (viz., $£_{40}$ rent $=$ income $£ 400$ to $£ 500$ ) the position of the $£ 160$ point falls so as to give a number equal to the $£ 28$ houses. ${ }^{2}$
The numbers are as follows (in thousands):-1909-10,
 2427.

If we take the official estimate of the total number of taxpayers as in 1909-10 at $\mathbf{x , 0 5 0 , 0 0 0}$ to $x, 100,000$, it may be said that this is the most reliable figure that has been obtainable at any time; because the great mass of incomes fall within the limits of abatement and error is confined to the following points:-(a) the number within this range who fail to claim: (b) the number of incomes above $£ 700$.

Now, with regard to (a), this until recent years was merely open to guesswork, but now it has become less important than ever because the percentage of non-claimants is very small. We have (a) very high rates of tax ; (b) wide publicity and opportunity; and (c) a claim that runs contingently with earned income relief, the failure to claim which involves a crushing difference in tax burden. The incentive to claim the $f 70$ abatement is now not really

[^230]
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less than that to claim the $£ 160$, and a deficiency in the number of these " upper" claims ten years ago has been rapidly overhauled under these influences. I do not think the percentage of non-claimants is above 2 now, but it is evidently more liberally allowed for in the official figures.
(b) The numbers above are relatively smaller. We are helped to an extent by the super-tax figures, the earned income relief on incomes to $£ 3,000$, and the statistics of larger houses; and there is not a very wide scope for difference in numbers. There is much more scope for difference in amounts of total income at each higher stage. Altogether the official estimate is very closely hemmed in by important checks. The internal evidence of the tax itself gets less reliable as we go back, and in 1860 there is practically none. The application of this index number gives the following result (in thousands) :-

Estimated Numbors of Taxpayers (thousands).

| Year. | Incomes over $£ 160$. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1860-r | 267.7 to 280.4 | 306.7 to 319.5 |
| 1874-5 | $452 \cdot 5$ to $473 \cdot 8$ | 518.2 to $539 \cdot 8$ |
| 1881-2 | 604 to 632-2 | 691.4 to $720 \cdot 2$ |
| 1894-5 | 727 to 761.7 | $($ add 106) $=833$ to 86777 |
| 1909-10 | 1,050 to 1,100 | 1,202 to $\mathbf{1 , 2 5 3} 0$ |

This method as a first rough approximation has the following difficulties:-
(I) It gives the earlier years the " benefit" of all recent improvements in administration, and to some extent would lead to over-statement, especially in 1860-r.
(2) It assumes that the relation of rent to income at the $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{E}} 150$ stage or thereabouts has not altered. If liable taxpayers with $£ 160$ per annum now live in $£ 27$ or $£ 28$ houses on the average, and if they now spend more of their income on rent than formerly, then in $\mathbf{1 8 6 0}$ any one with $£ 160$ per annum may have had, on average, a lower rented house, and the number of taxpayers was pro tanto larger than the number given by this method. This was probably the case, so that
an addition should be made on this account in the earlier years. It will be observed that, so far as $1875-6$ is concerned, this result is comparable with that obtained by Pareto's formula from the internal evidence of abatements.
(3) It assumes that the proportion of void houses or houses containing two taxpayers has not materially changed.

If we deduct from Baxter's estimate, 897,000 (over $£$ roo) in 1866, the incomes $£ 100$ to $£ 150$ (say 196,000, the mean of 1860 and 1874), we get about 700,000 incomes over $£ 150$ instead of about 420,000 by this method. Similarly, Levi's I,060,000 in $1879-80$ has to compare with about 650,000 by this index. Shearman ${ }^{1}$ considered that the whole number of incomes over $£ 150$ in 1884 must have exceeded 600,000 .

## The Number of Taxpayers in Recent Years.

The following official estimates have been given recently in Parliament:-1,150,000 taxpayers in 1912-13. No definite statistics are available as to the total nor as to division of income. A scientific classification of numbers and incomes in grades is not possible, and publication of official estimates might be misleading. ${ }^{3}$ 1,240,000 payers estimated for 1914-15, of whom only 164,000 will pay at the full rate. ${ }^{\text {. }}$

A comparison has been furnished ${ }^{5}$ :-Income: x903-4, £731,571,000; 1913-14, £935,000,000. Taxpayers: 1903-4. 950,000; 1913-14, 1,190,000. Estimated income per taxpayer: 1903-4, $£ 770$; 1913-14, $£ 786$. The percentage increase in average income was 2.1 and in taxpayers $25.3 .{ }^{\circ}$

Another reply gave the number of taxpayers as $1,100,000$, of whom 950,000 were entitled to abatements or earned income relief, leaving 150,000 paying at the full rate, Is. 2d.' The larger figure includes all persons who receive

[^231]small dividends from which tax at 1s. 2d. has been deducted, but the exempt persons who fail to claim on small sums are not included. ${ }^{1}$ The number of payers at the earned rate with incomes under $£ 700$ whose incomes were entirely earned was " not available." ${ }^{2}$ The estimate of $1,100,000$ payers was based upon figures given by Sir Henry Primrose, Professor Bowley, and Sir L. Chiozza Money to the Select Committee; it included dividend receivers with incomes over $£ \mathrm{f} 60$ per annum. ${ }^{\text {s }}$

Sir L. Chiozza Money has estimated the annual increase in taxpayers as 10,000.4 This, however, appears to be rather under the mark, the Sch. E assessments alone showing an annual increase of nearly 18,000 in fourteen years, and the abatements considerably exceed 10,000 also, although of course the whole increase cannot be assigned to new taxpayers.

Mr. W. H. Mallock throughout his investigations ${ }^{5}$ comes to the conclusion that the number of taxpayers is far higher than these estimates, and as a consequence the average income per taxpayer is much less than is generally supposed. He adopts a method which attempts to " fit " the taxpayers into the houses right down the scale by analysing the Schs. D and E classification tables " and constructing individual incomes and then providing these taxpayers with houses of suitable value.

His chief assumptions in such fitting are:-
(i) Houses worth more than $£ 20$ a year are occupied mostly by persons with over $£ 160$ a year (except in London).
(2) With the exception of houses 乃ust over $£ 20$ and those over $£ 200$, the income of each occupier is about ten times the rent.
${ }^{1}$ Hansard, 54 (25.6.1913).
2 Ibid., II (30.9.1909).
${ }^{2}$ Mr. Asquith to Mr. Fell (24.5.1909).
" "Things that Matter," 1912, p. $4:$ " Recent Fall in Real Wages."
s" The Nation as a Business Firm ": "Social Reform"; "The Possibilities of an Income Tax according to the Scheme of Pitt"; " Statistical Monographs," etc.

- A typical method of using the Schs. D and E classification may be quoted as follows :-J. Ackland, "The Revolution in the Incidence of Taxation," Contemporary Review, 1901. Total D and E assessments, 816,154; allow three partwers to a firm, and add 270,000 for "shareholders" in companies not otherwise assessed, and for persons assessed exclusively under other schedules-total, $1,200,000$.
(3) (a) Houses $£ 20$ to $£ 40$ may be taken to equal incomes $£ 160$ to $£ 400$; (b) houses $£ 40$ to $£ 80$ may be taken to equal incomes $£ 400$ to $£ 800$; (c) houses $£ 80$ to $£ 200$ may be taken to equal incomes $£ 800$ to $\{5,000$.

The great excess in (b) and (c) houses over Schs. D and E " incomes " in r903-4 is referred to " over-building." I The general correspondence between the increase in "incomes" and of houses from IgOI to 1908, 23 per cent. in each case, "cannot be the result of chance; it is evident there is actually a substantial coincidence" between the numbers. This proof is not complete, because it is only necessary to postulate an even distribution unchanged in each case to get "correspondence" between figures which are really unrelated except to a common factor like population. More especially does this apply to a section of the house values, say from $£^{25}$ or $£ 28$ to $£ 40$.

The way in which the " assessments" are turned into individual incomes for this purpose has already been considered.: The treatment relies on a comparison between the trends of two sets of figures, one of which is hypothetical entirely, while the other is tangible in its terms but hypothetical (and quite improbable) at the point where it is equated to the other series, i.c., the exemption limit. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Mr. Mallock explains any excess of houses over assessments quite simply by the necessity for housing those who do not appear under the Schs. D and E tables, but he does not examine their adequacy independently. His conclusion is that in rgor there were $1,200,000$ and in $19091,470,000$ taxpayers (allowance being made for unoccupied houses). The average income per taxpayer fell from $£ 590$ to $£ 533$. He deals specially with London to show that, on a proportionate scale, there should be 188,000 taxpayers, whereas there are 436,000 houses over $£ 20$, and his readjustment gives $\mathbf{3 3 0 , 0 0 0}$ taxpayers living in houses worth over $£ 30$ per annum ; but even with this allowance " the result remains substantially what it was before."

[^232]In the work quoted Mr. Mallock does not use abatement figures, but in a previous treatment ${ }^{1}$ he gets over the real difficulty of reconciling his figures with them by stating that most people will think it " probable that of persons in a position to claim abatements, those who failed to do so amounted to one-fourth or perhaps one-third." The taxpayers on this occasion numbered $\mathbf{x , 2 5 0 , 0 0 0}$ for 1905-6.

Sir L. Chiozza Money, in "Riches and Poverty," took the abatement figures, with an addition of 50,000 for nonclaimants, as the number of taxpayers up to $£ 700$ income, and then added the higher incomes only by reference to the houses. Persons in the metropolis with incomes over $£ 700$ per annum were assumed to occupy dwellings of $£ 60$ annual value, and upwards, and outside the metropolis a $£ 50$ limit was adopted. The fact that some persons with smaller incomes occupied such houses was set against the " blocks of flats with high rentals," which were assessed in blocks and not in fiats. An addition of 9,500 was made for Ireland, and as a net result the total incomes were put at $1,000,000$ ( 1903 -4 statistics). He definitely rejected the classification of assessments under Sch. D as unsuitable for these estimates. Dr. Cannan has said that Sir L. Chiozza Money's figures " hold the field," and they certainly came unscathed out of the examination by the Committee of 1906. By similar methods and on later figures Sir Henry Primrose arrived at $1,100,000$; he allowed rather mote for failure to claim abatements, and also for "residential shops" in the bigher incomes.

These results were, however, subject to criticism outside :-

[^233]Masses," Contemporary Review, April, 1907 (referred to by Sir L. Chiozza Money in the same review, June, 1907).

In his reply in August, 1907, Mr. Quail said : "My estimate . . . is probably below the mark, while Mr. Money's ( $x, 000,000$ to $1,050,000$ ) is clearly very wide of it. For here again, as with the entries in the registers of railway shareholders, he overlooks collective assessments. Income tax on the profits of public companies is assessed and paid in the lump. . . . The incomes of many shareholders are below the tax limit, and they are entitled to exemption or abatement, but as a rule do not take the trouble to claim either. Curious that so ardent a collectivist should ignore these collective shareholdings and assessments."

Sir L. Chiozza Money's method is far sounder because it makes the most of the available evidence, and also because a considerable error in the assumptions does not greatly alter the results. The other method ignores the best evidence and relies on an assumption, which runs across the statistics at such a point that a fractional change makes very important differences. The assumption itself (as to the house value corresponding with the exemption limit) is a most difficult one to postulate with any degree of certitude. The limit varies very widely in different places, and even though it might be ascertained exactly for several towns, it would still be hard to weight the results properly for the whole kingdom. In a particular sample for a given place, especially where the town combines industrial and residential populations, the frequency dispersion is wide, and a considerable number of instances must be taken before any reliable inference can be drawn.

Careful and precise observations by my friend Mr. W. B. Cowcher, B.Litt., lead to the view that, at any given house value of ordinary amount, the relation between rent and income, expressed as a percentage of the latter, gives a continuous series and a single mode, and in a frequency curve exhibits a moderate skewness. The skewness, however, is not sufficient to affect this general proposition, vin, that where, at a certain house-value $x$, the number of such houses " exhibiting" a taxpayer (income $£ 160$ or over) is one-half the total number of houses at value $x$ (i.e., an even chance), the number of houses with a value $>x$ not containing tar-
payers with incomes $£ 660$ and over will be balanced by the number of houses value $<x$ " exhibiting" such taxpayers. £160 Incomes and Equivalent Rontals. (1) Sample Opinion. It is perhaps only due to Mr. Mallock that his minimum house value method should be met on its own ground rather than merely dismissed as unreliable. But, in default of real statistical evidence on a sufficiently comprehensive plan, it is necessary to fall back upon opinion, and few persons possess the necessary experience to give an opinion of real value, for even an intimate knowledge of either factor, rent or income, separately is of little use. Only those who are called upon constantly, as a business, to observe the definite relationship between them can give evidence of asemi-statistical character. I have discussed this point with many official acquaintances from time to time and put the question as to the value $x$ at which the chance of an income $£ x 60$ or more is an even one (outside London). The answers have been noted, and when presented as a sample investigation fairly cover the whole country by the experience represented. Graph IX. gives the result in a very symmetrical curve, and inspires confiderice in the average, which is identical with the mode. The standard deviation is large enough to show that there are considerable differences in some localities. It can at any rate be fairly stated that the true statistical result cannot be different by more than $£ 2$, and this alone suffices to invalidate Mr. Mallock's results completely. Sample Investigation. ${ }^{1}$

|  | 0 and under |  | - 2 | £29 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underbrace{2}$ | 3 |  | - 1 | E30 |  |  |
| $\mathrm{f}^{2}$ | 5 |  | - 6 | E3I |  |  |
| $\mathrm{t}^{2}$ | 6 |  | 2 | E33 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Over $£ 35$ |  |  |

Total, 40 observations. Average, $£ 28$ ros. ; median, $£ 28$; mode, $£^{28}$ and $£ 29$ (on the smoothed series).
${ }^{1}$ G. H. Bhonden, an official observer, gave $f 27$ as 2 reasoned extimate in 1896 (S. J., 1896). One writer assumes the income tax class to begin at a rental as high as $\mathbf{6} 40$ (Zorn, " Incidence of the Income Tax").


At first sight the series seems very discontinuous. It was a natural tendency to express an opinion round about the nearest "five," $£ 25, £_{30}$, and $£ 35$, and only the more careful chose mid-points. Moreover, as a physical fact, although $£_{25} £^{£ 6}, £_{27}$, and $£ 28$ are all commonly found as house rents, $\mathfrak{f}^{29}$ and $\mathfrak{f}_{3} 3$ are rare. But if a value be assigned to the qualification "about" given by many replies, so that when an opinion was expressed " about $£ 28$ " it could be taken that within the experience of the witness it would certainly fall in the range $£ 26$ to $£ 30$, and if a range of five points be given to each observation, the series becomes continuous, and the curve is smooth and approaches the normal. The average for this series is slightly lower, the standard deviation 3.9 , and the co-efficient of dispersion $0 \cdot 14$.
It was agreed, without a dissentient, that the average for London would be at least $£ 5$ higher, and by "London" was intended a much larger area than is included under the official statistics as "metropolis." It should be remarked that the forty opinions expressed cover an experience of over 300 towns and areas, well extended over the kingdom.

The number of houses falling between Mr. Mallock's minimum and the $£ 27$ or $£ 28$ shown by this sample is so large that it fully accounts for the difference between his estimates and the official figures.

## (2) Rentals and Incomes $8160-$ Teof $\dagger$ by Pareto's Pormala. Graph X.

The smaller incomes bear a larger proportion than onetenth in rent, and the higher incomes a smaller proportion. If the exact relations at any point of income were determined, the relations for any other point could be estimated closely from the Pareto distribution formula. The point at which one-tenth is reached is not exactly known, but it is almost certainly not lower than $£ 400$, nor higher than $£ 500$. If the house and income lines are made to cross at $£ 400$ income and $£_{40}$ rent, the equivalent of $£ x 60$ is just over $£ 25$ rent (see A). If the lines cross so that $£ 500$ income and $£ 50$ rent coincide, the equivalent of $£ x 60$ income is about $£ 30$ (see B, moved paralled to A). (In this comparison the abso-

## Grapr X.

Relation of Rent to Income at figo Limit. Test by Pareto's Line.

lute magnitudes are immaterial ; only relative distributions are considered. The figures taken are for 1909-10, and from the lower incomes $£ 160$ to $£ 400$ has been deducted a minimum estimate for those who live in residential shops, not included in the house distribution. Houses are ior Great Britain, incomes for the United Kingdom-a difference which for this purpose is immaterial.)

Number of Porsons per House-A consideration of this factor, which is frequently used in these inquiries, is outside the scope of this work. ${ }^{1}$

## Relation of Rent to Income.

In addition to the relationship at the particular point of liability to income tax, various estimates of relationship have been made from time to time for other levels of income. The most precise information relates to the working classes, who suffer inquiries more gladly than the middle and upper classes would do I
B. S. Rowntree (" Poverty : A Study of Town Life," p. 201) found that the percentage of income paid in rent became less as the family income increased :-

| 18 |  |  | 008 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | " | " | 18s. to 203. | " |  |
| 14 | " | " | 31s. to 40s. ( | " | 365.) |
| 12 | " | " | 51s. to 60s. ( | " | 55s. 8d.) |
| 9 | " | " | over 6c) ( | " | 743.) |

Dawson (" Unearned Increment," p. 88) quotes evidence. for 25 per cent. to 288 per cent. Giffen assumed one-seventh to one-eighth at $£ 100$ income (S. J., 1885).

Dr. Bowley's investigations at Reading showed (Journal of Royal Statistical Society, June, 1913):-
Incomes under 20s. per week. Percentage paid in rent 30.9

${ }^{1}$ Giffen put 7 in houses over $£ 20,6$ in houses $£ 10$ to $£ 20$ and $5 \frac{1}{2}$ in those under fio (so as to allow for farmbouses, etc., not incloded). For Ireland he adds one-tenth above $\{20$, one-seventh fro to $\{20$, and one-fifth below f10 (S. J., 1885). Zorn takes 49233 (" Incidence of the Income Tax ${ }^{7}$ ): Ackland, 5 (Contemporers Review, 1901).

The Report of the Land Inquiry Committee (Urban), p. 43, tabulates similar results for six other places.

It must not be supposed, however, that the percentage continues to fall from these points as we leave the working classes. There is a distinct break when we begin with the middle and salaried class, and with "appearances" to keep up and a smaller family a larger percentage is afforded about $£$ r50 per annum, from which point the percentage falls continuously.
In 1852 one witness before the S. C. on Income Tax used a factor of 10 for houses $£ 150$ in value, and said that occupants of $£ 20$ to $£ 25$ houses spent one-seventh or one-ighth of their incomes in rent. ${ }^{1}$

Mr. Cowcher's researches ${ }^{2}$ support the following general statements:-(I) The percentage of income paid for rent and for rates diminishes as the income increases; (2) owneroccupiers live in larger houses than tenants with the same amount of total income; (3) women householders pay a higher percentage in rent than tenants generally. But it was not clear that, as is generally supposed, professional men pay more than business men.

The first statement, which would be accepted by general experience, is placed beyond doubt statistically for the lower range of incomes by superimposing the Pareto lines for houses and for abatements. If, moreover, there is general agreement as to the precise relationship at any amount and the lines are equated at that point, not only is it difficult to escape from the conclusion as to the point upon the "house" line which must correspond with the exemption limit, £x60 (Graph X.), but the diminution in the proportion of income paid for rent may also be clearly inferred.

Mr. Cowcher would suggest that if the proportion for incomes $£ 200$ to $£ 250$ be regarded as unity, the $£_{£ 300}$ to $£_{400}$ class would be represented by 8 , $£ 500$ to $£ 750$ by 7 , and $\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{I}, 000}$ to $£ \mathrm{f}, 500$ by $\cdot 5$.

We have seen that Sir L. Chiozza Money, in " Riches and Poverty," puts the $£ 700$ income against the $£ 60$ house in London and $£ 50$ house in the country. ${ }^{1}$
W. H. Mallock (" Pitt's Income Tax Scheme," Nineteenth Century, March, 19ro) uses the following estimates :-

| To $£$ ro rent | Jointly earned incomes under firs |
| :---: | :---: |
| fio-615 | £115-£155 (average, $£ 145)$ |
| E15-630 (average, $\mathrm{E}^{20}$ ). | £155-¢200 |
| £30- 550 (average, $£ 34$ ). | - $£ 200-6400$ |
| £50- 660 (average, $£ 54$ ). | £400- $£ 700$ |
| ¢60- 6100 | £700-¢1.400 |
| f100-6150 | - $\mathfrak{E 1 , 4 0 0 - 6 2 , 0 0 0}$ |
| E150-6200 | £2,000-£3,000 |
| (200- 3300 | £3,000- 45,000 |
| Over $£ 300$ | Over $£ 5,000$ |

In classifying the houses over $£ 60$ in value, in order to " fit in " the incomes over $£ 700$, W. H. Mallock (" Pitt's Income Tax Scheme," Nincteenth Century, 1910, p. 479) gives, for 1905, the following:-

| Range of Rents. | Mr. Mallock's Numbers (p. 479). | All Premises charged to House Duty (50th Report, p. 173). | Private Dwelling houses only. charged to House Daty (p. 177). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| f60- 6100 | 122,000 | 11.548 | 98,507 |
| f100-6150 | 53.000 | 68,599 | 45,360 |
| t150- 5200 | 19,000 | 25.949 | 16,709 |
| ¢ $200-\mathrm{\$} 300$ | 15,000 | 20,922 | 13,582 |
| Over $£ 300$ | 14,900 | 19,29] | 11,143 |

It is thus not easy to see what the basis of Mr. Mallock's figures is, bat he says he has taken " the number of all premises with rentals over $£ 60$ " and deducted "according to the proportions shown in the Statistical Abstract such as are other than residential." His division appears to be roughly :-

Private houses
All houses charged to House Duty

No. of houses, shops, etc., of $£ 60-£ 100$.

This is not a clear explanation, but he seems to have omitted to notice that the exact number of privatehouses is givenofficially, and that persons reside on all the other classes of houses charged to duty, and it is not clear whether he has estimated for Ireland or not.

Mr. Mallock further gives the following classification (for 1905), after remarking " dwellings over shops, such as are occupied by minor tradesmen, are not treated as dwellings, but are numbered amongst business premises. . . . I add the approximate additions to be made on account of Ireland and residential shops ":-


The chief points arising in this comparison are:-( $x$ ) The supposition that residential shops, estimated at 300,000 , between Ero to $£ 15$ are not included in the official figures is incorrect : (2) no estimate has been made for the farmhouses below $£ 20$ in value, not included in the official figures; (3) the figures are hardly " official," as the classification of House Duty cases fails to correspond : (4) no estimate is made for void property; (5) the
" shops" actually included are reckoned at their full value for residential purposes (in considering the character of income to be accommodated). Thus a house and shop at $£ 60$ is treated the same as a private house of the same value.

At this point the " remarkable closeness" to which he alludes in considering the number of incomes he has to accommodate disappears.-W. H. Mallocs, "Pitt's Income Tax Scheme," Nineteenth Century, March, 1910, p. 479.

Zorn puts the rent per household income of $£ 200$ at $£ 40$ 28., and for $f 125$ at 630 13s. ("Incidence of the Income Tax").

It is obvious that the higher the income the less the precise correspondence is likely to be between its amount and house rent. Some lay great stress on this lack of relation, ${ }^{1}$ and it was dealt with before the S. C. on Income Tax, 1906, ${ }^{3}$ but somewhat inconclusively bccause the examples given were chosen to prove the point, and also because total incomes were not quoted, but only Sch. D assessments with no division for partners' true shares. Even in this unpromising selection, however, a mode begins to be discernible -about 5 per cent. for the incomes round about $£ 4,000$, falling to 4 per cent. and less for incomes of larger amount. In these altitudes there is no doubt a wide variation. But it is strange that for lower incomes the variation gets less as the income increases. A feature that emerged from Mr. Cowcher's observations was that in groups "up to $£ 500$, " " $£ 500$ to $£ 1,000$, " and "or $f(\mathbb{E}, 000$ " the standard deviation became progressively less, and this seems to have a clear economic bearing on the question of elasticity of demand for houses.

## Number of Assessments Schs. $D$ and $E$ and Number of Taxpayers.

The use of the classification of assessments, for the purpose of ascertaining the number of taxpayers, by Baxter, Levi, Mallock, and others, has already been commented upon, and the chief difficulties are also referred to under

[^234]several heads in Chapter VI. The matter turns upon three points-(I) eliminating duplicates amongst the personal assessments; (2) assigning property and dividends to " persons who are also personally assessed under Schs. D and E ; (3) determining the number of those whose means consist solely of property and shares.

Under the second head the following statistical investigation is of interest:-

If one can form any estimate of the number of people who live entirely upon their property or dividends, without remunerated occupation, and of their aggregate income, it would be clear that the remainder of Sch. A and Sch. D (public companies, etc.) belongs, as "other income," to the salaricd or "earned income" class. It is proceeding upon false lines to say that if a certain aggregate assessment under Sch. D or Sch. E is paid by a certain number of persons the other aggregates are paid by a similar number in proportion, and to treat them all as diferent taxpayers. With a new class of relief upon unearned income, for "small incomes" under $£ 500$, statistics may be forthcoming to show the total unearned income belonging to such taxpayers. At present it is not possible to state what proportion of the salaried classes have "other income." I have for some time past made a series of observations, and have come to the conclusion that civil servants and teachers have perhaps the highest proportion, although, in view of their adequate pension provisions, it might have been thought that the incentive to thrift would be least amongst them. Out of 59 x elementary school teachers, with salaries from $£_{£ 60}$ to $£ 500,209$, or $35 \cdot 3$ per cent., had no other income. The percentage was progressively less as the salary increased:-Under $£ 200,38 \cdot 3$; between $£ 200$ and $£ 300,33 \cdot 4$; and above $£ 300,30 \cdot 3$. There was no definite relation between the amount of other income when graded finely. In broad groups it was a constant amount (E29) up to $£ 300$ salary and E5I above-approxi- $^{5}$ mating to equality in proportion for the two groups. A special mode at $f^{200}$ stood out above the average, viz, f.35, probably due to the fact that for many assistant teachers this was a maximum salary at which they had
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stood for some years, with no prospects beyond. The average for all cases with other income was $£ 32$, and for all the cases, with or without other income, $£ 20 \cdot 6$. Observation of salaries less than $£ 160$, but coming within the income tax because of the other income, indicated much larger proportions, progressively greater as the salaries became less. The reason is obvious: only the larger cases are included, the smaller ones not being sufficient to bring the total under observation, and the smaller the salary the larger the unearned income required to bring the total to view. I have excellent reason for estimating that the Civil Service would show, similarly, that about 65 per cent. have some other means, even if only a little bank deposit interest. Of over 3,000 bank officials of all grades 54.4 per cent. had other income, but the percentage amongst those with salaries over $£ 200$ was much higher. Although stockbrokers' clerks might be expected perhaps to have great facilities and inducements for investment, the percentage amongst them with means is comparatively low.

## Pareto's Law.

This law has been described as a " law for graduating incomes." It is strictly speaking an empirical formula which fits the distribution of incomps in different countries with success, and which may therelore be used with confidence as an interpolation formula, but with less reliability for extending a known distribution into lower or higher scales of income where distribution is unknown. "It breaks down at the extremities . . . and gives an infinite number of persons with no incomes, and one person with an infinite income." ${ }^{1}$ If the formula is given for middle class incomes it will be found to require modification for the highest or for the lowest incomes. Dr. Bowley has explained its use ${ }^{2}$

[^235]for the United Kingdom and furnished the following formule :-
$\mathrm{N}=\frac{\mathrm{A}}{\boldsymbol{x}^{*}} . \quad(\mathrm{N}=$ number of persons having a greater income than $x$ units per head.)
Number at $£ x=\frac{a \mathrm{~A}}{x^{a+1}}$. (A and $a$ are constants.)
Aggregate income above $£ x=£_{a-\boldsymbol{A a}}^{a-I} \cdot \frac{I}{x^{a-1}}$
Average income above $f_{x}=f_{a-I}^{a} \cdot x$.
In the case where $a=1 \cdot 5$, the average income between $f x_{1}-x_{3}$ is $f_{x_{2}+\sqrt{x_{1} x_{2}}+x_{n}}$

## CHAPTER XIV.

## Division of Property and Income into Categories.

Mayo-Suitr, in quoting the general income tax tables for 1896-7, remarks that it is impossible to trace " income to its source, either as derived from capital or from labour, from land or personal property, from accumulated wealth or from trade capital." ${ }^{1}$ Nevertheless, categories have frequently been attempted, and the chief lines of division may here be noted briefly and without any attempt to refer to all the long-forgotten excursions into this province.

## (x) Difforontiation: " Earned " and " Unearnod," " " Labour and Capital," ete.

From the very inception of the income tax there bave always been numerous writers upon the division of income into categories, "permanent and precarious," " spontaneous" and "industrial," "earned and unearned." Some of these have been in reference to proposed .forms of the system in the interests of just taxation, while others have been investigations into the relative burdens borne by the respective classes, or into the rate of increase of each of the classes.
With regard to the former, the argument and pleading do not belong strictly to this work, and we are concerned only with the distributions and statistical distinctions made. The reader is referred to the discussions themselves for further details ${ }^{3}$

[^236]The leading protagonist for reform along these lines was J. G. Hubbard, and an abstract of his scheme is appended to show his division in 1885 .

Sch. A was divided, one-fourth going to " capitalists" and not subject to an allowance for repairs. Sch. D is assigned one-half to capital and one-half to earned profits.

Discussion on the Income Tax, with proposed Bill (Right Hon. J. G. Hubbard, M.P., 1885).
Statement, showing the yield of a $5 d$. income tax levied on the assessments of $\mathbf{8 8 8} \mathrm{I}-2$, compared with the estimated yield of a $6 d$. income tax levied under the provisions of the Income Tax Administration Amendment Bill :-

| Schedule. | Yield of 5d. Tax ( 5000 ). | Assessment, 1881-2 ( 6000 ). | Rate and Amount of Abatements ( 600 ). | Revised Assessment ( 5000 ). | $\begin{gathered} \text { Yield } \\ \text { at } 6 d . \\ (f 000) . \end{gathered}$ | Plus or Minus ( $6 \times 00$ ). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A: Owners . Capitalint | 2,709 $\mathbf{9 0 2}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 130,0 \times 3 \\ 43.337 \end{array}$ | 27.736 | $\begin{array}{r} 102,277 \\ 43.338 \end{array}$ | 2,557 1,084 | - 152 +882 |
|  | $\begin{array}{r} 3,611 \\ 321 \\ 834 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 173.350 \\ - \\ 39.993 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \left.\begin{array}{c} 27.736 \\ \text { (16 per cont.) } \end{array}\right) \\ \text { - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 845,615 \\ - \\ 39,993 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 3.641 \\ 321 \\ 998 \end{array}$ | $+164$ |
|  | $\}_{4,809}{ }_{568}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} - \\ \text { Ird } 38,476 \\ \text { frd } \\ 9,095 \end{gathered}$ | 115,428 <br> 76.952 <br> 18,190 | $\begin{array}{r} 2,885 \\ 1,994 \\ 455 \end{array}$ | $\}_{-113}$ |
|  | 10,143 | - | - | - | 10,224 | $+8 \mathrm{r}$ |

Analyses of income tax assessments to show the increase in the income from capital and from salaries and wages of superin-

[^237]tendence respectively have also been made. Giffen gave the following summary (in millions):-


In this computation he makes the following estimates:-
Sch. A.-Assigned to capital, although "it is well known that not even in Sch. A is the income obtained without exertion and care, and some risk of loss, which are entitled to remuneration."

Sch. B. $-\left\{25\right.$ to capital in 1881 ( $£ 22 \frac{1}{1}$ in 1862 and 20 in 1843) with the note: "Interest on 500 millions of capital in 1881 at 5 per cent. In my paper on accumulations of capital I estimated agricultural capital at a larger sum than this; but since then there has been some loss of agricultural capital, and if a larger sum were taken, the rate of interest used in the calculation for the present parpose should be less." To "salaries, etc.," he assigns $\mathfrak{£} 36, \mathfrak{£} 381$, and $£ 44$ respectively. The totals of the two categories bear no discoverable relation to the Sch. B assessments.

Sch. C.-Assigned wholly to "capital."
Sch. E.-Assigned wholly to " salaries, etc."
Sch. D.-Includes mines, etc. (concerns No. III., Sch. A) throughout, the Sch. A figures excluding them throughout. Part I., "Trades and Professions," is divided between the two :-

$$
\begin{aligned}
& 1843 \text { - - } £ 46 \frac{1}{2} \text { salaries. . - } £ 29 \frac{1}{2} \text { capital } \\
& 1862 \text {. . } \mathrm{f} 49 \text { " . . . } \mathrm{E} 32 \text { " } \\
& \text { 1881 . . } \mathbf{E 1 0 0 ~ " . ~ . ~ . ~} 64 \text { " }
\end{aligned}
$$

and the 188 I division is explained as follows:- " Estimating that the income here is worth four years' purchase, and that it may be capitalised at that rate, and then allowing that this capital earns Io per cent., the rest being wages of superintendence, I have rather exaggerated than depreciated the estimate for capital employed in trades and professions, my estimate being rather more than that of Mr. Dudley Baxter in his famous paper. . . ." Part II, "Public Companies," is assigned wholly to capital, " although the vigilance necessary and the risk attendant on the business are really most serious, and part of the so-called profit is . . . strictly remuneration of labour."

Irelend.-An estimate is made for 1843, the total gross income under all schedules thas estimated being about $\{30,000,000$.

It will be observed that, although he eadeavoured to make all the necessary qualifications, Giffen omitted to notice that, while the Schs. D and E figures for 1843 and 188 r are comparable (incomes of $£ 150$ and upwards), the year $186 \mathrm{I}-2$ includes incomes $f 100$ to $f 150$, and is therefore not comparable with the others. In his subsequent remarks, however, where he concludes that the capitalist classes have advanced in forty years IIO per cent., working income in income tax returns 100 per cent., and working income not in income tax returns $\mathbf{x} 60$ per cent., this error has no effect ("Economic Inquiries," I., pp. 415-19).

Dr. Bowley, before the S. C. on Income Tax, 1906, assigned Sch. A and Sch. C, one-half of Sch. D ( $£ 221,000,000$ ), and the whole of Sch. D evasion ( $£ 35,000,000$ ) to the uncarned class. ${ }^{1}$ The income of public companies alone, however, without the unearned income assessed on persons and firms, was $£ 267,000,000$, or $£ 46,000,000$ more. The present statistics of differentiation do not enable an exact figure to be given, and it can only be said that earned income must be considerably in excess of $£ 234,000,000$ out of $£ \$ 66,000,000$.

Messrs. Mallet and Strutt allocated to unearned income as follows ${ }^{2}$ :-Under Sch. A, all except the income of clergy from landed property ; under Sch. B, a small amount for interest on loans to farmers ( 60,000 ) ; under Sch. C, all except small payments to clergy, etc.; under Sch. D, the whole of public companies' profits, but no part of the income of persons and firms except $£ 5,000,000$ for charges such as royalties, interest on loans, annuities, etc. ; under Sch. E, a small amount for interest on loans. The allowance of $£ 5,000,000$ for charges of this character appears to me to be very small, but otherwise the method is a distinct improvement on earlier estimates.

Productive and Unproductive Income.-W. R. Lawson, quoting the 1900-I figures, remarked:-" Of the 594 millions on which the tax was paid, a large proportion represented non-productive income, rents of land and houses, annuities, interests and dividends, salaries of Government and other public officials. The only income adding unquestionably to the wealth of the nation was that under Schs. B and D, namely, farming and business

[^238]profits. These formed less than 360 millions out of a total of 594 millions" ("Two Record Budgets, 1860 and 1903," Fortnightly Reviev, May, 1903).

## (2) Division of Capital into Real and Porsonal Property.

This division has generally been attempted in order to ascertain the relative burden of taxation on each class, and Goschen's Report on Local Taxation, with his use of tax statistics to show the increase in real property, has been widely quoted. Sir R. H. Inglis Palgrave (on "Local Taxation ') and Leone Levi (S. J., r884) have followed similar methods.

Baxter's division was " landed incomes," "personalty incomes," and "industrial incomes," but his treatment did not involve any actual analysis of total incomes.

This division for ascertaining incidence bristles with difficulties. For example, it is not a decided point as to whether land tax is a " tax," or whether redeemed land tax should be considered. How far rates are a burden on the thing which Lappens to be used as the measure of what shall be charged is an unsettled problem, and in view of the fact that taxes are paid by persons, and not by things, is probably not capable of ultimate solution.

In Lord Milner's view this distinction between realty and personalty is entirely a legal one, without economic significance, and is therefore to be fistinguished from the distinction between rateable and non-rateable property.

The Treasury classification in 1885 (H. C. 345 -" Paget's Return : Imperial Taxation on Real and Realised Personal Property") assigned the income from quarries and fishings, one-half of the income from mines and canals, and one-fifth of the income from waterworks, to "real property." For personal property the allocation included farming stock and implements, public debt, Indian and colonial funds, ironworks, gasworks, " other" public companies, foreign and colonial securities, railways (in and out of the United Kingdom), mortgages on rates, other profits, one-fifth of trades and professions, and the respective balances of mines, canals, and waterworks. With regard to the three last named, the
principle of division was based upon ownership-" where concerns are carried on either by companies or in partnership the interests of the shareholders or partners are deemed to be personal estate and are so treated for taxation. On the other hand, where . . . owned by individuals, they are regarded as real estate, and similarly where an interest in such con-cerns is retained by the owner by means of the reservation of rents or royalties, such interest is deemed to be real estate and is taxed accordingly." Railways, ironworks, and gasworks were taken as personal property, although partly really in value, because for Imperial taxation they were so treated (i.e., Sch. D instead of Sch. A and Probate Duty instead of Succession Duty).

Since 1900 and until recently the tax statistics have distinguished the assessments according to ownership, and it is clear that on this basis of division for mines the assignment to realty is too great, and for waterworks the one-fifth is also far in excess of the facts.
"Out of 1899 tax (income tax), $£ 18,200,000,1899-00$, £4,000,000 is derived from professional success and should more correctly be charged as taxes not incidental to property" (" British Finance in the Nineteenth Century," Edinburgh Review, 1899).
(3) Division into Rateable and Non-ratoable Proparty.

Lord Milner's classification before the R. C. on Agriculture, 1896, ${ }^{1}$ may be taken as typical :-

Assigned wholly to rateable property: Lands, houses, fishings, etc.

Assigned wholly to non-rateable property: Farmers' capital, Sch. C securities, railways out of the United Kingdom, foreign and colonial securities and interest, public companies, capital in trades and professions.
Assigned partly to one and partly to the other class: Quarries, mines, ironworks, gasworks, salt springs, waterworks, canals, markets, tolls, etc., railways.

[^239]The amount assigned in each case to rateable value was not a fixed proportion of the income tax assessments, but the actual sum rated under each head, the balance only. being assigned to the non-rateable class.

## 4) Division inte Claseos (by Amounts of Incomes) to Test Relative Tax Burdens.

Dudley Baxter and Leone Levi made a division of this character, ${ }^{1}$ but it was very broad, and the whole of the income assessed to tax was taken as belonging to the upper and middle classes in contrast to the manual labour class. But more detailed division has been attempted, generally by means of the Schs. D and E classification.
Such statements as that attributed to Joseph Chamberlain (in his earlier days) that the $f x 0,000$ income paid 3 or 4 per cent. in taxation and the working man 6 per cent. were usually arrived at by examination of typical cases rather than by aggregates.

## (5) Income " direetly" and " indireetly " Taxod.

The proportion of income taxed on " direct declaration" ${ }^{2}$ and that based on assessment by "external marks," or, as they say in America, from " view," is sometimes discussed, particularly in relation to foreign schemes of "global" taration. The description "declar-fion of taxpayer unnecessary " is somewhat misleading as applied to "Sch. A." It is true that the income can be assessed without a return and does not depend upon one, but an owner-occupier makes a "declaration"; only so far as his mortgagee or his ground landlord are concerned is it correctly described.

[^240]
## APPENDIX I.

GROSS ASSESSMENTS, SCHS. D AND E, 1894-5, 1876-7, AND 1853-4.
Methods by which the Effects of the Changes in the Exemption Limit bave been estmated for the Tables in Chapters VI. and VII.
When the Finance Act, 1894, raised the exemption limit from £ 150 to $£ 160$ a considerable sum automatically fell out of the gross assessments under Schs. D and E, but, for reasons already stated, the totals under Schs. A, B, and C were unafficted. (The abatement on incomes below $£ 400$ was raised from $£ 120$ to $£ 160$, but this had no effect upon gross assessments under any of the schedules.) There is no direct information upon the amount lost, for although it is stated that the cost, in duty at $8 d$. in the 6 , was by way of allowance from the assessment $£ 78,000$, and by way of repayment $\{55,800$ (39th Report, p. ro5), these details would convey nothing in terms of gross assessment even if the separate schedules were given. The following typical cases will show the nature of the changes effected :-

|  | Betare the Change |  |  | After the Changa |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Crum | Abats meat | Nat | Crom | Abatomeat | Not |
|  <br> 2. Wares ETss (asd total incoma) <br> 2. Warem Siso <br> 4. Wages Sras (and total monemel) <br> 5. Property, 140 ; intirest, $\mathrm{E}=0$ <br> 6. Property, 8to: batment, ©ys <br>  <br>  <br> o Sahart, Sx90 (emonnod Sch E and abatiod) : inturost es <br> sa. Silary, fise timernd |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \underline{E} \\ \square \\ - \\ - \\ \mathbf{3} \\ \mathbf{3} \\ - \\ - \end{array}$ | 56 $\begin{aligned} & \text { ung } 60 \\ & \text { poot } 75 \\ & \text { powity } \end{aligned}$ |  |

[^241]Similar changes took place in $1876-7$ and in 1853-4. There are various methods by which the change in the total gross assessment attributable to the change in the exemption limit can be estimated for Schs. D and E.

The first method, that of Average Increase, is a rough one, only to be used when other methods are not available. It assumes, first, that, if no legal change had been made, the gross figures would have exhibited the same average natural increase that had been present in the three or four preceding years; secondly, that if the new conditions bad applied to the year before the change, that year would have exhibitcd the same average natural decrease which was present in the three or four succeeding years, comparing each year with its successor. Then in the first case, taking the estimated year of old conditions from the same actual year of new conditions, we have the amount due to the change; in the second case a similar subtraction gives the amount of gross assessments for incomes or parts of incomes between the two limits for the preceding year; and the mean of the results is the estimated loss or gain as the case may be.

The second method, that of Abatemente, is a finer one, because it confines consideration to a smaller class of income, and, unlike the first method, is not affected by considerable variations in large assessments. It assumes for the year of change abatements similar to the preceding year plus the average increase of the years immediately before. The actual figures of the new conditions for that year are compared with this estimated result, and the difference is attributed to the change. A converse process, as in the first method, gives the amount of the same range of assessment for the preceding year, and the mean of the results is taken to minimise the riaks of error in the averas ${ }_{0}$ increase in abatements. To the result must be added an estimate for gross assessments not affected in any way by abatements, such as No. 9 in the examples.

The third method is that of Classification of Gross Amesments. After determining the maximum gross assessment usually affected by the exemption limit in question (which is about twice the amount of that limit), the total of the classes, which include the sum so determined, is compared for the year of change and the year preceding, the difference, after making a deduction for normal increase, being due to the change. Thus the change of exemption limit from $£ 150$ to $£ 160$ cannot affect an assessment of $E x, 000$, which remains the same in the two years, but $\in 310$ profits for two partners (having no other income) would be in assessment in one year and not in assessiment in the other. Conceivably $£ 620$ for four partners could drop out in the same way, but the case is rare and may be ignored.

The fourth method is that of Classitication of Net Assessments. This is not so exact as the third method, but it is necessary because for many years this classification was the only one published. It is essential first to bring the net assessments into terms of gross assessment by estimates or otherwise. The total abatements allowable can be allocated to the several classes by proportion, and in this way the sum to be added to any given class of net assessments to find the corresponding gross assessments may be estimated. But a better course is to determine the highest class (in amount) which can possibly exhibit a difference, due to abatements, between gross and net and to aggregate it with all the classes below, adding thereto the whole of the sum abated. In this way a sum is obtained for each year which, while not so narrowly confined to the assessments affected by exemption limits as the sums taken above may be, yet represents the true gross assessments of the lower and least fluctuating classes. Comparison of the two years is carried out as in the third method.

The fifth method is that of Dilforential Rates of Duty. It is used for 1853-4 and for interpolation in succeeding years, and is described with the computations on p. 489.

The sixth method is that of the Changed Average Assessment, described on p. 488, with the computations for 1875-6.

Sch. D, 1894-5: Exemption Limit raised from $£ 150$ to $£ 160$.

## First Method: Average Increase.

It is unnecessary to take the whole of the Sch. D figures into consideration, since an analysis into ( I ) "trades and professions," (2) public companies, and (3) "Concerns No. III., Sch. A," is provided, and (2) is wholly unaffected by the change, while (3) is affected only to a negligible extent. For ( I ) the figures are :-


The question is whether, if the exemption limit had remained unchanged, the $1894-5$ figures would have continued the decline of $1892-3$ and $1893-4$ or begun the recovery of $1895-6$ and subsequent years. These years were so wholly exceptional in trade conditions that the method is hardly applicable, but the analysis of assessments into amounts helps us to determine some of the constituent elements in the change.


Now the net assessments for gross assessments exceeding $£ 800$ are very unlikely to be affected by abatements, and except for life insurance and wear and tear (sufficiently constant to be ignored in a-comparison of years) the net and gross will correspond. By comparing these net assessments with previous years we can narrow down the inquiry. The net assessments for this group ( $£ 800$ gross and upwards) in $1893-4$ were $£ 80,202$, and for $1892-3$ £85,901. So that of the total decrease in gross assessments in $1894-5$ ( $£ 13,419$ ) $£ 7,164$ is assignable to the group unaffected by the change in law, leaving $£ 6,255$ to be dealt with in the other group. (Moreover, while the total decrease in gross assessments in 1893-4 was $£ 5,242$, the decrease in this group of assessments was $£ 5,700$, or an actual increase in the lower group.) We are thus led to the fourth method.

Fourth Method: Classification of Wet Aswesments.

|  | 1892-3. | 1893-4 | 1894-5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Gross assessments not exceeding $f^{800}$ (assessed net, (000) Abatements (net, $\mathbf{( 0 0 0 )}$. | $\begin{aligned} & 58,2061 \\ & 39,552 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 58,193^{1} \\ & 40,133 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 47.658 \\ & 44.522 \end{aligned}$ |
| Gross assesements not exceeding $t^{800-t o t a l, ~ w i t h o u t ~ i n ~}$ smirance allowances ( $\mathbf{( 0 0 0 )}$ ). | 97,848 | 98,326 | - 92,180 |

(The whole of the abatements Sch. D are added, and not merely the portion applicable to "trades and professions," because

[^242]no apportionment is available prior to 1894-5. The error is negligible on a comparison of years.)
The 1893-4 increase is $£ 478$; the $1894-5$ decrease is $£ 6,146$.
If we assume that 1894-5 would normally have been the same as 1893-4, the whole of this decrease, $\notin 6,146$, is assignable to the change, while if we assume a normal increase, the decrease due to the change is pro tanto increased. It has been seen that a large decrease in the higher classes is quite consistent with an increase in the lower classes (2893-4), and it can easily be understood that a depression in each of the upper groups of the classes will increase the number and amount of cases falling into the lower classes (unless there is a corresponding depression in those lower classes pushing down equivalent numbers and sums into the exempt class) to bring about the result. As a fact, the burden of all large fluctuations has to be borne by the higher classes, since the lower ones represent assessments much more stable and presenting in general a steady increase, such as salaried employments and retail businesses assessed on conventional or round figures, correct in the long run, but not moving, as a mass, freely with trade conditions. Hence in 1894-5 we find, looking at the numbers of assessments, decreases in each of the upper classes from "over £50,000" to " $£ 800$ to $£ 900$," and in the total of these classes, 3.648 in number. Now, normally (though a few might disappear as cases of " loss "), the lower classes would be increased by this number beyond the normal increase of this group (or at any rate by this number, allowing for no normal increase in a year of depression). So on examination we find the process begun at " $£ 700$ to $£ 800$," where $1893-4$ had 5,122 cases and 1894-5 5,24I ; but below this it is counterbalanced by the change in law, and every group shows a not decrease. Now, as the group $£ 700$ to ${ }^{5} 800$ is that in which the change in law reaches its minimum effects, the above reasoning is fully justified, and we are entitled to assume that with an unchanged law the lower group would have shown a marked increase in numbers, and would have exhibited the effects of the transfer of the 3.648 cases from the higher groups. Now, since the response to trade conditions for assessments below $£^{6} 00$ is much slighter than for assessments between $£ 400$ and $£ 800$, we may assume that the 3,648 cases fell mainly into the latter and the former merely maintained its position. The average of these cases may fairly be taken at $\{550$ each, or $\{2,006,400$ in all. Then the table may be continued :-


## APPENDIX 1.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { f000 } \\
& \text { Brought forward . . - 98,326 } \\
& \text { 1894-5. Estimated gross assessments (up to } \\
& \text { £800) . . . . . (add) 2,006 } \\
& \text { 1894-5. Estimated gross assessments (up to } \\
& £ 800 \text { ) (would have been under for- } \\
& \text { mer conditions) . . . . 100,332 } \\
& \text { 1894-5. Estimated gross assessments were } \\
& \text { actually for changed conditions - } \mathbf{9 2 , 1 8 0}_{8} \\
& \text { Difference . . . . . . 8,152 }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Second Method: Abatements.

Prior to 1888-9 these were not given separately for each schedule, but after that they were as follows:-

| Year. | Abatement, f120(1000). | Annual Increase. | Number of Abatements | Annual Increase. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1888-9. | 38,188 | - | 318,237 |  |
| 1889-90 | 38,455 | 267 | 320,460 | 2,223 |
| 1890-1. | 38,956 | 501 | 324,637 | 4,177 |
| 1891-2. | 39,284 | 327 | 327,198 | 2,561 |
| +1892-3. | 39,552 | 268 | 329,601 | 2,403 |
| 1893-4. | 40,133 | 58x | 334,441 | 4,840 |
| Average | - | 389 | - | 3,241 |
| 1893-4 (actual figures) . <br> Add average increase. <br> 1894-5 (estimated figures) Add one-third (abatements altered from $£ 120$ to $£ 160$ ) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} \quad 334,44 \mathrm{I} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | - 337,682 | 337,682 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Total . . . 54,030 |  |  |  |  |
| 1895-6 (similarly) Add average increase. |  | - 40,5 | $\begin{array}{r}2 \\ 9\end{array} \quad 337,682$ |  |
|  |  | - |  |  |  |
| Add one | ird . | $\begin{array}{r}40,9 \\ -\quad 13.6 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | 7 - 340,923 |  |
|  |  | 54,5 |  |  |  |


| - | 1894-5. |  | 1895-6. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | \$000 | Cases. | 6000 | Cases. |
| Estimated under old conditions of exemption limit | 54,030 | 337,682 | 54,548 | 340,923 |
| Actual abatements under new conditions | $43.841$ | 274,008 | 45,197 | 282,483 |
| Difference, due to change in exemption limit | 10,189 | 63,674 | 9,351 | 58,440 |

(Note.-Small assessments not subject to abatement at all, rcpresenting parts of total incomes between $£ 150$ and $£ 160$ (such as No. 9 in the examples), would not be touched by these figures, and must be added to the differences shown. In the aggregate they could not amount to much. All assessments under $£ 160$, forming parts of incomes of all magnitudes, came to $£ \mathrm{I}, 979$ net in 1894-5 and $£ 1,882$ in $\mathbf{1 8 9 5 - 6}$, and these sums therefore represent maximum figures. 'An estimate of onequarter would be an outside figure for the purpose.)
If the number of cases above is multiplied by $£_{£} 160$, the same result is reached. It leads, as a first approach, to the conclusion that the gross assessment fell about $£ 10,700$ and $£ 9,850$ in 1894-5 and 1895-6.

Conversely, carrying the new conditions back prior to 1894-5 :-


## Notes on these Results.

(r) There is the necessary assumption that an abatement of £ 160 could be allowed from an assessment of $£ 150$ or $£ 155$ in the years for which estimates on the old conditions have been made. This affects the figures slightly.
(2) Of more importance is the defective material upon which the above computations in regard to abatements have been worked. In 1894-5 no information was given as to abatements " allowed by schedule" (vide 45th Report, p. 209). The table shows that the difference between the old and the new figures, after adjusting 1893-4 for the effect of the re-assessment year under Schs. A and B, was much greater in 1894-5 than in the prior and succeeding years, bearing out the statement already abundantly verified that in a year of legislative change that change is given effect to imperfectly so far as the assessment figures are concerned, and falls late, swelling the " allowances by schedule." Thus, from the table, more than 6,000 abatements $£ 160$ were allowed by schedule in 1894-5 in excess of the abatements $£ 120$ in 1893-4, and the number attributable to Sch. D was about 4,000 . If, therefore, we substitute for the actual number 274,008 on p. 479, 278,008, we have a difference of 59,674 only, or £9,548,000.
(3) In taking the average increase in numbers on p. 478 at 3.241 , it seems quite possible on inspection of the figures that the real increase was less; it is not likely to have been less than 50 per cent., say 1,600 , and on this assumption the figure £ $9,548,000$ above is reduced to $£ 9,350,000$.

Besults of Methods.-Fourth, $£ 8,152,600$; second, $£ 9,450,000$ Figure taken, $£ 8,800,000$ ( $\pm £ 700,000$ ).

ScR. E, 1894-5.
Second Lethoil: Abatementa.

| Year | Amount (fool) | Number. | Increase: Amount ( $\mathbf{( 0 0 0 )}$ ) | Increased Namber. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1890-1. | 9,800 | 81,665 |  |  |
| 1891-2. | 10,356 | 86,300 | 556 | 4,635 |
| 1892-3. | 10,999 | 97,656 | 643 | 5,356 |
| 1893-4. | 11,561 | 96,344 | 563 | 4,688 |
| 1894-5. | 13.769 | 86,06I |  |  |

$\ddagger \quad$ Cases.

| 1893-4 (actual amount and number allowed). Add average increase | $\begin{array}{r} 17.561 \\ 587 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 96,344 \\ 4,893 \end{array}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1894-5 (estimated: on old conditions). | 12,148 | 101,237 |
| Add, to convert $£ \mathrm{I} 20$ into £x6o abatements (onethird) |  |  |
| actua amount and number | 16 |  |
| Difference ( 15,176 at |  |  |
| $\left(2,42^{8}\right)$ | 2,428 | 15,176 |

Sirth Method : Changed Average Assessment.

| Year. | Amount (fooo). | Number. | Averago Assessment. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1890-1 | 47,707 | 231,326 | 206 |
| 1892-3 | 51,583 | 246,789 | 209 |
| 1893-4 | 52,591 | 250,503 | 209.9 |
| 1894-5 | 51,040 | 235,574 | 216.6 |
| 1898-9 | 65,288 | 296,962 | 219 |

1893-4 (actual number) . . . . 250.503
Add annual increase 189I-2 to 1893-4 - 2,743
1894-5 (estimated number: old conditions) . 253,246
1894-5 (at the old average, $£ 210$ ). . . $£ 53,18 \mathrm{I}$
1894-5 (actual figures) . . . . 51,040
Decreese . . . . . . $\{\mathbf{2 , 1 4 1}$

## Thiri Wothoi: Fite Aswesments

Although parliamentary papers are available. ${ }^{1}$ and the information given is used for Sch. D, it cannot be used for Sch. E, the
${ }^{2}$ H. C. 165-1894, 324-1895 and 216-1896. In the latter the bracket from "not excoeding 6160 " to " not exceeding $£ 400$ " in evidently a misprint, and it should include the nert class, excoeding 8500 .
classes having been altered in 1894-5, and no comparison is possible.

Estimate adoptei, $£ 2,280,000( \pm £ 150,000)$.
The Brear in 1876-7: Sch. D.
In the 20th Report (p. 52) the effict of the extension of the exemption limit from fioo to f 150 is provisionally given as follows (in thousands) :-

| - | 1875-6. | 1876-7. | Decrease. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of persons assessed, $\underset{E}{\mathbf{D}}$ | 603.2 | $437 \cdot 2$ | 166 |
|  | 186-7 | 1478 | 38.9 |
| Total | 789.9 | 585 | 204.9 |

This " does not indeed represent the full measure of relief affiorded under these schedules alone by the extension of the limit of exemption from $£ 100$ to $£ 150$, because if there had been no alteration in the law the total number of persons chargeable in $1876-7$ would probably have been greater by at least 40,000 than the number chargeable in 1875-6, so that it may be estimated that there were about 244,000 fewer persons brought into assessment for $18 \% 6-7$ under Schs. $D$ and $E$ than there would have been."
If we divide the estimate of $40,000 \mathrm{jp}$ proportion to the total numbers in the Schs. D and E and add three-fourths, or 30,000, to Sch. D, the decrease in numbers assessed is 196,000 . In the 2rst Report ( p .56 ) fuller details were available, and the following estimate is made:-" In explanation of the decrease of $\{15,064,868$ for $1876-7$, it is necessary to point out that the extension.... caused a considerable diminution in the number of persons liable to be charged under Sch. D. There were 568,229 persons charged for the year 1875-6, and if the limit of exemption had not been altered, the number of persons liable to be assessed in 1876-7 would probably have exceeded 600,000 , but the number actually charged for that year was 401,137, and it may be observed that an average assesment of only $\mathbf{f x 0 0}$ on 200,000 additional persons would have represented $\left\{20,000,000\right.$ of gross profits. ${ }^{1}$ Notwithstanding there were decreases in several items under Sch. D.

[^243]there were increases under some other heads, and but for the change in regard to the limit of exemption the assessments for 1876-7 would probably have shown an increase not less than for the preceding year."

## First Method.

If we deal with the gross figures on this assumption, they would have been (in thousands):-


If we take the mean of these two results, the loss was \{19,430,000 ( + ).

The increase from 1876-7 to 1877-8 of $\mathbf{~} 3,718,000$ would of course have been greater if the incomes $£ 100$ to $£ 150$ had also been included, so that it is a fair assumption that the real increase in each of three years-1875-6, 1876-7 and 1877-8-was between four and five millions. (The increase of the five preceding years was $£ 82,949,000$ and of the five succeeding years $\{10,494,000$, the average being $\{9,343,000$. On this basis the "loss" was \{24.408,000, but there is no ground for preferring the estimate to the one already given, which definitely follows the obvious trend of the time, and is supported by an analysis of the classification of profits.)

In the 28th Report (p. 299), from the table of assessments 1868-9 to $1883-4$ classified according to amounts (in which the classification from 1873-4 is determined by the amount of the gross assessment, but the sums actually included are the not assessments), we may find collateral evidence by the fowrth methoil:-

| Class (1875-6). | Number charged. | Amount of Profits charged ( 000 omitted). | Add for Abate ments. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Estimated } \\ & \text { Grose. } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under $f_{100}$ a year . froo and under $E 150$ E 150 and under $£ 200$ | $\begin{array}{r} 34,601 \\ 243,643 \\ 92,593 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} f \\ 993 \\ 9,243 \\ 8,699 \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} f, 000 \\ 16,000 \\ \mathbf{1 6 , 3 0 0} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} f, 000 \\ 25,250 \\ 15,000 \end{array}$ |
| Assessments under $\mathbf{t 2 0 0}^{\mathbf{2 0}}$ (total gross) |  |  |  | 42,250 |

The anounts in col. 4 are arrived at-(a) for assessments under £roo by an estimate ; many of the assessments would be alike in gross and net, having no abatement, but others would have parts of the $£ 80$ abatement allowed, and the practical margin of error is not great ; (b) for the other classes by assigning the total abatements ( $£ 29,100,280 \div £ 80$ ), after deducting the amount above referred to for the first class, and after making an allowance for the $\mathrm{f} \mathbf{w}$ cases of firms where abatements are allowed against assesiments above $£ 300$, between the three classes $£ 100$ to $£ 150$, $£ \times 50$ to $£ 200$, and $£ 200$ to $£ 300$, in the same proportion as the numbers of assessments in those classes.

| Class (1876-7). | Number charged. | Amount of Profits charged (000 omitted). | Add for Abatements. | Estimated Gross. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under f150. 4150 to $£ 200$. | $\begin{array}{r} 60,450 \\ 132,833 \end{array}$ | $\underset{\substack{2,175 \\ 6,70 \cdot}}{f}$ | $\begin{array}{r} t \\ 2,000 \\ 13,000 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} f \\ 4,200 \\ 19,700 \end{array}$ |
| Assemments under $£ 200$ (total groms) |  |  |  | 23.900 |

The amount added for abatements is arrived at, as before, by an estimate in the first case and by dividing the total abatement $£ 27,420,000$ (after assigning a part to the "under $£ 150$ " class and a part to the "over $£ 400$ " classes) between the three classes " $£ 150$ to $£ 200, "$ " $£ 200$ to $£ 300$," and " $£ 300$ to $£ 400$ " in the same proportion as the numbers of assessments in those classes. The method is not very exact, but since it is the same for the two years, and it is the comparison rather than the absolute figures with which we are concerned, it may be expected to yield a fairly close result.

The difference between the total gross assessments "under $\mathrm{f} 200^{\circ}$ in the two years is therefore $\mathrm{f} 42,250,000-£ 23,900,000$,
(18,350,000. Now the great mass of the incomes (assessed to Sch. D) from $£ 100$ to $£ 150$ would fall in the combined class, but a few cases, such as assessments upon firms, in the following form:-

1875-6.-A. B. \& Co.-gross, $£ 280$; two abatements, $£ 160$; net $\{120$-would not be included since they would fall into the classes above $£ 200$ in 1875-6, and not appear at all in 1876-7, if the two partners had no other income and were therefore exempt in the latter year. Addition for this factor, and also the addition for a normal increase in the year in the class $£ \mathbf{r} 50$ to $£ 200$, will bring the estimate of $£ x 8,783,000$ close up to the total loss, already estimated at about $£ 20,000,000$.

But as the method of dividing the total abatements into sections is open to objection, and cannot be verified, it may be considered preferable to take the whole class of assessments below £ 400 , which must practically include all affected by the exemption limit, and so avoid splitting the abatement allowance at all, as follows:-

| Gross Income: Classes. | $\begin{aligned} & x 872-3-3 \\ & \left(\text { COOOO}^{2}\right) . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1875-6 \\ & (4000) . \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 8876-7 \\ & (4000) \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under fl 100 | 10,545 | 993 |  |
| froo- 150 |  | 9,243 |  |
| Under 1150. |  | - | 2,174 |
| 6100-4200. | 10,801 | 8.699 | 6,702 |
| 4200- 4300 | 9.903 | 15.840 | 13,016 |
| 7300- 4400 | 9.362 | 11,423 | 11,354 |
| Total net assessments | 40,617 | 46,198 | 33,246 |
| Abatements | 23.107 | 29,100 | 27,420 |
|  | 63.718 | 75,298 | 60,666 |
| Less life assurance (estimated). | 350 | 449 | 498 |
| Total gross assessments | 63,368 | 74.849 | 60,168 |



Second Method (modifled): Abatements.
Examining the abatement tables for corroborative evidence we find the following :-

| Abatement. | Year. | Amount ( ( 0000 omitted). | Number of Incomes. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| £60 on $£ 100$ to $£ 200$ | 1868-9 | 11,440 | 190,667 |
|  | 1869-70 | 12,006 | 200,100 |
|  | 1870-1 | 12,936 | 215,600 |
|  | 1871-2 | 13.593 | 226,550 |
|  | 1872-3 | 23,134 | 289,175 |
| $£ 80$ on $£ 100$ to $£ 300$ | 1873-4 | 25,290 | 316,125 |
|  | 1874-5 | 27,403 | 342,537 |
|  | 1875-6 | 29,193 | 364,912 |
| £120 on $£ 150$ to $£ 400\{$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1876-7 \\ & 1877-8 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 27,586 \\ & 30,044 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 229,884 \\ & 250,366 \end{aligned}$ |

Number of incomes $£ 100$ to $£^{200}$ ( $1871-2$ ) . 226,550
Add average increase ( 1868 -9 to 1871-2) . 11,961
Number of incomes $£ 100$ to $£ 200$ ( $\mathbf{1 8 7 2 - 3}$, estimated)

238,511
Actual number of incomes $£ 100$ to $£ 300(1872-3)$ 289,175
Estimated number of incomes $£ 200$ to $£ 300$ (1872~3) .

50,664
Assuming the same proportion was maintained in 1875-6, we have number of incomes $£ 200$ to $£ 300$ (1875-6)

64,000
And assuming the number of incomes $\{300$ to $£ 400$
was in the same ratio as the number of assessments $£ 200$ to $£ 300$ was to $£ 300$ to $£ 400$, i.e., 90,239: 36,673, we get:-

Number of incomes $£ 300$ to $£ 400(1875-6)$ - 26,000
Actual number of incomes $£ 100$ to $£ 300(1875-6) 365,000$
Estimated number of incomes $£^{100}$ to $£_{400}$ (1875-6) .

391,000
Actual namber of incomes $£ \times 50$ to $£ 400(1876-7) \mathbf{2 3 0 , 0 0 0}$

> Estimated number of incomes $\mathrm{fl}_{100}$ to $\mathrm{E}_{150}$ $(18 \gamma 6-7)(+$ year's growth $)$
. $\cdot$ At an average income of $£ 120$ this accounts for a loss of £19,320,000 (plus one year's growth).

Result.-On the whole, therefore, an estimate of $£ 20,000,000$ $\pm £ 500,000$ appears to be a safe one.

Sch. E: The Brear in 1876-7.
In the 2Ist Report it is pointed out that Sch. E showed a decrease of $£ 4,000,957$, but there was an estimated falling off of 44,000 in the numbers of persons assessed. If the average assessment was $£ 125$ (midway between the limits $£ 100$ and $f 150$ ), this gives $\{5,148,000$ dropped in $1876-7$.

## Fourth Method.

Net Assessments.-Tables in 28th Report, pp. 307-310 (fo00 omitted) :-

| Gross Incoma. | 1872-3. | 1875-6. | 1876-7. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under $£$ froo, but not exempt | 3,640 | 2,719 |  |
| ¢rion and under f200. - | 4.937 | 3.33 x |  |
| Under fis ${ }^{\text {a }}$, but not exempt | - |  | 3.004 |
| friso and under $£ 200$ |  | 2,871 | 2,104 |
| \% 200 to 6300 | 3.267 | 4,430 | 3,769 |
| t300 to ${ }^{\text {d }} 400$ | 3,01I | 3,417 | 3,077 |
| Total of net assessments under $f_{400}$ (gross) | 14,855 | 16,160 | 11,954 |
| Total sums allowed as abatements |  | 5.352 | 5.135 |
| Total gross assessments under $£ 400$. | 19,231 | 21,492 | 17,088 |
| Add to 1875-6, normal increase on third of (211,492-£19,23I . Add for life insurance, less in 1876 than 1875-6 through change exemption limit |  | 754 |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  | 30 |  |
| Estimated 1876-7 gross on previous |  |  |  |
| lines Actual $1876-7$ gross an new lines |  | £22,276 |  |
|  |  | 17,088 |  |
| Loss through exemption change |  | 5,188 |  |

Sixth Methoo.
Numbers of Assessments.-28th Report, p. 317 :-

| Year. | Numbera. | Gross Assestments ( 000 omitted). | Average Asemment. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1872-3 | 163.215 | $\underset{30,007}{f}$ | ${ }_{18} 8$ |
| 1875-6 | 186,679 | 34,044 | 182 |
| 1876-7 | 148,076 | 30,043 | 203 |
| 1883-4 | 184,122 | 37,734 | 205 |

It is clear from an inspection of the figures that the average assessment remained very constant in 1872-5 conditions at $£ 182$, and in the 1876 at seq. conditions at $£ 203$, slowly increasing. The increase in the exemption limit was therefore responsible for the sudden jump from $£ 182$ to $\{203$. From 1872-3 to $1875-6$ there was an increase of $\mathbf{2 3 , 4 6 4}$ persons, or $\mathbf{7 , 8 2 1}$ per annum ; adding this normal increase to $1875-6$ gives 194,500 for 1876 , on the old conditions-

|  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Lost, through exemption change |  |  |  |
| First Methoil |  |  |  |
| Gross Assessments, 1875-6 (000 omitted) |  |  |  |
| Add normal increase ( $34,044-29,539) \div 3$ |  |  |  |
| Estimated $(1876-7) \quad . \quad . \quad .1: \quad . \quad 35.511$Actual, $1876-7$ |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| nge |  |  |  |

Result-It appears, therefore, that the loss was about £5,300,000 $\pm$ £ $\mathbf{1 0 0 , 0 0 0}$.

Sch. D: Breat ma 1853-4
First ITethoil.
(000 omitted).
Year 1852-5 (Great Britain) . . . . 58,645

+ Three years' average, 1849-52 (increase) . 1,739
1853-4 (estimate) . . . . . 60,384 1853-4 (actual) • . . . . . 75,008

Difference, 1853-4 . . . . 146624

The actual figure should be much less because in 1853 new assessments were made, and the increase above $8852-3$ would be greater than the preceding average.

Third Method: Analysis of Assessments (Great Britain).
There is no necessity to carry the comparison beyond $£ 300$ assessments, as this will cover the case of two partners previously exempt.

(Difference, without normal increase in the year, $£ \mathbf{x} 2,240$.)
A careful inspection of the figures for succeeding years seems to indicate that a considerable excess sum was brought into charge in the first year of the new conditions, so that this result represents a maximum, and the probable real figure would not exceed ©II,000.

For Ireland the actual figure in 1855-6 was $£ 590$ (charged at II\&d.), so that the total by this method would not exceed \&iI.590.

## Firth Mothod: Diferential Rates

In the years 1853-4 to 1862-3 (except for 1858-9) differential rates of duty existed for incomes between £100 and $£ 150$ and those above fiso. As the aggregate net assessments ( N ) and the actual aggregate amounts of duty charged (D) are given, the net assessment charged at the lower rate ( $n_{2}$ ) should be ascertainable by the following formula, where $r_{1}$ and $r_{2}$ are the higher and lower rates respectively :-

$$
n_{2}=\frac{N r_{1}-D}{r_{1}-r_{1}}
$$

But on testing it with $D$ as given in the Reports it is found that the errors in $N$ and $D_{1}{ }^{1}$ due to composition duty and additional
${ }^{2}$ Vide Chapter VI.
assessments, are large in relation to the amount $\mathrm{N} r_{1}-\mathrm{D}$ and give a misleading result. Recourse to the annual parliamentary returns, with the classification of assessments, ${ }^{1}$ solves the difficulty, however, since the amount of tax applicable to each class is given. For all the classes except the two lowest this tax works out exactly at the higher rate, but on the others it is at a mixed rate, and the proportion charged at the lower rate can be found by the formula. An addition is necessary for allowances by schedule, and for concerns under No. III., Sch. A. The result is as follows ( 000 omitted) : -

(Estimate adopted, $£ 11,000,000 \pm £ 1,000,000$.)
Sce. E : Break in 1853-4.
First method gives $£ 1,895,000$ for Great Britain.
Third mekhod (differential rates) gives, 1853-4, £2,240,000 for United Kingdom.
second Rethod (H. C. Papers, 34 I of 1854 ; 482 of 1854). Great Britain.

| Classes. | Assessments $(1853-4)$ | Assesoments (1852-3). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Under $£ 150$ |  | 1,547,869 |
| Under f 100 | 891,690 |  |
| E100- 1150 | 2,448,226 |  |
| E150- 200 | 1,517,086 | 1,421,224 |
| \& $200-\$ 300$ | 2,128,355 | 2,046,630 |
| Total. | 6,985,357 | 5,015,723 |
| Difference . . . . . . . 1,970 <br> The 1852-3 figures inctuded some assessments that were in Ireland in 1853-4 (proportion of whole amount) |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Total | - | . 2,011 |
| (Extimsto silopted, $\{2,000,000 \pm £ 100,000$ : Great Britain.) |  |  |
| ${ }^{2}$ Vide p. 25 |  |  |

## APPENDIX II.

## DETAILS OF THE CONSTRUCTION OF VARIOUS TABLES IN THIS BOOK.

Table A4.
The task here is to fill up the blanks in the official tables for the years to $1850-\mathrm{I}$. As the totals are given, together with a classification for several of the years, it is chiefly a matter of distributing the totals so that the several classes give a consistent series, and there cannot possibly be a serious error in any item, especially as the most important-" Railways "-is given each. year in detail. This has been done and the total of the Concerns No. III., Sch. A, transferred to Sch. D.

For Ireland there are no figures prior to $\mathbf{1 8 6 0 - r}$. The mines, etc., are unimportant and have been carried back by a progressive decrease ; the item of most importance is "Railways," and this has been carried back from the known figure in $\mathbf{1 8 6 0}$ by reference to " net receipts " to 1849, after consideration of the statistics of Irish railways. Appendix III. gives details of the computations for lands and houses for Ireland 1842 to 1852, and 1853 to 1875. for which no figures are available or the official figures given are defective. These results are transferred to Table A4. Several small points remain to be mentioned :-

Lands, col. 1.-The uncommuted tithes for England and Wales have been added down to 1903 from the official tables; after that date they are not given separately and are taken at \{200,000, which is within a fraction of the true figure.

Houses, col. 3.-In Ireland since 1893 the properties "rated on haff-rents " (certain properties used for charitable and educational purposes) have been added to the houses. The corresponding additions have been made back to 1861 - 2 from the Reports. The error given in 1843-4 (" lands ") is to cover the absence of exact official data, also for Ireland 1842 to 1860 ; for 1860 to 1875-6 in Ireland, to cover the slightly uncertain transfer for farmhouses, disappearing therefore in aggregate Sch. A. The error for
" houses" is similar, with a slight addition 1862 to 1868 for property rated on half-rents in Ireland.

Table B.
So far as England was concerned, for the charge of duty the statutory basis was seven-eighths of one-half the rent. But for computing the statutory income it was one-half the rent, and this basis has been adopted for the table. (This mainly accounts for the difference between these figures and those given in Sir Algemon West's tables : R. C. on Trade Depression, 1886, p. 215.) The method of computation up to 1879 is as follows :-
(a) Official net
(b) Add abatements - . . -
(c) Deduct nurseries -
(d) Total lands (net)
(c) Corrected, by distributing deduction of one-eighth over "exempt" and " liable"
(f) Add " Nurseries " : Total liable
(g) $\quad$, Total exempt

(h), (f) and (g) (official gross)

Statutory income liable is one-half (e) plus (c); statutory income exempt is one-half (g).
table AD. Showing the Estimated Epfect of the Transfer of Railways, \&c. (Concerns No. III. Sch, A) to Sch. D, 1866-7.

| Year. | England: |  |  | Scotland. |  |  | Ireland. |  |  |  | United Kingdom. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Sch. D. | Sch. A. | Total. | Sch. D. | Sch. A . | Total. | Sch |  | Sch. A. | Total. | Sch. D. | Sch. A. | Total. |
|  |  |  | 60,236 | 4,876 |  | 5,812 | 3.331 | $\pm$ 173 | 50 | 3,38x | 60,994 | 8,434 | 69.428 |
| 1842 1843 | 52,707 49,962 | 7,449 7.440 | 57,402 | 4,262 | 936 | 5,188 | 3,332 | 213 | 55 | 3,292 | 57,461 | 8,42I | 65,883 |
| 1844 | 49,679 | 8,114 | 57,793 | 4,450 | 986 | 5.436 | 3,220 | 218 | 60 | 3,280 | 57,349 | 9,160 | 66,509 |
| 1845 | 53,029 | 9,396 | 62,425 | 5,259 | 8,205 | 6,464 | $3.37{ }^{\circ}$ | 168 | 65 | 3,435 | 61,658 | 10,666 | 72,324 |
| 1846 | 54,398 | 10,044 | 64,435 | 5.716. | 1,349 | 7,065 | 3,488 | 230 | 70 | 3,558 | 63,595 | 11,463 | 75,058 $\mathbf{7 5 , 5 8 9}$ |
| 1847 | 53.932 | 11,221 | 65,153 | 5,579 | 1,382 | 6,961 | 3,400 | 181 | 65 | 3,475 3,371 | 62,911 | 12,678 13.897 | 75.589 71,172 |
| 1848 | 49,202 | 12,286 | 61,488 | 4.782 | 1,531 | 6,313 | 3.291 3,416 | 200 200 |  | 3,371 $\mathbf{3 . 7 0 1}$ | 57,275 56,845 |  | 71,772 70,466 |
| 1849 | 48,825 | 11,773 12,106 | 60,598 61,872 | 4,604 4,805 | 1,563 1.502 | 6,167 | 3,416 3.57 | 200 | 285 370 | 3,701 3,948 | 56,845 58,104 | 13,621 13.978 | 70,46 72,082 |
| 1850 | 49.721 | 12,106 | 61,827 | 4,805 | 1,502 8.637 | 6,307 6.692 | 3.578 3.708 | 1200 | 380 420 | 4,128 | 60,586 | 14,833 | 75.419 |
| 8851 | 51,823 | ${ }_{12,776}$ | 64,599 | 5,055 | 1,637 1,635 | 6,692 6.727 | 3.7 <br> 3.85 <br> 158 | 184 192 | 420 | 4,128 4.322 | 60,586 62,497 | 14,363 15,688 | 75,419 78,185 |
| 1853 | 53,553 | 13,583 | 67,336 | 5,092 | 1,635 | 6,727 | 3,852 | 192 | 470 | 4,322 | 62,497 79,567 | 17,082 |  |
| 1853 | 68,135 | 14.482 | 82,617 | 6,873 | 2,080 | 8,953 | 4,558 |  | 520 | 5,078 | 79,567 7088 | 17,082 87,957 | 96,049 $\mathbf{9 7 , 6 4 6}$ |
| 2854 | 68,384 | 15,215 | 83,599 | 6,859 | 2,132 | 9,011 | 4.446 |  | 590 | 5,036 4 | 79,689 8888 | 87,957 18,611 | 97,646 |
| 8855 | 67.832 | 15.708 | 83,540 859 |  |  | 8,972 9,038 | 4.337 4.280 |  | 650 780 | 4,987 5.060 | 78,888 | 18,611 19,450 | 97,499 99.697 |
| 2856 1857 | 69,111 73,107 | 16,488 19,076 | 85,599 92.183 | 6,836 $\mathbf{7} \mathbf{1 0 7}$ | 2,182 2,775 | 9.038 9.882 | 4,280 4.510 |  | 780 930 | 5,060 5,440 | 80,247 84,725 | 19,450 | 99,097 107.506 |
| 1857 1858 | 73,107 73,445 | 19,076 19,303 | - ${ }_{\text {92,183 }} \mathbf{9 2 , 7 4 8}$ | 7,107 $\mathbf{6 , 7 7 9}$ | 2,775 $\mathbf{2 , 7 3 2}$ | 9,882 | 4,510 |  |  | 5,440 $\mathbf{5 , 5 2 7}$ | 8, 8 8,8125 | 22,975 | 107,787 |
| 1859 | 73,448 76,991 | 19,680 | 92,741 96.671 | 7,779 7.383 | 2,732 $\mathbf{2 , 6 2 2}$ | 10,005 | 4,628 |  | 950 | 5,578 | 89,001 | 23.252 | [12,253 |
| 1860 | 77,825 | 20,893 | 98,718 | 7.176 | 3,052 | 10,228 | 4,604 |  | 990 | 5,594 | 89,606 | 24,935 | 114,54I |
| 1861 | 81,120 | 21,431 | 102,551 | 7,893 | 3,008 | 10,901 | 4.678 |  | 1,032 | 5,710 | 93,691 | 25,471 | 119,162 |
| 8863 | 85,088 | 21,794 | 106,882 | 8,235 | 3,027 | 11,262 | 4,674 |  | 1,120 | 5,794 | 97,997 | 25,941 | 123,938 |
| ${ }^{2863}$ | 87,308 | 22,406 | 109.714 | 8,536 | 3,089 | 11,625 | 4.369 |  | 1,071 | 5,439 5 5 | 100,213 110,106 | 26,566 29,556 | 126,779 $\mathbf{1 3 9 , 6 6 2}$ |
| 2864 | 95,637 | 24,854 | 120,491 | 9,799 | 3.499 | 13,288 | 4,670 |  | 1,203 | 5,873 |  |  |  |
| 2865 | 103,908 | 27,090 | 830,990 | 10,943 | 3,663 | 14,606 | 5,397 |  | 1,251 | 6,548 | 120,148 | 32,604 | 153.752 |

[^244]
## Table D.

The stages in the construction of this table are as follows :-

| (I) Ordinary official " gross " assessments | Example: Years. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 8847. | 1865. |
|  | 70,192 | 134,439 |
| (2) Break 2: False "gross" down to 1867 (substitute official net). | 59,512 | 120,148 |
| (3) Break 4: Additional assessments (add) | 401 |  |
| Break 4: Composition duty effects (deduct) | 2,123 |  |
| (5) Add abatements to net, 1863 to ${ }^{\circ}$ | 57,790 | 500 |
| (6) Break 9 : Railways, etc., No. III., Sch. A to 1865-6 . (add) | 12,603 | 9,500 32,604 |
| (7) Basis for (8) and (9) . (total) | 70,393 | 162,252 |
| (8) Break 3: Life assurance, 1853 to 1873-4 . . . (add) | - | 267 |
| (9) Break II: Wear and tear allowances |  | 6 |
| (10) Break 10: Unassessed duty to | 269 | 620 |
| 1890-1 | 34 | 458 |
| Break 1: Ireland, 1842-185.? Appendix III. |  |  |
| (12) Municipal stocks, transferred from |  |  |
| Sch. C in 1893 . . (add) | negligible |  |
| Total | 74,171 | 163,597 |
| (13) Adjustment to 1850 exemption limit, 1853 to 1875 and after (deduct) | - | 13,980 |
|  | 74,171 | 149,600 |
| limit up to 1894 . | 72,300 | 145.300 |

The range of possible error in most of these adjustments is too small to come into the result. From 1842 to 1853 the Irish adjustment and the composition duty give a special computation
for each year. Adjustment for the $£ 150$ exemption limit gives a possible error as in Appendix I.; there is clear evidence up to I86r that the $£ 100$ to $£ 150$ section fluctuated very slightly, after which it increased in amount, but decreased in proportion up to 1875, and the error has been increased to cover the possible inaccuracy of the interpolation. The proportionate computation from 1894 to date gets less secure as we recede from the starting point, but the error cannot well be more than the figure assigned.

The adjustment to the $£ 160$ exemption limit is taken back from 1894 proportionately. As it has to go back fifty years, it might of course get far from the truth, but it is possible to narrow down the possible deviation very closely. As at 1845 we have, without complication, the classification test, the range " $£ 150$ to $£ 200$ " is known for that year and for 1892-3. The sum assigned to " $£ 150$ to $£ 160$ " is slightly over one-third in the latter year, and slightly less in the former. The index of distribution ${ }^{2}$ is closely similar, and in the earlier years there is hardly scope for a greater error than $\cdot 2$. As the midway point is approached this is increased to 4.

## Table E.

The stages in the construction of this table are as follows :-

|  | Example: Years. |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1847. | 1865. |
| (x) Ordinary official "gross assessments" | 11,927 | 23.746 |
| (2) Break: False "gross" down to 1867 (substitute official net) | 11,807 | 21,528 1,980 |
| (3) Abatements to net, 1863 to 1867 , (add) <br> (4) Life insurance and "expenses," 1853 to 1873 <br> (5) Ireland, I842-53: Appendix III. (add) | 690 | 1,980 373 |
| (6) Total | 12,497 | 23,88I |
| (7) Adjustment to $£ 150$ exemption limit 1853 to 1875 and after 1894 (deduct) | - |  |
| (8) Total | 12,497 | 20,270 |
| (9) Adjustment to $\ddagger$ roo exemption limit up to 1894 . | 11,970 | 19.410 |

8 Pareto index applied to the gross assessments

The range of possible error under (4) is too small to affect the result. The Irish adjustment is correct within 06 , and the adjustment for the $£ 150$ exemption limit can hardly exceed 2 , when the differential duty is examined and the " fit " at each end 1853 and 1875 is found, but after 1894 with the growing totals a larger figure is assigned as possible. The adjustment for the $£ 160$ exemption limit is a small one, and is tested fairly closely by the assessments classification 1845, etc., and found to bear a proper ratio to the $£ 150$ to $£ 200$ class. Uncertainty in the middle years is allowed for, and the whole error bas to be added to the preceding column.

## Compatations for Unassessed Daty to 1890-1 Iat Table D.

Reference is made to the particulars given under the heading "Receipts in addition to the foregoing for duty unassessed and of recoveries from default schedules of prior years" in the earlier reports (e.g., 38th Report, p. xiiii.).

In order to ascertain what proportion of the sums under this heading relate to duty unassessed, and what to recoveries of sums already assessed, for the purpose of obtaining the true " gross assessment" the sums (of duty) given for the years 1891-2 to 1900-1 have been reduced to terms of income (at the rates of tax proper to the several years) and the results compared with the differences between the gross assessments given in 1900, on the new basis, and those for the same years in the previous annual reports. Over the nine years the unassessed income averages nearly 75 per cent. of the unassessed ic pme plas recoveries from default schedules. Several difficulties arise in connection with the adjustment of the gross figures of earier years. (a) As the duty is in some cases that which is due after the allowance of abatements, etc., it does not give the full gross income if it is merely multiplied by the rate in the $£$. But in total amount the unassessed duty upon the assessments above $£ 400$ is far larger than the unassessed duty on assessments below $f 400$, and, since prior to 1894 no abatement was allowed upon a higher income than $£ 400$, it is safe to say that the error due to this element is negligible, especially for comparative purposes. (b) Duty unassessed relates to income for prior years, and therefore it seems incorrect to add it to the total income for the year in which it is recovered. But there is no good means of splitting it up for its proper years, and it may relate to income for one up to ten or more years, according to circumstances in individual coses.

Moreover, on analysis the present system appears to adopt the whole of it as the income of the year preceding recovery, so that on the whole it appears to be best to risk the slight possible error, which can hardly be greater than the possible error due to an arbitrary method of splitting the amounts. (c) For the years subsequent to $589 \mathrm{I}-2$ the official adjustment has been accepted, although it evidently covers some other small discrepancies. For the preceding years it will be seen that the "duty recovered" varies very widely, and the following method has been adopted :-

I842 to 1852.-Of the small sums in these years a considerable proportion must have been default recoveries, and there could, in the nature of the case, have been little unassessed duty; 50 per cent. has been taken as so applicable. From 1853 it has been postulated that a regular progressive sum would be recovered from default (after allowing for the varying rates of tax), and starting with 60 per cent. as unassessed duty (an advance on the previous decade, but less than the later proportion) the balance of duty has been reduced to the amount per penny (the mean rate of the three preceding years) : this sum has been progressively increased each year until the sixties, when for reasons relating to the collection it was markedly diminished, ${ }^{1}$ and from that date it has increased again progressively until 1890. Each year's figure has then been recomputed into total duty from default schedules by using the mean rate of the three preceding years at first, then of two and a half, and later of two years, according to the improved methods of administration. These sums have been deducted from the official total figures each year, and the balance regarded as unassessed duty. The unassessed duty has been reduced to assessment terms by the mean rate of the three preceding years and the result assigned to the gross assessments of the your procoding recovery. These estimates have been slightly corrected in places for the known effects of re-assessment years. The probable error throughout cannot be considerable and is far less than any conventional statistical method of computation would give, for it is based on the elimination of the factor which fluctuates least. The figure given for the probable error is based, not upon the duty unassessed, but upon a range of error of $\pm 20$ per cent. in the sum allocated to recoveries from default (and of $\pm 40$ per cent. during the early sirties, when those sums were much less)-an ample figure when it is considered that it allows of this considerable deviation of any one year from the normal line of the recoveries "per penny in the f."

1 9th Report. Pp, e4, 27: 20th Report, pp. 4x, etc. ann

## APPENDIX 11.

Sch. D : Additions for Unassessed Duty.

| 1842 |  | 1867 | $490 \cdot 5$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1843 |  | 1868 | $544 \cdot 7$ | $\pm 67.2$ |
| 1844 | $14 \pm$ 土 3 | 1869 | $563 \cdot 4$ | $\pm 86.4$ |
| 1845 |  | 1870 | 823 | $\pm 57.6$ |
| 1846 | $3 \pm .6$ | 1871 | 3,177 | $\pm 57.6$ |
| 1847 | $33.6 \pm 6.7$ | 1872 | 1,323.8 | $\pm 72$ |
| 1848. | $9 \pm 15$ | 1873 | 3,013.2 | $\pm 81.6$ |
| 1849 | $29.2 \pm 5.8$ | 1874 | 6,299•5 | $\pm 96$ |
| 1850 | $32 \pm 6.4$ | 1875 | 7.800 | $\pm 110 \cdot 4$ |
| 1851 | $44^{\circ} \mathrm{P}$ 士 $8 \cdot 9$ | 1876 | 4,341.6 | $\pm 156$ |
| 1852 | $207.5 \pm 27.8$ | 1877 | 4,000 | $\pm 139.2$ |
| 1853 | $307.4 \pm 30 \cdot 8$ | 1878 | 2,428.9 | $\pm 115.2$ |
| 1854 | $144.0 \pm 29^{\circ}$ | 1879 | 4,88I•I | $\pm 144$ |
| 1855 | $36 \cdot 2 \pm 37.2$ | 1880 | 3,023.3 | $\pm 144$ |
| 1856 | $65.5 \pm 32.1$ | 1885 | 4,232.5 | $\pm 216$ |
| 1857 | $91.4 \pm 40 \cdot 8$ | 1882 | 4.542 | $\pm 288$ |
| 1858 | $528.0 \pm 38.4$ | 1883 | 5,954.2 | $\pm 235.6$ |
| 1859 | $222 \cdot 0 \pm 38 \cdot 4$ | 1884 | 5,017•1 | $\pm 288$ |
| 1860 | 226.3 $\pm 4.8$ | 1885 | 5,112.7 | $\pm 216$ |
| 1861 | $229 \pm 76$ | 1886 | 6,083.9 | $\pm 329$ |
| 1862 | 144.6 $\pm 10 \cdot 8$ | 1887 | 6,459.6 | $\pm 288$ |
| 1863 | $97.5 \pm 13.4$ | 1888 | 7,073.6 | $\pm 308.6$ |
| 1864 | $489.6 \pm 16.4$ | 1889 | 4.596-3 | $\pm 370 \cdot 3$ |
| 1865 1866 | $458 \cdot 3 \pm 19 \cdot 2$ $135 \cdot 4 \pm 28.8$ | 1890 | 4,087.2 | $\pm 370 \cdot 3$ |

Table G2: Abatements.
Abatements ( $£ 60$ on Incomes $£ 100$ to $£ 200$ ), 1863-4 to 1871-2. Prior to 1868-9 (see 28th Report) only the "total amount of income abated from the assessments" fis known (i3th Report, p. 208). It is allocated to the several schedules, by estimate, as follows:-

| Year. | Total <br> $(4000)$ | A. | B. | D. | E. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $1868-9$ | 14,947 | 204 | 1,290 | 11,441 | 2,012 |
| $1867-8$ | 14,262 | $200 \pm 10$ | 1,285 | $\pm 10$ | 10,880 |
| $1866-77$ | 13,572 | 200 | 1,200 | 10,210 | 1,947 |
| $1865-6$ | 12,981 | 200 | 1,201 | 8,500 | 1,980 |
| $1864-5$ | 11,751 | 200 | 1,201 | 8,820 | 1,480 |
| $1863-4$ | 9,249 | $100 \pm 50$ | $409 \pm 50$ | 7,500 | 1,150 |

Noce-It monld be tedious in the extreme to describe in detail the
laborious " fitting up" involved in arriving at these estimates. They have to dovetail into other known data in so many ways that the range of possible error is very narrow. Among the considerations involved aro-(a) consistent and stable figures for A and B; (b) a materially less figure for $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ in the earliest year; (c) a consistontly diminishing figure back from $1868-9$ for D and E ; (d) a oum under $D$ and $E$ always less than the difference between gross and net assessments ; but (a) only so much less as to leave a consistent balance, under each schedule, for exemptions.]
(I) From 1863-4 to $1888-9$ the amount of assessment abated under Sch. B was treated on the same terms as assessment under the other schedules, whereas it did not represent income in the same way. To obtain the "income" corresponding to the other schedules the statutory income should be determined therefrom (one-half in England and Wales, and one-third in Scotland and Ireland). This error has been particularly referred to in 1887, and the official figures were made up on a new basis in 1889-90. The corresponding figures for each previous year have been found, and the difference is adjustment I (minus).
(2) Until Ig00-I, only the amount abated in the assessments was shown under the separate schedules. After that date abatements allowed during the course of the collection and also by repayment were allocated to the respective schedules, so that the net assessment should be given as a true net income on which tax was received. But the separate annual reports from 1874-5 give the total abatements by repayments. Prior to $1874-5$, back to 1868-9, this item is obtained by reference to the duty repaid, on the same plan as obtained officially after 1874. From 1863-4 to 1868-9 the separate sums repaid for abatements are not given, but the computation is made by proportion to the total repayments. This gives adjustment 2 (plus).
(3) The abatements allowed " by schadule " during the course of the collection were not given until rg00-r, but as a ten-year corrected table was then furnished it is possible by deducting the total in the assessments plus repayments from the new total to ascertain the correct figures, $\mathbf{1 8 9 1 - 2}$ to 1899-1900. For prior years the estimates are made proportionately on the information so gained. It is a peculiarity of "re-essessment " years that the sums abated in the assessment under Schs. A and B are smaller than usual, ${ }^{1}$ but the difference is made good by the sums allowed " by schedule " being correspondingly greater. The sequence of figures in cols. 2 and 3 is thas made regular. This additional

[^245]allowance has been provided for in such years, and the total arrived at gives adjustment 3 (plus).
(4) The net total of the foregoing is given in the " adjustments" column, and the true amount corresponding with the present system is shown in the next column. The margin of error between $1890-1$ and $1874-5$ is not greater than $\pm$ I per cent., and prior to $1874-5$ it is not greater than $\pm 2$ per cent.

The method of arriving at the number of claimants is referred to in the text. ${ }^{1}$ The numbers given in the earlier reports were not arrived at on this plan, and were merely the total number of assessments wholly or partly abated-a figure which should be ignored for statistical purposes.

Table 65 : Stages in Construction.
(1) Elimination of income below $£ 150,1853$ to 1862 , by differential rate, deducted from net produce.
(2) Net produce obtained from " net produce per Id." by the annual rate (to 1900), after allowing for recoveries from default, and unassessed duty, shown separately in earlier years.
(3) Deduction for composition duty ( $\mathbf{1 8 4 2}$ to 1860).
(4) Allowance for effect of compositions ( 1842 to 1850).
(5) Additions for Ireland ( 1842 to 1853).
(6) Additions for insurance from 1853 -in the earlier years entailing estimates of totals from partial figures.
(7) Deduction of income below $£ 150$ ( 1863 to 1875).
(8) Addition of abatements from 1863 .
(9) The foregoing give the taxable income at $£ 150$ with no repairs.
(10) Deduct repairs-one-eighth on lands and between onesixth and one-seventh on houses from 1842.
(ix) Add for repairs upon property belonging to exempt persons. (" Nil" where the exemption is for interest or ground rent, and a large fraction where the balance of mortgaged property is exempted.)
(12) This gives totals at $£ 150$ exemption limit, with repairs.
(13) From 1893 backwards deduct income between $\mathbf{f} 150$ and £160.
(14) This gives figures for the conditions of 1894 to present date.
(15) From 1894 add all repairs, and deduct repairs on exempt property.
(16) From 1894 add income between $£ 160$ and $£ 150$.
(17) This gives, from 1894, the figures in continuation of proceding conditions.

$$
{ }^{2} \text { P. } 297 .
$$

## APPENDIX III.

IRELAND. 1842 TO 1853.
Detand of the Estimates made under the several Schedules for the Years prior to the Imposition of the Income Tax, in order to Complete the Tables for the United Kingdom in thosr Years.

$$
\text { Ireland : Schs, A and B, } 1842 \text { to } 1853,1853 \text { to } 1875 .
$$

The official statistics prior to 1875 were defective, and their interpretation gives rise to several difficulties. It has been necessary to remedy these defects-which can only be done as the result of minute study-and to estimate the details for the years 1842-3 to 1852-3.

Slage ( x . - The net figures from 1853 to 1876 as given in the 13th and 28th Reports are first set out. From these are deducted the transfers to Sch. D (railways, etc.), 1853 to 1865-6.

Stage (a). -The net and the gross are identical down to 1875. all deductions being ignored. That they were small is shown by 1876 figures (with a higher exemption limit), and the 28th Report merely says "cannot be distinguished." The xst Report indicates that the "net " was a true net, and the deductions have to be added, but the 28th Report shows that if any addition is made the sequence in the gross is unaccountably disturbed. The answer to the riddle is found by checking the duty. From this it is clear that from 1857-8 the gross is a true one, and it is the net which is excessive, whereas prior to that date the net was reached from the duty, and $£ 22,000$ has to be added to give the true gross.

Stage (3).-The "property rated on half-rents" (included in the "fines" column) has to be added to the " messuages," and this removes some of the anomalies in the latter.

Stage (4).-In $1876-7$ there is a footnote that the large difference in messuages as compared with previous years is due to the value
of farmhouses having been previously included there instead of with lands. ${ }^{1}$ The adjustment is obviously about $£ 630,000$. But the process started earlier: it is clear there is a transfer in 1873 of $£ 117,000$, for otherwise the Sch. B gross figures cannot be explained, and the figures for the several columns do not run properly. Again, in 1862 to 1864 there was a similar disturbance $(£ 260,000)$ in the opposite direction. These have been rectified before taking the figures back.

Stage (5).-The gross assessments prior to $\mathbf{1 8 6 1}$ are then divided in proportion between lands, houses, and other property back to 1853.

Stage (6).-All four columns of stage (5) are carried back to 1842 by reference to the poor rate valuations.

Stage (7) (Sch. B).-The gross are, ex hypothesi, the same as lands in stage (6). We have given us officially: exemptions after 1872-3 and net assessments from 1853-4. The exemptions are found by deduction back to 1853 , and both by proportion back to 1842 .

These results interlock in several ways, and satisfy the following practical tests :-
(i) Gross assessments under each head exhibit a clearly defined re-assessment grouping.
(2) Gross assessments for Sch. A from 1853-4 move in close agreement with the net poor rate valuation ${ }^{2}$ at each point of contact (viz., valuation at 3oth September, 1856, with new assessment 1857-8), with a constant proportionate difference due to the properties assessed and not rated, and those rated and not assessed.: These figures go back to 1851, and the exact poor law valuation aggregate for Ireland is known for 1842, 1845, 1846, 1849, and 1850.4 The average propor fon between the assessments and the valuation at the three re-assessment years 1853, 1857, and 1861 has been used to obtain the fictitious Sch. A prior to 1853 (i.e., what the Sch. A assessments would have been if the tax had applied to Ireland in those years), the intervening years being closely verified. This proportion hardly varied, and the range of probable error assigned is quite adequate.
(3) Gross assessments for lands and houses agree in trend with the evidence given before the several committees, and also with

[^246]the returns made to Parliament on the tenement valuations ${ }^{1}$ from 1842 to I86I, after which the adjusted official figure applies.
(4) The Sch. B exemptions and deductions form a residual, but the result is in harmony with the movement of the gross, and it exhibits the deficiency (accompanied by an equivalent excess in the net assessments) which is properly found in the re-assessment years, ${ }^{2}$ and generally it shows the drop in the last year which is to be expected in the " lands" assessment where all changes are downward, and no additional values like new houses come into the total.
(5) The figures for Sch. B exemptions, taking the best years for comparison (viz., the year following each re-assessment year), bear a practically constant relationship to the total. The percentage increases after 8875 (owing to the higher exemption limit) and remains constant for a time. The slight difference gives the additional factor for computing the figures prior to $\mathbf{8} 83$ with a close degree of accuracy.
Each succeeding cross-check enables the assigned probable errors to be reduced, and therefore these results, obtained after various alternatives had been tried, cannot be far from the true comparative official figures. Their relationship to the true values of the properties is discussed elsewhere. ${ }^{\text {a }}$
The results are found in Table A4.

## Sch. D.

The decade preceding the imposition of the income tax in Ireland in 1853 was one of a remarkable character. It saw the great famine, the evictions, and an extraordinary decrease in population. It would be imagined that the yield of an income tax under Sch. D must be very adversely affected at such a time, but it appears, on examination, that the class of people chiefly concerned were so wretchedly poor that their whole sustenance was drawn from the land, and their actual disappearance hardly affected that business and commercial activity which is reached by Sch. D. The statistics of consumption of spirits and beer, tobacco, tea and coffee reflect in only a very slight degree the great catastrophe of 1846-7, while the operation of the three years' average system under Sch. D would minimise what depression there was by masking its effects. The diminution in population of this hopelessly indigent
${ }^{1}$ Vide p. 161. For $186 \mathrm{x}-\mathrm{a}$ it is in close agreement with the adjustment on P. 425 of the Financial Relations Report, 1894. after allowing for farmbouses.

Vide p. 3 12.

- Chap IV.
class, with practically no spending power whatever, leaves very little trace in this respect.

Since we are concerned only with the gross assessments at the exemption limit of $£ 150$ which obtained from 1842- $\mathbf{3}$ to 1852-3, and the statistics for 1853 onwards relate to the gross assessments at an exemption limit of $£ 100$, an adjustment is necessary, and is given in the following table ( $\{000$ omitted) :-

| Year. | Gross. <br> Sch. D. ${ }^{1}$ | Gross Ascessments relating to Incomes between $\{100$ and \& 50. | Difference between the two preceding Columns, represent ing Grost Asese tion Limit of $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{I}} \mathrm{yO}^{\circ}$. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $t$ | $f$ | € |
| 1853-4 | 5,078 | 572 | 4.506 |
| 1854-5 | 5,036 | 572 | 4.464 |
| 1855-6 | 4,987 | 590 | 4,397 |
| 1856-7 | 5,060 | 595 (estimated) | 4,465 |
| 1857-8 | 5,440 | 600 | 4,840 |
| 1858-9 | 5.527 | 580 | 4,947 |
| 1859-60 | 5,578 | 542 | 5,036 |
| 1860-1 | 5,594 | 567 | 5,027 |
| 1868-9 | 7,527 | 820 (estimated) | 6,707 |

Up to 1861-2 the actual sum for col. 3 is determinable from the amount charged at the lower rate (except in 1856-7, which has been completed by estimate). After that year the differential rate ceased and the abatements took their place, so that further estimates would be necessary to continue the series. It is desirable, however, to determine how closely the index number would approximate to the facts in a year at least as far removed from the base year on one side, as the earliest year to which it is proposed to apply that index number is distant upon the other side, i.e., twelve years. The year $1868-9$ has been chosen, and col. 3 has been estimated by relation to the mean between (a) the last year for which the differential rate exists; and (b) $18 \% 6-7$, when the exemption limit was raised from $f 100$ to $\{150$, the sum assignable to the change being calculated as in Appendix I. Col. 4 gives the series to which the index number has to conform approximately. The first two years are ignored, and 1855-6 is

[^247]taken as the base, for the reasons given in the roth Report, ${ }^{1}$ where, for comparative purposes, the two earlier years were ignored.

In constructing the index number it has been thought desirable to use components which will represent (I) the consumption of the mass of the population so far as commodities outside foodstuffs derived from the land are concerned, since the latter affect Sch. D profits but slightly (items representing professions and luxuries are also necessary) ; (2) the movement of the larger finance and commerce ; and (3) the movement of extermal trade.
(I) For the "consumption index" the following annual statistics for Ireland have been used :-
(I) Quantities of spirits distilled.
(2) Number of licences issued to spirit dealers.
(3) Number of bushels of malt charged with Excise Duty.
(4) Number of licences issued to beer dealers (not retailers).
(5) Number of licences issued to spirit retailers.
(6) Number of licences issued to spirit distillers.
(7) Quantities of spirits charged for home consumption.
(8) Number of licences issued for post horses and carriages
(9) Number of licences issued to tea and coffee dealers.
(ro) Number of licences issued to tobacco dealers.
(II) Number of licences issued to tobacco manufacturers.
(I2) Amount of licence duty paid by attorneys, notaries and conveyancers.
Other series that might have been useful had to be excluded because for legislative or other reasons they were not complete and uniform in basis over the period 1839 to 1868 . The details have been obtained from the Annual Reports of Trade, etc., and from the I3th Report. Numbers 9 to 12 were taken as applicable to the years for which the statistics are given, but the others were thrown into three years' averages corresponding with Sch. D. The result is shown on p. 506.
(2) For financial movements very little statistical material is available. The most complete series of figures is the record of Irish note circulation. This seems to have reflected the movements of commerce very well ${ }^{2}$ until the sixties, when it became

[^248]| Yoar. | : | : | 5 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 18 | 12 | Index. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1842-3 | 95 | 88 | 87 | 50 | 105 | 144 | 101 | 63 | 53 | 78 | 169 | 124 | 96 |
| 1843-4 | 75 | 75 | 77 | 50 | 89 | 137 | 79 | 63 | 56 | 81 | 158 | 154 | 9 r |
| 1844-5 | 68 | 70 | 73 | 57 | 83 | 126 | 71 | 63 | 60 | 87 | 154 | 146 | 88 |
| 1845-6 | 70 | 71 | 79 | 63 | 82 | 126 | 71 | 63 | 73 | 94 | 155 | 143 | 91 |
| 1846-7 | 83 | 73 | 87 | 69 | 86 | 127 | 80 | 63 | 87 | 100 | 148 | 159 | 97 |
| 1847-8 | 95 | 79 | 99 | 71 | 90 | 133 | 90 | 65 | 87 | $8^{2}$ | 131 | 154 | 99 |
| 1848-9 | 80 | 82 | 98 | 72 | 92 | 132 | 89 | 64 | 84 | 87 | 126 | 149 | 97 |
| 1849-50 | 89 | 85 | 98 | 69 | 9 I | 131 | 86 | 61 | 82 | 84 | 121 | 153 | 96 |
| 1850-I | 88 | 86 | 94 | 73 | 89 | 125 | 82 | 63 | 84 | 86 | 120 | 132 | 93 |
| 1851-2 | 98 | 89 | 100 | 8 8 | 90 | 122 | 88 | $7{ }^{1}$ | 86 | 86 | 110 | 148 | 97 |
| 1852-3 | 98 | 92 | 99 | 89 | 90 | 128 | 90 | 83 | 90 | 89 | 108 | 143 | 99 |
| 1853-4 | 97 | 95 | 100 | 95 | 94 | 114 | 95 | 90 | 93 | 92 | 109 | 132 | 100\% |
| 1854-5 | 99 | 97 | 99 | OR | 97 | 107 | 98 | 96 | 96 | 95 | IO2 | ro3 | 99 |
| 1855-6 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 10\% | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| 1856-\% | 101 | 104 | 100 | 100 | 102 | 98 | 33 | 102 | 104 | 105 | 98 | 99 | 1001 |
| 1857-8 | 101 | I08 | 101 | 108 | 105 | 105 | 88 | 103 | 108 | 109 | 98 | 102 | 103 |
| 1858-9 | 107 | 112 | 105 | 117 | 108 | 110 | 82 | 105 | 114 | 115 | 97 | 97 | 106 |
| 1859-60 | 105 | 116 | 115 | 133 | 109 | 113 | 78 | 110 | 120 | 120 | 97 | 95 | 109 |
| 1800-1 | 99 | 117 | 126 | 148 | 109 | 109 | 74 | 115 | 126 | 126 | 96 | 92 | IIIP |
| 1861-2 | 79 | If6 | 133 | 169 | 108 | 106 | 64 | 118 | 129 | 130 | 94 | 93 | IIIt |
| 1868-9 | 66 | 118 | 149 | 372 | 99 | 79 | 56 | 158 | 158 | 148 | 76 | 81 | 126 |

almost stationary as cheques and bank deposit accounts gradually came more into favour. ${ }^{1}$ The index is adversely affected for r868-9 only, and for this purpose the actual result is ignored, and as there is evidence that banking activities were fully maintained ${ }^{2}$ the rate of progress in the index from 1855 to 186 r has been continued to give the figure necessary for 1868-9.

Scotch and Irish.-But there is a disturbance in the earlier period, after the Banks Act of 1845, which throws the figures quite out of harmony with the facts of the years 1846 to $1848 .{ }^{\text {s }}$ Rather than abandon this series altogether, figures have been estimated ${ }^{4}$ and substituted for each year, and the average is affected accordingly.
(3) The index for external trade activity is also troublesome to construct. The statistics for exports and imports change their basis at various dates from 185 I to 1856 , although it is just possible by parallel series to bridge the gap. But exports are relatively small ( $\{341,000$ in 1855) and fluctuate widely from year to year, while imports are often quite out of proportion to any possible effect upon home profits. Thus they were $£ 1,951,000$ for 1845. $£ 2,896,000$ for $1846, £ 8,035,000$ for 1847, $£ 4,294,000$ for 1848, the years covering the Irish famine. Such figures are obviously unsuitable. There is a series of tonnage figures for Dublin, Cork, and Belfast, but it " breaks" badly at 1854. The best series available is the "coasting trade" tonnage of vessels cleared in all Irish ports. It represents steam vessels; but the sailing vessels for the greater part of the series are relatively small and slowly diminishing, while the statistics for them are incomplete. Both of the other sories lend general support to the one adopted, so far as they go.

In the complete index number weights are given to ( $x$ ) and (3). doubied in each case. The table on p. 508 gives the result.

It will be seen on a comparison of the last six years mentioned with the foregoing actual figures of Sch. D that the latter aggregate to $£ 31,022,000$, and the table to $£ 31,147,000-a$ difference of 4 per cent., while the largest error is 477 per cent., and in four of the years the difference is I per cent. or less. A range of error

[^249]of 10 per cent. is therefore considered an ample allowance, especially when it is remembered that the actual use of these estimates is to make up the aggregates for the United Kingdom for comparative purposes, in which this allowance forms lese than $\cdot 5$ per cent. of the whole.

| Year. | Consumption Index, $\times 2$. | Finance Index. | External Trado Index, $\times 2$. | Total Index. | Profits in $\{000$ on basis of col. 4 (Error $\pm$ $x 0$ per cent.). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1842-3 | 192 | 96 | 90 | 378 | 3,325 |
| 1843-4 | 182 | 96 | 90 | 368 | 3,235 |
| 1844-5 | 176 | 94 | 92 | 362 | 3,185 |
| 1845-6 | 182 | 97 | 100 | 379 | 3,335 |
| 1846-7 | 194 | 92 | 114 | 400 | 3,520 |
| 1847-8 | 198 | 91 | 114 | 403 | 3.545 |
| 1848-9 | 194 | 90 | 130 | 414 | 3,641 |
| 1849-50 | 192 | 88 | 136 | 416 | 3,658 |
| 1850-1 | 186 | 84 | 138 | 408 | 3,588 |
| 1851-2 | 194 | 82 | 144 | 420 | 3.695 |
| 1852-3 | 198 | 79 | 160 | 437 | 3,845 |
| 1853-4 | 201 | 83 | 174 | 458 | 4,030 |
| 1854-5 | 198 | 90 | 196 | 484 | 4,255 Actual. |
| 1855-6 | 200 | 100 | 200 | 500 | 4,397 4,397 |
| 1856-7 | 201 | 109 | 204 | 514 | $4.520 \quad 4.465$ |
| 1857-8 | 206 | 117 | 214 | 537 | 4.723 4,840 |
| 1858-9 | 212 | 121 | 226 | 559 | 4,916 4,947 |
| 1859-60 | 218 | 119 | 240 | 577 | 5,070 5,036 |
| 1860-1 | 222 | 120 | $256$ | 598 | 5,278 5,027 |
| 1868-9 | 252 | 143 | 360 | 755 | 6,640 6,707 |

As a check upon these estimates, however, the simpler method of percentage proportion may be applied, i.c., it may be assumed that Irish profits bore the same ratio to those of Great Britain before 1855 as they did after that date. The actual proportion in 1855-6 was $5 \cdot 5: 94 \cdot 5$. By 1862 it had fallen to $5: 95$, by 1871 to $4: 96$ and by 1877 to $3: 5: 96 \cdot 5$. But if we assume that the 1855-6 ratio obtained from 1842 and that the ratio was not more in Irehand's favour, we shall probably be doing full justice to $a$ disastrous decade in Irish history. Since the ratio is that of full Irish profits to profits from Great Britain excluding Irish posses-
sions, it is necessary to apply the ratio to the estimated net figures, vide p. 2II, to give a series of full Irish profits comparable with the foregoing estimates. After allowing for the No. III., Sch. A, assessments, ${ }^{1}$ the result is as follows :-

| Year, | Estimates by Index. | Estimates by Percentage. | Estimate adopted. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1842-3 | $3.325 \pm 332$ | $3,337 \pm$ I4 | 3,331 $\pm 173$ |
| 1843-4 | 3,235 $\pm 323$ | 3,239 $\pm 102$ | $3,237 \pm 213$ |
| 1844-5 | $3,185 \pm 318$ | 3,255 $\pm$ II9 | $3,220 \pm 218$ |
| 1845-6 | $3.335 \pm 333$ | 3,404土 2 | $3.370 \pm 168$ |
| 1846-7 | $3.520 \pm 352$ | $3.456 \pm 108$ | $3.488 \pm 230$ |
| 1847-8 | $3.545 \pm 354$ | $3.400 \pm 18 \mathrm{~L}$ | 3,400 $\pm$ 181 |
| 1848-9 | $3.641 \pm 364$ | 3,291 $\pm$ I | 3,291 $\pm 200$ |
| 1849-50 | 3,658 $\pm 366$ | 3,416 $\pm 44$ | 3,416 $\pm 200$ |
| 1850-I | $3.588 \pm 359$ | 3,569士 4I | $3.578 \pm 200$ |
| 1851-2 | $3.695 \pm 369$ | 3.722 | $3.708 \pm 184$ |
| 1852-3 | $3.845 \pm 384$ | 3,860 | $3.852 \pm 192$ |

The results are so close in most cases that the mean has been adopted, but in the three years 1847-8 to 1849-50, in view of the known depression over the whole kingdom, the presumption is in favour of the percentage method, for it is unlikely that Ireland was relatively lass depressed than Great Britain. ${ }^{2}$ Moreover, the index series at this point contains several doubtful components.

## Soh 8

The figures after 1853 for Great Britain are less by about \& 90,000 formerly assessed upon offices in Ireland, which then were included in the Irish figures. The percentage borne by Irish assessments remained very constant for a considerable period, so that, as the amounts involved are quite small, the proportion has been continued beckwards to 1842 for Table E.

Totale-The net taxable income as a whole rose from 195 millions in 1842 to 19.9 in 1847 and then fell to 18.8 in 1852 .

In view of the utility of the rst Report for purposes of interpretation, and of the fact that it is not generally available, a synopsis of the tables is appended.
${ }^{2}$ Vide P. 493.

- Viat also R. C. on Financial Relationa, Qo. 4.062, etce.


## Year 1855-8-First Report, Asseusments.

|  | England. | Scotland. | Ireland. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sch. A: <br> Lands <br> Messuages Concerns, No. III. (Manors, etc.) <br> Other profits <br> Tithes | $\begin{array}{r} f \\ 41,048,091 \\ 44,196,369 \\ \mathbf{x 6 , 1 9 9 , 0 6 1} \\ 127,757 \\ 366,897 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{3,872,714}{f} \\ \mathbf{4 , 2 3 9 , 2 1 6} \\ \mathbf{2 , 2 5 3 , 8 8 7} \\ \mathbf{6 2 , 9 6 4} \end{gathered}$ | $t$ |
| Total gross | 101,938,175 | 12,428,781 |  |
| Deductions: <br> Land tax <br> Sea walls, etc. Colleges and hospitals Exempted Net at $16 d$. <br> , 1 I建d. | $\begin{array}{r} 594,329 \\ 456,142 \\ 98,072 \\ 7,770,480 \\ 91,752,736 \\ 1,266,416 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 15,662 \\ 38,039 \\ 816,749 \\ 11.405,140 \\ 153,191 \end{array}$ | 11,878,545 |
| Persons exempt | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { sor,035 } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ 67,788 \end{gathered}$ |  |
| Sch. B: <br> Lands <br> Nurgeries and markét gardens <br> Composition for ${ }^{\circ}$ tithes leased | $\begin{array}{r} \underset{4}{f}, 021,100 \\ 29,960 \\ 19,088 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8,666,607 \\ 6,107 \end{array}$ |  |
| Grose asmesment | 41,070,148 | 5,872,714 |  |
| Deductions: <br> Ono-eighth <br> Other deductions <br> Exempted <br> Net astessments: <br> Lands at 8d. <br> Nurgeries 5ld. <br> Composition at 44d. | $\begin{array}{r} 4,253,425 \\ 34,444 \\ 12,193,63 \mathrm{I} \\ 21,660,471 \\ 2,883,955 \\ 26,165 \\ 18,057 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} - \\ 2,828,507 \\ 2,563,972 \\ 474,128 \\ 6,107 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 2,572,288 \\ 2,396 \\ = \end{gathered}$ |
| Persons assessed . : : osempt . : | $\begin{gathered} \text { No. } \\ 623.949 \\ 355,674 \end{gathered}$ | No. 64,942 47,063 |  |

## Year 1855-6-First Report, Assessments-continued.



## Year 1855-6-First Roport, Assessmente-continued.

Duly Payable.

|  | England. | Scotland. | Ireland. | Total, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sch. A, at 16d. $\because \quad \text { II立d. }$ <br> Total. | $\underset{\substack{1334,891 \\ 60,608}}{f}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \underset{760,342}{f} \\ 7,337 \end{array}$ | $\underset{791,903}{f}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 6,687,136 \\ 67,945 \end{array}$ |
|  | 6,195,499 | 767,679 | 791,903 | 7,755,08! |
| Sch. B, at 8d. $\cdots \quad$ 5id.$" \quad$ 16d.$" \quad$ Total. | 720,313 69,172 1,783 277 | $\begin{array}{r}61,059 \\ 7,567 \\ \hline 400 \\ \hline\end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} 61,264 \\ \ldots \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 842,636 \\ 76,777 \\ 3,183 \\ 277 \end{array}$ |
|  | 791,545 | 69,026 | 61,302 | 921,873 |
| Sch. C | 1,627,157 | - | 91,403 | 1,718,560 |
| Sch. D, at 16d. 5 p.". c. composition Total . | $\begin{array}{r} 3,957,698 \\ 405, \times 39 \\ 7,295 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 392,025 \\ 40,160 \\ \mathbf{6 2 6} \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 249,7^{89} \\ 28,259 \\ 2,162 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 4,599,512 \\ 473,558 \\ 10,083 \end{array}$ |
|  | 4,370,132 | 432,8II | 280,210 | 5,083,153 |
| Sck. E, at IGd. <br> - $11 \frac{1}{2} d$. <br> Total . | $\begin{aligned} & 746,997 \\ & 113,479 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 43.831 \\ 5.380 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 52,807 \\ 6,361 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 843,635 \\ & 125,220 \end{aligned}$ |
|  | 860,476 | (9,211 | 59,168 | 968,855 |
| Groee Total | 13,844,809 | 8,318,727 | 1,283,986 | 16,447,522 |

## APPENDIX IV.

## THE INCOME TAX OF THE NAPOLEONIC WARS, 1799 то 18 I 6.

Summary Tables for selected Years (compined from the original Parliamentary Returns.)

## The Income Tar of 1801.

(The First Classification given.)

| Class of Income. | No. of Persons in Class. | Amount of Assessment. | Proportion of In come:-One- | Amount of Income (000 omitted). |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{60} \mathbb{E}_{65}$ |  | $\stackrel{\&}{6}$ | th | $\stackrel{6}{3} 163$ |
| $60-65$ | 54,321 | 26,357 | $120$ | 3,163 |
| 65-70 | 14,728 | 10,595 | 95 | 1,007 |
| 70-75 | 23,913 | 23,113 | 70 | 1,618 |
| 75-80 | 9,32I | 10,258 | 65 | 667 |
| 80-85 | 19,639 | 25,291 | 60 | 1,517 |
| 85-90 | 7,302 | 11,116 | 55 | 611 |
| 90-95 | 11,205 | 19,459 | 50 | 973 |
| 95-100 | 7,335 | 15.323 | 45 | 690 |
| 100-105 | 24,031 | 57,916 | 40 | 2,317 |
| 105-110 | 4,925 | 13,154 | 38 | 500 |
| IIO-I15 | 6,136 | 18,157 | 36 | 654 |
| 115-120 | 4,083 | 13,461 | 34 | 458 |
| 120-125 | 8,582 | 30,668 | 32 | 981 |
| 125-130 | 4,365 | 17,829 | 30 | 535 |
| 130-135 | 5.760 | 25,850 | 28 | 724 |
| 135-x40 | 3,646 | 18,502 | 26 | 481 |
| 140-145 | 5,784 | 32,370 | 24 | 777 |
| 145-150 | 3,069 | 19.728 | 22 | 434 |
|  | 218,145 | 389,148 |  |  |
| 150-155 | 9,203 | 65,285 | 20 | 1,306 |
| 155-160 | 2,184 | 17,311 | 19 | 329 |
| 160-165 | 3,761 | 32,010 | 18 | 576 |
| 165-170 | 2,082 | 19,46I |  | 331 |
| 170-175 | 3,647 | 37.41 | 16 | 599 |
| $175-180$ $180-185$ | 2,035 | 22,975 | 15 | 345 |
| 180-185 | 3,758 1,884 | 46,100 | 14 | 645 |
| 190-195 | 2,684 | 25,954 | 13 | 337 498 |
| 195-200 | 2,320 | 41,302 | II | 454 |
| 200-500 | 42,694 | 1,223,908 | 10 | 12,239 |
| 500-1,000 | 14.762 | 949,847 | 10 | 9,498 |
| $1,000-2,000$ $2,000-5,000$ | 6,927 3,657 | 904,115 | 10 | 9,041 |
| 2,000-5,000 5,000 . | $\mathbf{3 , 0 5 7}$ $\mathbf{1 , 0 2 0}$ | $1,040,275$ 097,039 | 10 | 10,403 |
| 5,000. | 1,020 | 997,039 | 10 | 9,970 |
| Total | 320,759 | 5,853,629 |  | 74,677 |

This accounted for $£ 5,853,629$ duty. The balance unclassified made up $£ 390,809$ more (Scotland $£ 19,768$, and children's allowances, $(371,041)-\{6,244,438$ in all.
Details under Schs, $\mathbf{A}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ (foo0).

|  | 1806. |  |  | 1808. |  |  | 1810. |  |  | 1814-3. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Eydand } \\ \text { Wind } \\ \text { Waler } \end{gathered}$ | Soot- | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Endind } \\ & \text { Wand } \\ & \text { Wales. } \end{aligned}$ | Scot- | Total. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Eopland } \\ & \text { Hand } \\ & \text { Walea } \end{aligned}$ | Scotland. | Total. | England and Walen | Scotland. | Total |
| Property from lande, aceording to General Rode Na. 1. | 25,906 | 3,926 | 29.834 | 87,360 | 4.34 I | \$1,709 | 29,503 | 4,637 | 34,190 | 34,330 | 5.075 | 39,406 |
| Hiousme, dito . | 81,203 | 788 | 21,984 | \$2,030 | 8,012 | 13.042 | 13,011 | 1,169 | 84,179 | 14,895 | 1,364 | 16,259 |
| Thine | 2085 | - | 2,018 | 2,140 | - | 2,140 | 2,353 | - | 2,353 | 2,733 |  | 2,733 |
| Mapors: | 44 | $\cdots$ | 44 | 548 | 1 | 712 | 64 $\times 35$ | - | 64 $\times 56$ | 72 $20 \%$ | 10 | 72 217 |
| وuarrise : : | 19 | 4 | ${ }^{2}$ | 35 | 84 | 39 | 39 | 13 |  | 50 | 2 x | 27 70 |
| Minee : | 386 | 47 | 364 | 425 | 59 | 437 | 483 | 78 | 568 | 616 | 63 | 679 |
|  | 47 | 48 | 4\% | 138 | 23 | 153 250 | 223 55 | 45 | 268 138 | 575 | 63 | 638 65 |
| Toul | 99897 | 4.937 | 448835 | 42.867 | 5,519 | 47,906 | 45,876 | 6,009 | 51,886 | 53,495 | 6,643 | 60,138 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Lan | and |  | Lan | d H |  |
|  | 4\%,298 | 2,832 | 20,220 | 18,508 | 3.018 | 31,600 | 26,970 | 4,178 | 31,081 | 31,098 | 4,498 | 35,596 |
|  | 4,777 | 447 | 3,324 | 3,137 | 566 | 3,703 | 8,213 | 886 | 8,099 | 10,045 | 995 | 11,040 |
|  | 9,833 | 657 | 4.490 | 3,644 | 763 | 4,407 | 7,391 | 739 | 8,230 | 8,083 | 946 | 9,029 |
| Total | 55,908 | 3.936 | 49.834 | 27,368 | 4,342 | 31,709 | 42,514 | 5,796 | 48,309 | 49,226 | 6,440 | 55,663 |
| Olat 8 : Tilite free TItheable Tliche tree is pert Thute free on pasmint of componition for tithes adi utheo lomed | 6,874 | 2,575 |  |  | 4,488 |  |  | 3,899 |  |  |  |  |
|  | 17,848 | $\cdots$ | 17,44 | 18,618 | - | 28,612 | 20,217 | - | 20,317 | 23,269 | - | 23,269 |
|  | 656 | - | 656 | 790 | - | 790 | 856 | - | 836 | 748 | $\dot{-}$ | 74 L |
|  | 503 | - | 509 | 328 | - | 528 | 499 | - | 499 | 56x | - | 56 z |
|  | 1,086 | - | 8,658 | 2,748 |  | 2,748 | 1,932 | - | x,932 | 2,232 | - | 2,232 |
| Total ${ }_{\text {Deductions }}:$ | 27,536 <br> .8 <br> 8 | 2,575 | 30,812 885 | $\begin{array}{r} 28,936 \\ 939 \end{array}$ | 4,188 | 39,124 939 | 29,477 | 3,899 | $\begin{array}{r} 33,376 \\ 1,018 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \hline 6,262 \\ & 923 \text { est. } \end{aligned}$ | 4,367 | $\begin{aligned} & 40,628 \\ & 923 \text { est. } \end{aligned}$ |

Gross Assessments under each Schedulo-Ercept Sch. C and Public Offices (£000).

| - | 2803 |  |  | 1805. |  |  | 1806. |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Rogland | Scot- <br> Land. | Total | Engand | Scot. land. | Total. | England | Scot. land. | Total |
| Sch. A . | 34,671 | 3,827 | 38,498 | 37,686 | 4,087 | 41,773 | 39,897 | 4.837 | 44,835 |
| Deductions . | 1,567 | 393 | 1,960 | 2,34* | 393 | 2,741 | 1,015 | 198 | 1,206 |
| Seh B ${ }^{\text {Dedrctions }}$ | 23,701 $\mathbf{8 2 6}$ | 1,574 | 44,275 | 25,004 | 1,986 | 26,992 | 25,878 | 2,375 | -6.453 |
| Deductions. | 826 | 187 | 942 | 83 I |  | 994 | 80s |  | 85 |
| pounded for | 162 | - | 163 | 243 | - | 243 | 1,658 | - | 1,698 |
| Sch C | 6,324 | 771 | 6,695 | 4.747 | 149 | 4,894 | - 32,764 | 5,80\% | 34670 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sch. D } \\ & \text { Deductions: } \\ & \text { Seh. } \end{aligned}$ $\text { Sch } \mathrm{B}$ | 32,935 535 | $\underset{\text { 16x }}{\text { 1,90 }}$ | $\frac{34,855}{696}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 32,790 \\ 76 \\ 754 \end{array}$ |  |  | 32,764 980 | 1,007 340 | 34,370 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Total frome } \\ & \text { extimates } \end{aligned}$ | 97,365 | 7,653 | 103,0rs | 100,981 | 8,280 | 109,263 | 99,449 | 9,359 | regoes |
| Total deder | 2,392 | 510 | 2,903 | 2,255 | 556 | 2,818 | 1,900 | 193 | 2009 |


|  | seds. |  |  | 8820 |  |  | 2184 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Bendand | Scotland. | Total | Ragiand | Scotland. | Total | Radand | Seottrod. | Total. |
|  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r} 47,986 \\ 1,067 \\ 31,376 \\ 939 \\ 1,748 \\ 33,479 \\ \overline{1,33 y} \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 45,876 \\ & 99.477 \\ & 1,018 \\ & 1,952 \\ & \frac{23,5218}{1,5157} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 6,009 \\ & 73 \\ & 3899 \\ & - \\ & 2, \\ & 2793 \\ & 372 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 51,896 \\ 93,34 \\ 33,018 \\ 1,982 \\ \frac{1,932}{34,408} \\ 1,599 \end{gathered}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & 6,643 \\ & 81 \\ & 4,367 \\ & - \\ & \frac{2,778}{518} \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Toutime | rearos 6 | 12,14* | x44x96 | 208,723 | 12,473 | 123, 294 | 123,323 | 14,293 | 137863 |
| Total dedro- | 8800 | 56 | 2,006 | 5 | 73 | 2008 |  |  |  |

Sch. D : Classification of Profts (Great Britain). ${ }^{1}$ (000 omitted.)

| - | 1806. | 1808. | 1810. | 1812. | 88x4. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ¢50 and under ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  | $\{2,782$ | 2,744 | 2,974 |
| £50 and under 5100. ) | 9,913 | 9,747 | 16,793 | 7,085 | 7,215 |
| 6r00 $\quad$ \% 150.1 | 4,617 | 4.565 | $\left\{\begin{array}{l}3,196 \\ 18\end{array}\right.$ | 3,307 | 3,415 |
| tr50 " 200.1 | 4,617 | 4,565 | [1,813 | 1,724 2 | 1,756 |
| t200 t 300 | 2,311 | 2,310 1,658 | 2,312 | 2,379 1,690 | 2,491 r,808 |
| t400 " 5500. | I,2II | I,240 | 1,223 | 1,183 | I,266 |
| t500 $\quad$ \% 600. | 1,078 | 1,101 | 1,104 | 1,164 | 1,227. |
| \% 6000700. | 789 | 770 | 790 | 796 | 863 |
| t700 " 8800. | 513 | 526 | 553 | 561 | 606 |
| t800 " t900. | 645 | 596 | 594 | 610 | 681 |
| f900 $\quad$ ¢ $61,000$. | 344 | 323 | 327 | 295 | 305 |
| t 1,000 " ${ }^{\text {E }} 11,500$. | 1,746 | 1,647 | 1,834 | 1,71I | 1,903 |
| f 1,500 ". $\{2,000$. | 1,036 | 1,073 | r,109 | 1,043 | 1,274 |
| \% $2,000 \sim 3$ 2,000. | 1,634 | 1,524 | 1,490 | r,594 | 1,669 |
|  |  |  | $\{2,069$ | 1,852 | 2,109 |
| t5,000 and upwards.) | 5.970 | 5.534 | 14,741 | 4.647 | 5,498 |
| Amount assessed under Ist and 2nd |  |  |  |  |  |
| cases <br> Amount assessed under other cases | 33,474 1,097 | $\begin{array}{r} 32,615 \\ 884 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |
| Total | 34.570 | 33.499 | 34,402 | 34,384 | 37,059 |

Amount ol Allowance of Doty on Income Distinguished in Classes.
( 000 omitted.)

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Tables give Scotland separately, if required.

Number of Houses assessed to House Daty, 1822 and 1829. (From H.C. 187 and 387 of 1824 and 123 and 160 of 1830-1, which gives county details (in thousands).)
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Imports (see Balance of Tmde).
" Improvements":
in England, 347
in Scothand, 19
Incidence of Taxation, 47, 133, 137. 188, 291

Income:
and Capital (ses Annuities), 421
Categories of, 466
from Abroad, etc., 166, 322
not Distributed, 422
"on which Tax is Received," 356
Tax Deducted from Profits, 191
Tax Statistics, General Character, 1
Index Numbers, 341-342, 372
for Irish lincome, 504
for Taxpayers, 441
Indian (see Foreign and Colonial).
Indirect Taxes, 472
Industrial and Provident Societies, 163
Inhabited Houses and Inhabited House Duty, 107-108, 111
Insurance (see Life).
Interest:
in Trade, 172
not Payable out of Profits, 174
Secured on Rates, 228, 240, 391-393. 404,470
Treatment of, 186
Untaxed, 165, 228
Inventory Values, 378
Investment Income, 398
Ireland:
Agricultural Holdings, 74
Annual Values in, 21, Chapter IV.
Bank of, 167
Banking Statistics, 506
Capital Values, $406-407$
Economic Position, 218
Farmers' Incomes, 86, 363
Fiscal Autonomy, 323
louses in, 128
Incomes in, 1842 to $1853 \ldots 211$, 237. 371, 468, 501, etc.

Aseesed in England, 237, 365
Income Tax Introduced, 87, 167. 204, 210, 285

Interest Paid, 148
Land Purchase and Exemption, 70, 147, 217
Land Sales, 156
Progrese in, 277
Railways in, 490
Repains, in, 61
Rental, 382
Sporting Rights, 47, 348
Schedule Bin, 86
Tarable Capacity, 167, Chapter X.

Ireland-condd.
Taxpayers, 438
Value of Property in, 142, 358, Chapter IV.
Ironworks, 37, 220, 225, 392, 404

Labour and Capital Incomes, 464
Soe Wages.
Land:
Purchase in Ireland, 217, 368
Tax, 57, 77, 349-352, 470
Valuation of, 27, 340
Value of per Acre, 103. 343
Value of per Acre, Counties, 343
Value Net, 344
Values, Taxation, 339, otc., 347 $-348$
Land Commission Interest, 238
Land Enquiry Commission, 459
Lands (see also Agriculturai, Sites).
Defined and Described, 41, 350, 404, 471, Chapter IX.
Value (Capital), 38x, etc.
Leases (sed Fines), 16, 17, 173, 187, 350
Liconsed Premises (see Pablic Houses).
Lifo Insurance Companies, 187, 190, 254, 368, 422
Lifo Insurance Premiums, Allowance for, 70, $866,306-207,304=$ 305.494

Lifo Insarance Premiams and Supertax. 332-337
Limited Liability, Effect of, 396
Liverpool, Building Valuee, 345
"Living " Capital, 380
Local
Loans, 389
Property, 405
Taxation (seo Rates), 29x
Local Autharitios, 240, 248-249, 294. 350, 405

Lock-up Shops, 109, 122, 196
Lodging Houses, $812,116,133$
Lodgings, 109
Losos, Farming, 92, 94
Loeses in Trade , 172, 18i-187, 257. 397
Lunatic Asylums, 18 :

## Macrinhrt and Plant (sen Weer

 and Tear).Maintenance of Property, 6a
Manors, 44. 348-349
Mansions, $22,109,359,385$
Martet Gardens, 81, 90

Markets, 37, 226, 250, 348--350, 392
Massachusetts, Values in, 347
Messuages (see Buildings, Houses), 50, 52
Metropolis :
Annual Value, 16
Valuations, 35
Metropolitan Board of Works, 326
Metropolitan Consolidated Stock, 168
Milk Sellers, 173
Mineral Rights Duty, 223
Mines, 37, 170, 177, 193, 212, 220, $223,348-349,391,404,470$ Abroad, 230-232
Miscellaneous Profits, 48, 229, 393, 404
Mortgage Interest, 45, 70, 368
Mortgages, 34, 340, 367
Movable Property. 380, 400, 405
"Multiplier, 398, 407, etc.
Municipal Trading, 228, 250, 351, 402-403, 422, 424-425

National.
Capital, 85, 376, etc.
Debt Commissioners, 163-:168, 190
Debts (set Consols), 388, 404
Dividend, Chapter XI.
Income, 85, 371, 415
List of Estimates, 427
Property, 402
Nationalisation of Land, Chapter IX.

Not Assessments (see " Income on
which Tax was Received 'I. 306
and Tazable Capacity, 357
Net Produce, and Not Produce par Penny, 213, 274
Not Receipt, 274, 281, 365, 375
New York, Values in, 347
Now Zealind, Values in, 35 I
Number of:
Assessments (sem Classifics. tion). 462
Properties, $103-4$
Taxpayers, 3, 242,430, etc., 449

Ossolnsemere, 194- 296, 203
Officials, Chapter VII., 863
Old Ago Pensions, 118
"Other Profits," 385
Owner-cceapied Property, 23, 82, 172. 420

Ownership of Property. 72

Paget's Return, 381, etc., 47047I
Pareto's Law, 319, 241, 329, 332336, 374, 431, 443, 447, 456, 464-465
Partners (see Firms), 336
Patent Rights, 190
Pauperism, 76
Pennsyivania, Values in, 347
Pensions, 270, 304, 367, 402
Old Age, 418
Perquisites, 264
Personal Capital, 379
Personalty; 367, 407, 470
"Persons." 238-244, 394
Pit-sinking Costs, 194, 203
Pitt's Income Tax, 330, 351, 430431, 514
Place of Assessment (see Claseification), 365
" Flutometric Unit," 407
Poor Rate:
Comparisons, 25, 340, 351, 359
Values, 30, 32, 340
Portsmouth, Values in, 345
Post Office Annuities, 190
Preliminary Expenses, 173-174, 192
Premiums (see Life Insurance).
Prices, 277, 286-287, 341, 372
Private Houses, 108, 112, 13 I
Average Value of, 446
Probate Duty, 365
Production, Census of, 179
Productive and Unproductive Incomes, 469
Professions (see "Trades"), 170171, 222
Profits Abroad, 171, 174
Progress, 275. 288-290, 428
Progress in Agricaltore, 343
Illusory Aspects, 379, etc.
Progression, 372
Protection, 225
Problic Burdens in Scotiand, 20
Pablic:
Departments, 263, etc.
Fands, 165, 470
Honses, 23, 114, 173
Revenre, Payment out of, 163
Public Companies:
Abroad, 232
Asecsments 0n, 246, 327. 394 $-395$
Non-rateable, 47I

Quapiens, 37. 212, 220, 226, 391, 470

Rack-RENt, 18
Railways, 37, 41, 177, 212, 220, 222, 348, etc., 359, 393, 404, 470, 490. 494
in Ireland, 490
out of the United Kingdom, 227, 230, 393, 404
Refreshment Kooms, 43, 111
Rateable and Non-rateable Property, 470-471
Rates:
and Evasion, 324
Drainage, 59
Generally, 349
in Scotland, 19, 83
Interest secured on, 173
of Income Tax, Schedule B, 88, 105
on Tithe Rentcharge, 59, 352
of Duty, True, 278
Ratings (see Valuation, Ireland).
Clasaification of, 30
Defects of, 25, 291, 340, 360
On Mines, etc., 193, 224, 348
Reading Rents, 458
Real Property Burdens, $30,52,58$, 470
Realty. 367, 470, etc.
Reassessment Years, Effect of, 13, 31-36, 113, 129-132, 341, 499
Remittances from Abroad, 173. 323
Renewala and Replacementa, 178, 196, 425
Rent:
and "Annmal Value," 16
in Relation to Income, 454, 458
Lost, 64
Reductions and Remisaions, (1,339
Repars, 17, 59, 60, 66, $111,147$. 160, 172, 195, 284, 295, 307, 351, 360, 500
Repayments, Allowances by, 31, 53, 256
Reports by Comminsioners of Inland Revenue, 5, 10
Reserves, 199. 337, 414, 422
Residence Test, 172
Reidential Shops (see Shops).
Returns, Neglect to lake (ses Evasion).
Reversion Dutv, 47
Roads, 345. 403
Royal Family, Hoases of, 110,120
Royalties:
Mineral, 193, 223, 391, 469
Patent, 190
Rabber Companies, 232

Alarizs, 263, otc.
alt Springs (ses Concerns, No. III.,
Schedule A), 226, 249, $47 \mathbf{I}$
nvings, 428
Banks and Interest, 263, 228
Schedule," Allowances by, 31, 53
chedule A, otc. (sec A, B, C, D and E. respectively).
chedules of Default, 214, 496-497 chooln, 65, 112, 12 I
cotland :
Agricultural Holdings, 74
Annual Values in, 18, 24
Effect of Rater on Values, 59, $59,60,352,384$
Flats, 117
Valuation, 364
Valuation of Capital, 406
jeewalls, 58
jecurities, Depreciation of, I83
Sequence of Asecesmenta:
Schedule A, 37, $7 \mathbf{I}$
Schedule B, 92
Schedule C, 166
Schedule D, 804
-Schedule E, 37I
Goneral, 309
Sottloment Estate Duty, 4r3
Sowers, 41, 404
Shoplreopert, Incomes of, 443
Shops, I12, 118, 159, 137, 248, 461
Single Tax, 344
Site Values, 344, ete., 352
Abroad, 347
Small Holding4, 66, 73, 104, 342
Socialistic Incomes, 418
South Aastralia, 352
Speculation, 188, 380
Sportiag Rights, 47, 226, 340, 386
Stablea, rog, 585
Standard of Livint, 136
Statistres (swo Incomes, Value, etci).
Early Tables, 514, etc
Stody, Allowance for, 270
Sublatting, 109
Subsistonce Minimam, 37x
Supertern, son, 506, 329, etch, 430, 448

TaRIF REFONM, e06, 235, 276278, 370
Tar (sse " Deduction ${ }^{* \prime}$ )
Tan Burdens of Cheses, 47:
Tareble Capacity of Ireland, 355. otco

* Tarabio Incoma, ${ }^{40} 84,308,3 \times 6-$ 328, 4놀
Taxise on Land, 38, 35a, 470 88N

Taxpayers, Numbers of, 3, 242, 430, etc., 449
Teachers, Incomes of, 463
Telegraphs, 402
Tenant Right, 150, $156,160,360$
Tonements, ro9, 117,128
Timber, 24
Tithe and Tithe Rent Charge, 28, $42-44,60,84,34 \mathrm{I}, 353,490$
Tolls, 37, 226, 349, etc., 392, 471
Trade:
Houses for, yog, I22, yg6
Prosperity of, 212, 225, 252. 257, 276, 286
Unionism, 258-259
" Trades and Professions," 222, 258, 393, 468, 470
Tramways, 4r, 349, otc., 35I
Travelling, 206-207, 269
Unassessed Duty, $213,494,496$
Unearned Income, 33 r, 374, 425
of Employees, 463
"Unearned Increment," 35, 342344
Unamployment, 212
United States, 323, 326, 347, 35I, 368

Vazuation, 25, 32, 340, 35x, 359
Methods of, 377
of Owner-occupied Property, 23
Poor Rate (se Roassessments, Iroland).
Valuation of Capital Wealth, 404
Valuations, A List of, 406
Void Property, 34, 63, 85, 92, 133, 295. 347. $3^{8} 5$

Waers, 324,428
Wages and Profits, 136, 233. 237. 258, 286
Wales, Assessments in, 39
Wasting Assets, 16, 180, 192-m93
Waterworia, 37, 225, 250, 348349. 392, 402, 404, $47^{\circ}$

Wayleaves, 48, 229
Wealth (se Capital).
Growth of Nation, 310, 376, etce.
Wear and Tear, 173, $178,196,927$. 356, 284, 295,494
Woekly Property: 16, 17
Wives Household Services, 375
Wived Incomes, $42 \mathrm{x}-42 \mathrm{~m}$
Wood Green, Values in, 345
Woodlands, $24,40,340,384$
Workhouses, 122
Wording Claswes, 35, 29x, 394
붑

INDEX TO REFERENCES TO EVIDENCE BEFORE ROYAL COMMISSIONS, SELECT COMMITTEES, AND DEPARTMENTAL COMMITTEES.

| Thle |  | Year. | Prap. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Agricultere . . . . | R.C. | 1896 | $15,25,26,28,29,30$, 31, 34, 39, 42, 43, 58, $63,68,76,80,95$. 97. 106, 153, 340, 341, 381, 382, 386. 387, 388, 399, 401, 408, 471 |
| Banks of Issue. | S. C. | 1857 | 507 |
| Burdens affecting Real Property. Consolidated Annuities (Ireland). Co-operative Societics Depression in Trade and Industry | S.c. | 1875 1846 | 15, 30, 52, 58, 388 |
|  | S. c. | 1852 | 148 ${ }^{\text {1 }}$ |
|  | S.c. | 1879-80 | 204 |
|  | R. C. | 1886 | $\begin{gathered} 76,80,86,96,106, \\ 186,225,252,257, \\ 258,277,286,492 \end{gathered}$ |
| Financial Relations between Great Britaip and Ireland | R.C. | 1894 | $\begin{array}{r} 38,86,89,154, \\ 236,322,35, \\ 382, \\ 302,503, \end{array}$ |
| General Valuation, etc. (Ireland). Grand Juries, etc. (Ireland) Imperial and Local Taxation | S.C. | 1869 1842 | $149,150$ $145$ |
|  | D. C. | 1912 | $\begin{aligned} & 18,19,23,26,100, \\ & 103,158 \end{aligned}$ |
| Income Tax | S. C. | 1851-2 | 15. $45,64,86,100$, 178, 208, 209, 210, 222, 251, 262, 325, 337, 302. 428, 430, 431, 459 |
|  | S.C. | 1861 | 45, 47, 195150.189, |
|  | D. C. | 1905 | 190, 195, 197, 203. 204, 222, 325, 424. 426 |
|  | S.C. | 1906 | 6, 11; 222, 241, 243, 245, 297, 299, 313. 320, 323, 324, 329. 330, 332, 337. 409 450, 452, 460, 462, 469 |
| Inland Reverme and Customs | S.C. | 286x-3 | 222, 325 |


| Title. | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { R. C } \\ \text { S. }_{1} \\ \text { D. } \end{array}$ | Year. | Pago. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Irish Land Act | S. C. | 1870 | 152 |
| Irish Land Acts | R.C. | 1898 | 156, 157 |
| Land Acts (Iroland). | R.C. | 1887 | 153 |
|  | S. C. | 1894 | 154 |
| Land in Walea | R.C. | 1893-6 | 15, 34, 39, 76, 80, 87. |
| Lav of Rating in Ireland. | S. C. | 1871 |  |
| Local Taxation | R.C. | 1896 to | 58, 104, 143, 155 |
| Mining Royaltiea | R. C. | 1802 1890 | 223 |
| Monicipal Trading | S.C. | 1903 | 250 |
| Poor Law in Scotland | S. C. | 1869 to | 74. 76 |
| Poor Rate Assessments | S. C. | 1868 | 15, 26, 134 |
| Rating of Machinery Bill | S. C. | 1887 |  |
| Rating of Mines | S. ${ }_{\text {c }}$ | 1857 | 193 |
| Reduction of Tithe Rent Charge | R. C. | 1892 | 42 |
| Small Holdings * | S. C. | 1889 | 73, 104 |
| Tacation of Iroland | S. C. | 1864-5 | 100, 150, 355, 357, 358 |
| Town Holdings ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ( ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | S. C. | 1890 | 35, 39, 134, 139 |
| Town Land Valuation (Ireland) Valuation (Iroland). | S.C. | 1844 1844 | 148 |
| Valuation of Lands and menta (Scotland) Bill | S. $C$. | 8870 | 18 |
| (Scotiand) | S. C. | 2865 | 18 |
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| Year. |  | Paga. | Year. | Numbers. | Pago |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{gathered} 1814-15 \\ 1816 \\ 1824 \end{gathered}$ | 238 | 52 | 1852 | 268 | 162 |
|  | 90 | 251 |  | 339 | 311 |
|  | 187 | 518 |  | 403 | 162 |
|  | 387 | 518 | 1852 | 54 | 137 |
| 1830-31 | 123 | 518 |  | 244 | 118 |
|  | 160 | 518 |  | 33 L | 137 |
| 1832 | 331 | 52 |  | 360 | 137 |
| 1840 | 428 | 167 |  | 362 | 311 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1841 \\ & 1842 \end{aligned}$ | 331 | 161 |  | 399 | 312 |
|  | 224 | 165 |  | 480 | 253 |
|  | 235 | 52,77 |  | 491 | 106 |
| 1843 | 253 | 169 |  | 547 | 137 |
|  | 235 | 161 |  | 553 | 161 |
| 1844 | 334 | 16I | 18 | 556 | 312 |
|  | 212 | 162 | 2 | 195 | $13{ }^{3}$ |
|  | 315 | 253.312 |  | 244 | $13^{6}$ |
|  | 316 | 17 |  | 680 | 77 |
|  | 513 | 145 | 1853 | 452 | 150 |
| 1845 | 102 | 52,77 |  | 616 | 253 |
|  | 125 165 | ${ }^{137} 77$ | 1854 | - 194 | 211 |
|  | 259 | 45,77 237 |  | 342 | 167,253. |
| 1846 | 107 | 253, 312 |  | 471 | 313 |
|  | 216 | $16 \pm$ | $\bigcirc$ | 482 | 490 |
| 1847 | 100 | 312 | 1854-55 | 254 | 30, 77 |
|  | 159 | 161 | 1855 | 482 | 167, 253 |
|  | 170 708 | 169 168 | 1856 | 313 | 253 |
|  | 747 | 253, 312 | 1856-57 (II.) | 408 | 77 |
|  | 889 | $16{ }^{\text {2 }}$ | 1850-57 (12.) | 337 27 | 251 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1848 \\ & 1849 \end{aligned}$ | $44^{6}$ | 16I | 1857 (11.) | 69 | 253 |
|  | 70 | 161 |  | 220 | 507 |
|  | 317 | 253 165 |  | 317 | 77 |
|  | 407 | 161 77 | $1857-58$ 1888 | 492 | 106, 261 |
|  | 630 | 137 | 1859 | 2 | 106,265 |
| 1850 | 200 | 161 |  | 3 | 78 |
|  | 270 346 | 2II |  | 123 | $7^{88}$ |
|  | 346 | 161 162 | 1859 | 218 | 311 |
| 1851 | 27 | 253 | 1859 (11) | 23 | 312 |
|  | 65 | 312 |  | 69 | 312 |
|  | 185 | 77 |  | 119 | 253 |

INDEX TO HOUSE OF COMMONS PȦPERS. 533

| Yoer. | Numbers | Pata. | Yans | Number. | Paga |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1860 | 128 | 162 | 1868-69 | 198 | 3 IX |
|  | 130 | 106 | 1869 | 568 | 79, 262 |
|  | 136 | 311 | $\pm 870$ | 454 | 52, 106, 26 x |
|  | 155 | 78 | 1871 | 103 | 261 |
|  | 300 | 106 |  | 183 | 312 |
|  | 332 | 30. 78 |  | 221 | 313 |
|  | 393 | 78 |  | 287 | 79 |
|  | 400. | 78, 138 | 1879 | 96 |  |
|  | 456 | 52 |  | 322 | 75, 162 |
|  | 476 | 315 |  | 317 |  |
|  | 501 546 |  |  | 384 397 | 137 |
|  | 546 571 |  |  | 397 422 | 79 162 |
|  | 572 | 138 | 1873 | 397 | 137, 253 |
|  | 592 | 318 | 1874 | 42 | 79 |
| 1862 | 155 | $7^{8}$ |  | 45 |  |
|  | 455 | 78 |  | 87 | 261 |
|  | 509 518 | 253 78 |  | 159 209 | 162 169 |
| 1862 | 172 | 318 |  | 215 | 30 |
|  | 377 | 311 | 1875 | 369 | 313 |
|  | 388 | 318 |  | 424 |  |
|  | 466 | 253 |  | 461 | 30. 79 |
| 1863 | 199 248 | 78 | 1876 | 335 422 | 79 |
|  | 428 | 433, 444 | 1877 | 7 | 79 |
|  | 526 | 253 |  | 457 | 224 |
|  | 528 548 | 261 78 | 1878 | 75 | 262 |
| 1864 | 318 | 78 |  | 234 <br> 402 | 79 |
|  | 207 | 128 | 1878-79 | 363 | 312 |
|  | 809 | 311 |  | 388 | 312 |
|  | 331 | 78 | ${ }^{1879}$ | 298 | 253 |
|  | 549 565 | 311 253 | 1880 (II.) 1882 | 373 392 | 312, $79,106,139$ |
|  | 565 568 | 253 78 |  | 292 | ${ }_{262}{ }^{\text {79, }} 106,139$ |
| 1865 | 113 326 | 78 162 |  | 293 |  |
|  | 226 469 | 162 253 | 1883 | 204 | 162, $79.106,138$ |
|  | 476 | 912 |  |  | 262 |
|  | 477 | 78 |  | 344 | 139 |
| 1866 | 144 | 163 | 1884 | 17 20 | 168 |
|  | 300 | 164 |  | 35 | 79, 106, 139. |
|  | 324 | 318 |  |  | 79, 262 106, 139. |
|  | 48 | 885 |  | 235 |  |
|  | 494 | 444 | 1885 | 234 | 2538382 |
|  | 512 | 52, 78, 26x |  | 345 | 381, 382, |
| 1867 | 324 144 | $\begin{aligned} & 79 \\ & 74.79 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | 385, 388, 389, 38, |
|  | 393 | $31{ }^{17}$ |  |  | 391-393. |
|  | 527 | 253 |  |  | 395. 39\% |
| $1867-68$ 1868 | +63 | 79 253 | 1887 | 23 | $168^{47}$ |
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| Year. | Number | Pag | Yoens | Number. | Pagar |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1887 | 27 | 162 | 1896 | 216 | 79, 80, 253, |
|  | 195 | 312 |  |  | 48 t |
| $\begin{array}{r} 1888 \\ \mathbf{1 8 9 0} \end{array}$ | 214 | 43 |  | 217 | 52, 106, 139, |
|  | 289 | 312 | 1898 |  | 262, 275 |
|  | 163 | 312 |  | 88 | 250 |
|  | 170 | 79 |  | 309 312 | 89 |
|  | 228 | 253 |  | 312 | 80 |
| 1892 | 32 | ${ }^{224}{ }^{24} 80,206$, |  | 313 347 | 375 350 |
|  |  | $79,80,106$, 262 | 1899 | 347 <br> 179 | 250 234 |
| 1893 | 39 | 339 375 | 8900 | 317 150 | 375 |
|  | 163 | 375 |  | 150 | 80 |
|  | 305 316 | 375 375 |  | 221 222 | 40 |
|  | 334 | 375 |  | 377 | 375 |
|  | 344 | 375 | 1902 | 182 | 375 |
| 1894 | 118 | 375 |  | 307 | $80,106,262$ |
|  | 124 | 79 | 1903 | 197 | 224 |
|  | 165 313 | 253,476,481 |  | 340 183 | 312 80 |
|  | 313 | 375 365 | 1906 1907 | 183 344 | 80, 80, 106 |
| 1895 | 314 204 |  | 1907 $19129-13$ | 344 414 | 750, 106 |
|  | 322 | 253,476,481 | 1913 | 119 | 80 |
| $\begin{gathered} 1895 \text { (II.) } \end{gathered}$ | 454 4 | 80 79 | 1914-15 | 142 46 | 224 322 |

## [NDEX TO REFERENCES TO REPORTS OF THE COMMISSIONERS OF INLAND REVENUE.

| Number. | Pago. | Number. | Pago. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| xet | 10, 205, 207, 209, 210, 312, 501, 509, 510 | 37 th 38 th | $\begin{aligned} & 214 \\ & 168,496,499 \end{aligned}$ |
| 8th | 326 | 39 th | 441, 473, 476 |
| 9th | 326,497 | 40th | 52 |
| roth | 138, 497, 505 | $413 t$ | 52, 88, 90, 105 |
| IIth | 326 | 4and | 52 |
| zath | 167, 837, 267, 326 | 43rd | 52, 264 |
| 13th | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Io, } 37,42,152,167,168, \\ & 205,254,256,498,501, \\ & 505 \end{aligned}$ | 44th | 20, 52, 122, 213, 214, 352, $44^{2}$ <br> 10, 213, 222, 230, 274, |
| 79th | 52, 207 |  | $10,28,288,308,480$ |
| 30th | 168, 178, 442, 482 | 46th | 230 |
| arst | 52, 482, $4^{87}$ | 48 th | 117 |
| and | 48a | 49th | 322 |
| B4thand | 5 | 50th | 116 |
| Supplt |  | srat | 1118,313 |
| esth | 180, 214, 8r, 8\%, 207 | 5and | 39, 6x, 94, 314 |
| s8th | $10,52,53,81,82, ~ 107, ~$ 109, $110,134,149,163$, | 33rd | $295,426$ $20,225$ |
|  | 168, 205, 207, 256, 442. | 56th | 52, 107, $110,114,115,13$ |
| i | 483, 487, 488, 498, 501, 509 | 57th | 164, 223, 265, 266, 284 52, 122, 337 |

## INDEX TO CASES CITED.

| Vamen | Elotumer | P40. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Adams v. Thrift and Others (1915) | Times, 2 Feb. to 6 Feb., 1915. | 323 |
| Ainslie, In re (1881) |  | 12 |
| Attorney-General ${ }^{\text {v. Lancashirs and }}$ |  | 264 |
| Bowers 0 . Harding (1891) | 3 T. C. 22 | 270 |
| British Institute of Preventive Medicine v. Styles (1895) | 3 I. C. 376 | 1 |
| Browne o. Furtado (1902) |  | 121 |
| Calcutta Jute Mills v. Nicholso | 1 T.C. 83 | 171 |
| Cawse o. Nottingham Lanatic Hospital (1891) | 3 T. C. 39 | 121 |
| Cbariton 8. Commissioners of Inland Revenue ( 1890 ) | 27 S. L. R. 647 | 269 |
| Charterhouse School v. Gayi | 3 T. C. 435 | 121 |
| Charterhouse School o. Lamarque (1890) | 2 T.C.6II | 121 |
| Clerical, Medical, and General Life Assurance Society v. Carter (1889) | 2 T. C. 437 |  |
|  | 3 T.C. 430 | 121 |
| Colquhoun $\%$. Brooks (1889) | 2 T. C. 490 | 171 |
| Commissioners for Special Purposes \%. | 3 T. C. 513 | 66 |
| Cook \%. Knott (1887) . | 2 T.C. 246 | 270 |
| Duke of Norfolk $\quad$. Lamarque (1890) | 2 T. C. 579 | 45 |
| Forbes 9 . Stadard Life Asourance Co. (1894) | 3 T. C. 268 |  |
| Glasgow Coal Exchange Co., In re (1879) | ${ }^{1}$ T.C. 211 | 108, |
| Grainger v. Gough (1896) | 3 T. C. 462 | 172 |
| Haddington Burial Boand v. Commissioners of Inland Revenve (1884) | ${ }_{2}$ 1.c. 46. | 171 |
| Herbert $\%$. McQuade ( 1901 ) | 4 T. C. 489 | 264 |
| Hesketh 9. Bray (1888) | 2 T.C. 380 |  |
| Jepeon ${ }^{\text {a }}$. Gribble (1876) | ${ }^{1}$ T.C. $7^{8}{ }^{\text {r }}$ - |  |
| London County Council ${ }^{\text {o. Attomey }}$ Generl (1907) |  |  |
| London Library ©. Carter (1890) | 2 T.C. 594 |  |
| Lothian \%. Machrae (1884) | 2 T.C. |  |
| McDougall \%. Campbell (1899) | 37 S. L. R. 181 | 115 |
| Mersey Docks 5. Lucas (1883) | C. 25 |  |
|  | 3 T. C. 294 | 46 |
| Mnsgrave 5 . Dundee Royal Lematic Asylum ( I 895 ) | 3 T. C. 363 |  |
| Feedham \%. Bowers (1888) | 2 T. C. 360 | - 121 |
| Reith s. Governing Body of Weatm |  |  |
| School (1913) | 6 T. C. 166 | - 122 |
| Religious Tract Society 0. Forbes (1896) | 3 T. C. 415 | - 172 |
| Revell \%. Directors of Ehworthy Bros. ( 1890 ) . . . . | 3 T.C. 12 | - 270 |
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| Namen. | Referenco. | Page |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Riloy v. Read (1879) | I T. C, $2 \times 7$ | 208 |
| Scoble and Others v. Secretary of State for India (1903-4) | 4 T. C. 618 | - 169, 189 |
| Scottish Widows' Fund and Lifo Assurance Society v. Allan (1900) | 4 T. C 369 | - 514 |
| Smiles v. Merchant Co. of Edizburgh |  |  |
|  | 2 T. C. 533 | - 124 |
| Stevens v. Bishop (1888) | 2 T. C. 249 |  |
| Strathearn Hydropathic Co. (I881) | ${ }^{\text {I }}$ T. C. 375 |  |
| Tischler \& Co. v. Apthorpe (1885) | 2 T. C. 89 | 172 |
| Truro Public Rooma Ca v. Armfield (1886) | 3 T. L. R. 89\% | xay |
| Trustees of the Mary Clark Home |  |  |
| Anderson (2904) 888 | 5 T.C. $4^{8}$ | - 122 |
| Turner e. Cuxon (1888) | 2 T. C. 422 | 264 |
| Usher's Wiltshire Broweries, Ltd. v. |  |  |
| Bruce (2914) | 6 T. C. 393 | 174 |
| Weguelin v. Wyatt (1885) | ${ }^{\text {T. C. }} 86$. | - 124 |
| Wilson v. Fasson (1883) | 1 T. C. 526 | - 121 |
| Wootten v. Rolfe (188) | 47 L. T. 252 | - 124 |
| Yewens v. Noakes ( 1880 ) | IT. C. 260 |  |
| Young v. Douglay (1879) | I T. C. 227 | 124 |
| Yatradyfodwg. etc., Sowerarp Board $\boldsymbol{v}$. Bonsted (3007) | 57 |  |

INDEX TO ACTS OF PARLIAMENT CITED.

| Statate. | Paga. | Statuta | Pager |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 38 Geo. III., c. 5 | 57 | 18\& 19 Vict.c. 80 | 60 |
| 39 Geo. III., c. 13 | 46,60 | 20 \& 21 Vict c. 58 | 18 |
| 43 Geo. III., c. 122 | 46 | 23 \& 24 Vict. c. 4 | 146 |
| 45 Geo. III., c. 49 | 46, 350 | 27 \& 28 Vict.c. 52 | 146 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 48 \text { Geo. III., c. } 55 \\ & 7 \text { Geo. IV., c. } 62 \\ & 6 \& 7 \text { Will. IV., c. } 7 \mathrm{I} \end{aligned}$ | 26, 46, 305, | 29 a 30 Vict. c. 36 |  |
|  | 120 | 32 \& 33 Vict. c. 67 34 \& 35 Vict. c. 103 | 16.44 |
|  | 143 | 34 37 \& 38 | 24 |
|  | 41,44 | c. 70 | 146 |
|  | 161 | 41 \& 42 Vict.c. 15 | 123, 178 |
| 1 \& 2 Vict.c. $56{ }^{\text {c. }} 96$ | 24, 26 | 48 a 49 Vict. c. 31 | 227,320 |
| 1 \& 2 Vict.c. .565 \& 6 Vict. c. 35 | ${ }_{143}^{18}$ | 50 a 51 Vict. c. 15 | 87, 229 |
|  | $18,26,37$, 44, | $\begin{array}{llllll}51 \\ \text { a } & 52 & \text { Vict. c. } & 49 \\ 52 & \text { a } & 53 & \text { Vict.c. } 50\end{array}$ |  |
|  | 59, 60, 63. | 53 \& 54 Vict co 8 | 94. ${ }^{182}$, |
|  | 84, 81, 88, | 54 \& 55 Vict.c. 25 |  |
|  | 182, 209, | ${ }_{57}$ \& 58 Vict. c. 30 | 57, 61, 63 |
|  | 263, 269, |  | 147, 19, |
|  | 350, 352 | 59 \& 60 Vict.c. 28 | $88^{43}$ |
| 9 at 10 Vict.c. 110 14 A. 15 Vict c. 36 15 \& 16 Vict.c. 63 16 \& 17 Vict.c. 13 | 146 | 6 Ca 62 Vict.c. 37 | 147 |
|  | 114 | 62 \& 63 Vict ${ }^{\text {c }} 17$ | 60 |
|  | 143. 146 | 3 Edvi VII., e. 46 | 117 |
|  |  | 4 Edal VII, ce 23 | 114 |
| c. 34 | 59. 81, 88, | 7 Edw. VII., c. 13 | 215, 244 |
|  | $142,163 \text {, }$ |  | $313,322$ |
|  | 263. 264, $269.305$ | 10 Edw. VII., c. 8 $4 \& 5 \text { Geo. V., c. } 10$ | $\begin{array}{ll} 384 \\ 170, & 173 . \end{array}$ |
| 17 \& 18 Vict. c. 8 | 143, 146 |  | $323$ |
| 18 \& 19 Victe c 35 | ${ }_{305}^{18,19,142}$ | 5\& 6 Geo. V., c. 62 | 306 |

Table A3 (continued from $p$-36).
Gross Sch. A. England and Wales (£000 omitted). (Excluding Metropolis.)

| Year. |  |  |  | Lands, | Messuages. | Total. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1982-13 |  | - | - | 36,745 | 150,636 ${ }^{\text {- }}$ | 187,381 |
| 1913-14 | - | - | - | 36,805 | 152,927 | - 189,732 |
| 1914-15 |  | - | . | 36,801 | 154,906 | - 191,707 |
| 1915-16 | - | - | - | 36,690* | 155,880* | 192,570 |

- Estimated. (Nofe.-There was no reassessment in this area from II to 1920 inclusive, and therofore the figures become less and less resentative of the true values.)

Table A4 (consinued from p. 49).
Lands (including Tithes) (f000 omitted).

|  | Year. |  | England and Wales. | Scotland. | Ireland. | United Kingdom. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15-14 | * | - | 37,071 | 5,713 | 9.699 | 52,484 |
| 14-15 | - | - | 37,063. | 5,698 | 9.705 | 52,466 |
| 15-16 | - | - | 36,950 | 5.595 | 9.700 | 52,245 |
| 16-17 | - | - | 36,950 | 5.595 | 9.700 | 52,245 |
| 17-18 | - | - | 36,910 | 5.590 | 9.700 | 52,200 |

Table A4 (contimued from p. 50).
Housen and Messuages (foon omitted).

| Year. | Engtand and Wales. | Scotand. | Ireland. | Unitod Kingdom. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 5-14 | 904.018 | 21,203 | 5.419 | 228,699 |
| 4-15 : | 204.270 305.563 | 91.739 81.758 | 5.454 | 235,463 332,844 |
| $\mathrm{C}^{-37}$ | 207, 187 | 21,847 | 5.566 | 234,600 |
| 7-18 | 207.495 | 21,893 | 5.663 | 235.051 |

Gross (Sch. A: Assassmonts) (contimued from p. 5r).
Lands, Houses and other Property ( $£ 000$ omitted).

|  | Year. | England. and Wales. | Scotland. | Ireland. | United Kingdom. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1913-14 | - • | 239,757 | 27,385 | 15,120 | 282,262 |
| 1914-15 | . - | 241,972 | 27,898 | 15,160 | 285,030 |
| 1915-16 | . | 243,148 | 27,814 | 15,224 | 286,186 |
| 1916-17 | . | 244.772 | 27,902 | 15,267 | 287,941 |
| 1917-18 | - | 345,040 | 27,943 | 15,365 | $\begin{aligned} & 288,348 \\ & 290,000^{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |

* Royal Commission on the Income Tax, Vol. I., App., P. 20.

Table B2 (continued from $p$. 95).
Farmers who Eloctod to be assessed Sch. D instead of Seh. B United Kingdom.

|  | Year. |  |  | Number who Elected. |  | Grose 5000. Amonnt of Profits Amesmable. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1913 | - - | - |  | 332 | 124-1 | 13.0 |
| 1914 | - - | - | - | 330 | 120\% | 126 |
| $1915{ }^{*}$ | - $\cdot$ | . | - | 8,259 | $387{ }^{\circ}$ | 120-3 |
| 1916 | - | - |  | 1,500 | -1 | - |
| 1917 | - | $\bullet$ | * | $1,500$ | -1 | $\cdots$ |

* Vide 6oth Report, g. 15. i No details available since.

Table H. D. (continued from p. 141).
Number of Houses (Classified) (Great Britain) sinee 1874 (in thousands).

| Yeas. | Elouse sot chroped to Hlow buy. |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Hiomes |  | $\frac{6 \mathrm{y} \text { and }}{600}$ |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & 1913-14 \\ & 1914-15 \\ & 1915-16 \end{aligned}$ | 840 842 | $3,232-5$ $3,233-8$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2,210-8 \\ & 2,2442 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1,0013 \\ & 1,038-7 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7528 \\ & 7680 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7,340-5 \\ & 7,406-5 \end{aligned}$ |

* No statinticn compiled daring the wae period.

Table H．D．（continued from \％${ }^{p}$ ．I4T）．
Number of Houses（Classified）（Great Britain）nince 1874 （in thousands）．

| reas | 3 Nu |  | Number of Eloume charged to Rotute Duty． |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Shopp } \\ & \text { (ReHI: } \end{aligned}$dential). | Publio－ hourch． | Farm－ houses | Dwelling－housen． |  |  | Lodging： houen． |
|  |  |  |  | 6 20 to 640. | fas to E60． | All Values． |  |
| 5－14 | 906．9 | 88.7 | 33．2 | E，210，4 | 2350 | 1.5749 | 293 |
| $4-15$ | 3034 | $88 \cdot 4$ | 330 | 2，167－3 | $236 \cdot 5$ | 8，592］ | 30.8 |
| 5－160 | $3009 \pm 1$ | 87－4土5 | 33．7土 | 2，18200 | 236．5土2 | 8，60a ${ }^{2}$＋ 5 |  |
| $6-17^{\circ}$ | 094．8土 | $88 \cdot 7 \pm 5$ | Scrat | x，1830．0 | 2347\％ | 1，601 ${ }^{\circ}+5$ | $3000 \pm$ |
| 7－18＊ | 490－2 | 844土9 | 3－6圭5 | 2，1730土4 | 2396土 | 7，5850土5 | $300 \pm 2$ |

－Ratimatod．As thero was no ponenil revaluntion aloce xgro the atatiatice are decressiggly epromentative of true valuer．（Vimpe． 359 ）

Table Di（continued from p．219）． Initod Kingdom－Cross Soh．D Assessmonts（in million $\AA$ ）．

－Not yot determinable．
† Eatimate．Royal Commission on the Income Tar，Vol．I，App．，p． 20.
Table D2（continued from p．220）．
Amounts for the United Kingdoy（ （000 omitted）．


[^250]Table G4 (continued from p.318). "Taxable Income" as now given in Official Reports, earried back to 1842 in the Conditions of 1876-93, and those of 1913, respectively.

Milliona.


- Vide Royal Commission on the lncome Tar, Vol II, App., p. So.
tVide Royal Commanion on the lscoma Tax, Vol. In, App., P. It.
Table G5 (continued from p. 338). Super-Tax Statistics.


Table $\mathrm{G}_{5}$ (continued from $p$. 338).
Super-Tax Statistics.



[^0]:    "As examples of unsuitable units we may instance .... ©I income broaght under the review of the Inland Revenue Commissioners, which is often not income, while much income is not included. Most official publications fail from want of definition. What is meant by gross income, how are estates valued for probate, what is the relation between assessed value of houses and

[^1]:    3 "Onr Statistics: A Plex for a Central Government Department," Financial Revien of Raviems.

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ Ninatamith Cenampy, 1910, p. 943 .

[^3]:    ${ }^{2}$ Videp. 38
    E In "o Palitical Thought from Speacer." ${ }^{\text {" }}$ proper of MacDougall's "Social Pyychology."

[^4]:    "The worth of the individud is monswiol not by his divect echiconmant, but first and foremost by its melue for the mole, the

[^5]:    2 Official evidence on the procedure in making new Sch. A and B assessmenta may be found in the following (inter clie):-
    S. C. on Bardens affecting Real Proporty, 1846, Qs. 1.900, etce
    S. C. on Income Tax, 1851-2, Qan $x, 350$, etc.
    R.C. on Agricultural Depression, 2896, Qa- 45.420, etc.
    S. C. on Poor Rate Assessments: T. Sargent, Secretary to Board of Inland Revenue, Qu, 6,316, etc.
    R. C. on Land in Walos, 1893-6, $\mathrm{ga}_{3}$ 76.545, ate

    83th Report.

[^6]:    I On the general and moch misunderstood question of tamation of leascholds, and the " wasting amset" difficnlty, vide my article in Ecomomic Reries, July, 191I.
    ${ }^{2} 32$ \& 33 Vict c 67, 血4-

[^7]:    " In London a householder is subject to a rather vexatious anomaly, which might well be removed, on account of the local assessments for House Duty and income tax under the Metropolis Valuation Act. The Act says that each house is to be assessed at the annual value. Inasmuch as a yearly tenant generally pays more than a tenant on lease, the assessors say that the annual value of a house is what a yearly tenant would pay, and they stick on $£ 10$ per cent. when they are dealing with a leasehold."Hugh Chisholy, "Justice for the Taxpayer," Fortnighdy Revicen, March, 1897.

    The practice for income tax parposes is similar outside the metropolis. In any case, the "vexatious anomaly" is not very clear.

    England and Wales (not maluding Metropolis 9) Annual Value.-"The annual value of lands, tenements,

    I In theory higher reats may be expected to be chargeable " by the wrekt" and the value to be lot "by the year "is not necessarily the aggregate of the weekly payments. Mareover, it is a meting practice to allow a "contingency "balance or marsin.
    assessment and Valuation Conference, 1909, Kesolutions, p. \& - Ibid. p. 6.

    - Since 1870

[^8]:    117 \& 18 Vict. C. 91, 2. G. See ako D. C. on Imperial and Locel Taxation, 1912, evidence by H. T. Eva

    - Armour. p. 807.

[^9]:    "Grifith's " Instructions to Valuers in Ireland," 1853 , p. 8es

[^10]:    ${ }^{1}$ "Improvement of Official Statistics," S. J. 1908.
    As above, p. 16.

    - For a fuller discussion of the difficulties attending the valuation of the properties, see "Land Valuation and Rating Reform." Economic Jowrnal, March, 1911, by the writer. Also "Rating of Country

[^11]:    Mansions," an article in the Transactions of the Surveyors" Institute 187-5. p. 177.
    1 For the significance of this as "income " in the case of durellinghouses, vide Chapter XII., "The National Income." For its importance in the case of factories, etc., vide Chapter VI., "Sch. D - Buildings. ${ }^{*}$

[^12]:    1 Vide the interesting examples of assessments in different circumstances, to include the moerge value of large timber in Senior's "Income Tax Law and Practice ${ }^{\text {T }}$ 1864. Pp 806-9.

    - 12. C. on Agriculture, 18y6, Lord Milner, Q.63.358.

[^13]:    1 Such as Easter offerings, pew rents, interest secured on chapels, etc.

[^14]:    2. R.C. on Agricultural Depression, 1896, 9. 45.575, etco.
[^15]:    1 Economic Journal, ibid., March, 19ri. See also R. C. on Agricultural Depression, 1896, Q. 45.589, etc., as to the effect of mortgages, R.C. on Depression in Trade, 1886, Q 743 ; R.C. on Land in Wales, 1893-6. Qs. 76,545, etc.

[^16]:    ${ }^{1}$ Giffen was warned by the Board of Inland Revenue that the assessment in 1842 could not be talken as a fair statement of rental (R. C. on Financial Relations, Q. 7,661).

[^17]:    ${ }^{2}$ R.C. on Agriculture, Q. 45.542. Evidence before R. C. on Land in Wales, Q.76.545, etc., refers to the effect of a change of surveyors in Anglesea, and a note by a "high anthority" that assessments prior to 1874 were not well made.

    IS. C. on Town Holdings, 1891. Qs. 1845-5I, 2993-8, 2003-5

    - Concerns No. III., Sch. A. vide p. 37.
    - gand Repart. p. 145.

[^18]:    ${ }^{2}$ Ystredyfodme. Ac., Somevare Board v. Beasteri, 5 T. C. 230

[^19]:    1 Vide, generally, R. C. on Reduction of Tithe Rentcharge, 1892.
    ${ }^{2}$ 13th Report, P. 198.

[^20]:    ${ }^{2}$ See Wataridge, "Prosperous Agricultare, ${ }^{\text {an }}$. 69. Also Sir T. H. Elliott's memorandum for the R. C. on Agriculture, 1896, Appendix A, p. xvii. Total commuted tithe, $\{4.054,653$ : extraordinary tithe about 430,009 Also H. C. 114 of 1887 for connties and parishen

[^21]:    " In the payment of this fine the tenant advances the rent of future years, and the aggregate of the fines and reserved rents, divided over the term of renewal, represents the average income derived from the property by the lessors. Income tax is now levied upon the full annual value of the property in the hands of the tenant, and it is also levied on the fines received by the lessors, so that the State taxes a large portion of the ' profits' of the property twice over. The assessment of the fines in the hands

[^22]:    ${ }^{1} 5$ 2 6 Vict c. 35, 3. 60 (ii) (5).
    ${ }^{2}$ Mostyne $\nabla$. London, 3 T. C. 2940
    ${ }^{2} 39$ Geo. 3. C. 13; Sch. A, IV.
    43 Geo. 3, c. 122, s. 31 ; Sch. A, II., r. $4-$

    - Vide p. 350; and also Manors, etc., p. 45.

[^23]:    ${ }^{1} 5$ \& 6 Vict C. 35, s. 60 : Sch. A, II., 6.

[^24]:    ${ }^{1}$ S. J., 1887, p. 208.
    2 R C. on Local Taxation, Appendix, 582.
    ${ }^{2}$ Vide pp. 352, 470. Lord Milner, when Chairman of the Board of Inland Revenue, in giving evidence before the R. C. on Agriculture, 1896, though loth to express an opinion, evidentry considered it a true tax (Qs. 63.085, 63.425, etc.); but the deputy-chairman, Sir F. L. Robinson, gave it as the "Inland Revenue view" that it was a variable rentcharge ( $Q$. 45.247). Also vide conmments by the present writer in Economic Journal, July, 1911. The view held in 1846 may be gathered from the Report of the S. C. on Burdens affecting Real Property.

[^25]:    2 I6 \& 17 Vict. a. 34. 3. 37.
    a Heshefh v. Bray, (1888) a T. C. 380 ,
    t $\$ 6$ Vict. C. 35, s. 60 : Sch. A. V., 4.

    - By the Act of 1853 : it had previonsly beea a tweaty-ane years" average.
    - 5 \& 6 Vict. © 35, 2. 60; Sch. A. V. 4

[^26]:    1 Viale p. 43 on Tithe Rentcharye.
    ${ }^{2}$ Vide Dowell's "Incume Tax Laws " (fifth edition), p. Idvii.

    - Ibid., p.

[^27]:    : Finance Act, 1894 .

[^28]:    ${ }^{1}$ Vide p. 53.
    3 S. C. on Income Tax, 1851, Q. 1,649.

    * 5 \& Vict. © 35, a. 65, No. VL

[^29]:    ${ }^{2} 5$ \$ 6 Vict. © 35, 2. 6x, Na. VI.

    - Ibial

[^30]:    ${ }^{1}$ Commissioners for Special Purposes v. Pomsed, 3 T. C. 53.

[^31]:    2 Vide p. 148. Vide p. 53- Vide p. 499.

[^32]:    ${ }^{1}$ S. J., 1876, p. 393.

[^33]:    ${ }^{1}$ P. 366, Vol. II.
    ${ }^{2}$ H. C. 144 of 1867.

[^34]:    II.e., nnder Sch. A.

    2 1617 Vict. C. 34, 2.2 .
    . 5 \& 6 Vict. C. 35. \&. 63.
    S \& 6 Vict. e 35 . 8.63 (viii.). Hop grounds were originally included with nurseries, etc, but were subeequently, in 1853, brought under the ordinary Sch. B.

    - 28th Reporto p. 80.

[^35]:    T The question of the deduction of ono-eighth for tithe does not arise, as it applies to payment of duty rather than to computation of income.

    3 Proportion raised by Budget of September, 1915, to equal the. whole rent
    *Vide Transactions of Surveyors Institute, 1896: Cal G. W. Raikes an "Re-apportionment of Rates and Taxes."

[^36]:    1 The value of sporting attached to lands is included noder Sch. B as well as under Sch. A when land is cocupied by the owner, and the position tarea in the text is therefore emphasised.

    - Vide p 386
    - Vice p. roj.

[^37]:    1 The criterion for the right to appeal to have actual profits substituted for the fixed assessment.
    ${ }^{2}$ Qs. 755. etc., and general evidence on Sch. B to Q. 775-
    a Vide p. 39.

    - Vide p. 35.
    ${ }^{3}$ Vide p. 3x, and Table A3.
    "The nearest approach to a record of agricaltaral rent " (Major Craigie, S. J., 1880, P. 304).
    - Vide p. 87.

[^38]:    1R.C. on Land in Wales, 1893-6, Qs 76.545, etce

    - 5o e 51 Vict. C. 15, s. 18 : wide p. 93 -
    - Vile S. J. 1880 , P. 304 (Major Craigie).

[^39]:    "As to the earnings of this class, we have official evidence which is sufficient. Certain figures with regard to them are given in the income tax returns (Sch. B). These, however, as they stand now, are most misleading. The farmers' profits have, for purposes of assessment, been theoretically reduced since the year 1896. Up to that date they were estimated as being about equal to the rent (see Cd. 4954, p. 137). Since that date it has

[^40]:    ${ }^{1} 5$ \& 6 Vict C. 35, 2. 167, and 16 \& 17 Vict. Co 34, 2. 28.
    24 ist Report, P. 98.

    - Fimance Act, 1896 , s. 28.

[^41]:    ${ }^{2}$ Pointed ont by Major Craigio, S. J. 1887, p. 324-

[^42]:    ${ }^{1}$ 4IIt Report, p. IIO.

[^43]:    - Not all theoe were actmally charged to tan. For example, in both
     91 were tiable.
    $\dagger$ This increase followed a circuhar letter to farmers inewed by tive Board of Agricultura (Vile R. C. on Agricultera, 1804. 9 45-45s)

[^44]:    - Vide Gifien's evidence, R. C. on Trade Depremenion, 1886 : and see Qs. 8.794, etc., to 9,674, and p. 100, Final Report.
    ${ }^{2}$ The Amount and Distribution of Income, S. J., 1910.
    - I.e., at 32s. per acre (Vide p. 103). Vide, P. 93

[^45]:    - Vide p. 94.
    - The accounts under B are defoctive in detail for comperisoos. Uoder C the profits are far less on the averago than in A.

[^46]:    " Quoted by Nicholson, " Rates and Taxes in Agricalture," p. 101.

[^47]:    : R. C. on Agricaltaral Depreesion, Appendic, p. II\&

    - Pp. 33-36

[^48]:    ${ }^{1}$ "Labour Bill in Farming " Journal of Royal Agricultural Society, p. 84.
    2. Richards, Journal of Farmers' Club, March, 1913.

    - A. Dudley Clarka Journal of the Royal Agricaltural Society. 1893. P. 23.
    - Sir R. Paget. " Division of Capital in Agricniture as between Landiord and Tenanto Journal of the Farmers Club, March 1914.

    For a coinparison between Ireland and England, see Sir J. Caird, S. J. 188x. p. ${ }^{635 .}$

[^49]:    ${ }^{1}$ Before the Eighty Club, and December, 1912. See also D. C. on Imperial and Local Tarntion, Qa, 6,037, 8,907-8, 9,098-9,100, $9.152-6.0 t c$

[^50]:    ${ }^{2}$ s8th Report, p. 86.

    - 56th Report, p. 69.
    asth Report, p. 8i

[^51]:    ${ }^{1}$ Lord President in Re The Glasgow Coal Exchange Co., (1879) IT. C. 211.

    2 Riley F. Read, $^{(1879)}$ I T. C. 217.

    - Vide p. 123.
    - For a summary of the deciding cases see Piper's " House Tax Laws" 1903. Pp. 16 et seq.

[^52]:    ${ }^{2}$ 28th Report, p. 86. - IR

[^53]:    28th Report, p. 87.
    8 56th Report, p. 69.
    ${ }^{3}$ 28th Report, p. 87.

[^54]:    "Inhabited House Duty is only levied upon houses assessed at over $£ 20$ per annum. A house assessed at $£ 20$ is of the real rental value of $\mathrm{f} 23 \mathrm{I3s}$.4 ., as one-sixth of the annual value of buildings is allowed to be deducted for the cost of repairs. A note to this effect appears on p. x6x of the Commissioners' Report " (1g08).J. C. L. Zorn, "The Incidence of the Income Tax " (Igo9), in which the writer turns all the tables into these new gross figures, and in the course of fifty-five pages upon this foundation proves many astonishing things, e.g., the number of income taxpayers is over $2,000,000$, and those with incomes under $\{x, 000$ under-pay by 46 per cent., those above by $\$ 7$ and 36 per cent. 1

[^55]:    1 Fide p. $3^{2}$.
    -Vile Ping。

[^56]:    1 Vide p. 132 for a consideration of this class over a period of years The statistics in the present form have been available since 1874, and for prior years recourse may be had to Electoral Returns-"Of the tota nomber in England and Walos, more than haf are rated at less than 86 per annum ${ }^{8}$ (W. Newmarch, S. J. 1857. P. 199).

[^57]:    1 Vide p. 126.

    - Above 430 the Perne index is 403 , bat below $f 30$ it is uniformaly 344. Vile P. 464.

[^58]:    1 Vile p. 65. The figures given for 1899-1900 are the sums allowed in the assessment only.

    - Vide cases of Nadhem V. Bomms: Cemse V. Nottingham Luinatic Hospital: Musgraes v. Dundio Royal Lsmatic Aswime (z \& 3 T. C.).
    - Jepson v. Gribble, I T. C. 78, and Wilsom v. Fassom, I I. C. 526.
    - Chanteribomse School v. Lainaingme, I T. C. 61x.
    - Chapterhouse Satool V. Gayier. 3 T. C. 435.
    - Criftom Collage v. Tempsons 3 I. C. 430
    - Broume v. Furtiolos 4 T. C. 537.

[^59]:    "Trade or Business, Profession or Calling": Exemption allowed-Glasgow Coal Exchange, membership subscriptions payable-used for exchange purposes by coal masters, merchants and brokers, and occasionally let for balls, etc. ${ }^{2}$

    Premises occupied by mutual insurance society (Scottish Widows' Fund and Life Assurance Society). ${ }^{3}$

    Exemption not allowed-An hotel, where the hotel-keeper and his family resided elsewhere (Young v. Douglas ").

    Two farmhouses, one occupied by a farm servant, and the other by the steward (In re Ainslic ${ }^{\text { }}$ ).

    Premises occupied by Merchant Company of Edinburgh, the secretary also carrying on his business as law agent. ${ }^{6}$

    Premises occupied by London library-attendant and wife in residence for protection of premises. ${ }^{7}$

    Premises occupied by British Institute of Preventive Medicine.s
    "Caretaker "-wservant or other Person": Exemption not allowed.-Clerk (with salary of $£ 150$ per annum), with wife, children, and servant occupying eight rooms and two attics.

    Bank clerk (salary $£^{\text {(roo), }}$ with wife, daughter and son, both of age. The salary included services in closing offices, cleaning and firing, and attendance at door. ${ }^{10}$

    Premises in charge of female caretaker, a condition of her employment being that her son, aged 22 , should sleep on the premises for increased safety. He was a clerk elsewhere; an adult daughter and servant were also resident. ${ }^{11}$

[^60]:    ${ }^{1}$ Concerns No. III., Sch. A, amemed mader Sch. D. Vide p. 222.

[^61]:    - The tax deecription is broader, and inchodes coffee-houses and ternpernace hotela, so that the two classes axe aot atrictly comperable (see Census Repart. VI., 5 )
    t This represeats the shopes otc, ander $f=0$ in valua. In reso thate were about isaceo in armber (vide p. 118)

[^62]:    2 Vide p. 119.

    * H. C. 20\%-1864.

[^63]:    1 Vide p. 31.
    -Vide Hansard: Vol. 45, cols. 1483 and 1507 : Vol. 46, cols. 349. 1180, 2063: Vol. 47, cols, 41 11, 1322, 2194: Vol. 48, cols. 1485, 8490: Vol 52, col 1638: Vol 52, col 339: Val. 55, col 1s33-

[^64]:    1 Hansard, Vol 48, cole. 1485, ete.

[^65]:    1 This figure is arrived at by deducting the houses bubject to duty from the total number of inhabited honses.

[^66]:    1 On 15th March, 1912, Mr. John Burns stated in the House of Commons, in debate on the Housing of the Working Classes Bill, that there were 500,000 honsee void in the country generally, 60,000 being in London.

    2 Pp. 244 ebc.
    The official evidence by T. Sargent, before the S. C. on Poor Rate Assessments, 1868, that the lose on Honse Duty assesments was I per cent. and included loas by voids, must have been given under a misapprehension as to the true facts.
    ${ }^{3}$ Vile 56th Report, p. 70.

    - For defimitions, etco, see S. C. on Town Holdings, 1890, p. 663.

[^67]:    1 "Statistical Monographa." His figure for 1900 appears to be wrongly calculated.
    ${ }^{2}$ F. 374

[^68]:    ${ }^{2} 16{ }^{8} 17$ Vict. e. 34, s. 12
    ${ }^{2} 17$ d. 18 Vict. c. 24, 5. 5-

    - Vide p. 35.

[^69]:    ${ }^{1}$ I6 a 17 Vict. C. 34. s. 13.

    - 17 Vict. C. 8, s. 2.
    - Valuation Act 18sa, 3. Is.
    - Memorandam on Local Taration in Ireland prepared for the Royal Commission on Local Taration 1897. Ihose Acts were repealed by the consolidatings Act of $\mathbf{3 8 3 6}$.

    I at Vict a 56

[^70]:    " It will, I believe, appear that the valuations for poor rates in Ireland are more nearly and more generally correct than has been supposed; and I believe also that they will be found fully to sustain the views expressed in my letter to Lord Morpeth of the 9th March, 1841, which is given in the last Report of the Poor Law Commissioners, and to which I beg to refer your Lordship.
    " When it is considered that these valuations are the first efforts which have been made to obtain a general tenement valuation in this country-that they exhibit, separately, every house or other holding, of whatever size or value-and that they have been completed within a comparatively short period, by a large number of valuators, separately appointed by the several boards of guardians, and proceeding simultaneously in all parts of the country:-when these circumstances are considered the results here given cannot, I think, be deemed unsatisfactory."
    ". . . The variance in the items of which the gross value is composed is of less consequence, as the net or rating value is not ${ }^{1}$ Poor Law Commiseloners' 12th Amual Report, p. 228.,

[^71]:    a Finance Act 1894335 (d)

[^72]:    a Vide p. 217. ${ }^{2}$ Vide p. 70 on brilding societies. P. 196.

[^73]:    1 As given in Appendix Na $I$ of the Report of S. C. © General Valuation, etc, Ireland, 186 g,

    - Vide 28th Report.
    - Qe. 494-5, 1,736-9, 0tc.

[^74]:    ${ }^{1}$ Qs. 4,069, 4,070.
    2 Repart and Evidence, P. 454

    - H. C. 452- 852
    - Q. 5,329.
    - P. miii.
    Q. 4. 450, 4.745-63.

    Ts. 1,578-83, 1,612, 1,627.
    Q. 702

[^75]:    ${ }^{1}$ 13th Report, p. 130.
    © $0.4,639$
    ${ }^{2}$ Qs. 1,212 and 8,513.
    Q3. 1,269, 1,614.
    Q. 1,269.

[^76]:    ${ }^{1}$ Os, 1,576, 5,153.

    - Qs, 657, 678, 2,967.
    - Vol. fo Qs 28, 218, eten

[^77]:    : Vide Qs. 6,411, 10,998, 14,232, 14,278, 15,137, 19,118.
    ${ }^{2}$ Q. 7,118.
    As 647,000 out of 719,000 were wholly exempt, they were indifferent as to whether assesement was over the rent.

    - Q. 5,650.

[^78]:    1 County details were given in the 1894 "Financial Relations" appendices.

    Q3. 3.406, 3.409, 3.514-
    E P. 412.

[^79]:    2 Institute of Surveyors, Transections, 1902-3, p. 267.

    - Vide also "Valuation of the City of Dublin." C. Dawson, Statistical and Social Inquiry Society of Iroland, 1897. p. 320, for comparison with Belfast. Belfast was actually raised from $\mathbf{6 1 , 2 7 1 , 1 7 0}$ to [1,396,02\%, after appeals, or just under 10 per ceat. Dablin was raised from $\{1,008,023$ to $61,177.940$ before appeals, and if the amount allowed on epped is similar to that in Belnet, this will give ultimately f $1,184,000$, or an increase of 11 per cent. I have strons rosson for suppoeing that in neither case is the new valation strictly

[^80]:    $116{ }^{1} 17$ Vict C. 34, s. 2.
    "Dowell's " Income Tax Laws " (seventh editica). P 21\%. - 88th Reports pr 83.

[^81]:    ${ }^{1}$ 56th Report, p. 106. An analysis of the " exemptions " amongst the several classes of stock was given for 1898-9, 43rd Report, p. 138, and similarly for 1899-1900.

[^82]:    1 Vide p. 170.

    - In $\mathbf{1 8 5}$-3 a special return (H. C. 95-1852-3) was given classifying the exemptions for dividends from Public Funds :-

[^83]:    1 Vide p. 295, etc.
    6 Vide p. 227.

[^84]:    1 The statistics at this point are deceptive. Where is the increase (for Engiand) that would be expected upon the reduction of the exemption himit from \& 150 to f 100 ? It is masked by a transier to the "Ireland" column. Reference to the Pariamentary Returns 341 of 1854 and 482 of 1855 will show that payments through the Bank of Ireland, which, prior to 1853. were included ander Engiand. are transferred to " Ireland "after that date.

[^85]:    ${ }^{1}$ A footnote on p. 55 of the 38th Report explains that "it has been deemed expedient to record all Assessments on Interest of Municipal and Corporation Stocks and Loans nonder Sch. D, instead of partly under Sch. C and partly under Sch. D." These sums have accordingly been transferred to Sch. D in Table Dr.

[^86]:    1 A fuller treatment may be found in many legal and practical handbooks.
    ${ }^{2}$ Finance Act, 1915. $\quad$ Vide p. 212.

[^87]:    ${ }^{1}$ Morsey Dochs V. Luces, 2 T. C. 25 : Paldingtom Burial Bowill v. Commers. of I, R., 2 T. C. 46 : Roligious Tract Soc. V. Fonbes, 3 T. C. 415. otc.

    Clevical, Moticel, and Gemeral Lifo Ass. Soa v. Certer, \& I. C. 437.

    Colquibuen V. Brools, $\&$ T. C. 490.

    - Calcuita Iris Mills v. Niciolsoo, I T. C. 83, and many subeequent cases.
    - Vide p.egx.

[^88]:    1 Kodak, Ld. v. Clavk, 4 T. C. 549, etc.
    ${ }^{2}$ Tischler © Co. V. Apthorpe, 2 T. C. 89, ete.
    : Greinger V. Gough, 3 T. C. 462 . Vide also debates on the Finance Bill, November, 1915 .

[^89]:    ${ }^{1}$ "It is not possible to admit the proposition that . . . We ought habitually to follow the same lines as those on which the owner of the business estimates his profits."-Sir Henry Primrose (Cd. 2576, p. 11). Hie also remarked " a very large number of people pay now in excess of their true incomes" (Answer II4).
    s Recently altered under a House of Lords decision (Usher's Breany, 6 I. C. 399).

[^90]:    : Vial my erticle "Economic Aspects of Income Tax Change," Ecomomic Revirw, October, 1909.

    - Vile Income Tax Committee's Report. xgos.
    "The People's Progress, "Chap XI.
    Op. cit. p. 58. See also Sir T. Whittaker's criticism. "Tamation and Ownership of Land."

[^91]:    whole assessed profits for the year $=x+76 \pi$, or two months after he end of the middle year.
    1 20th Report, P. 54 . Vide also S. C. an Income Tax, 1852, Qs. 2.475, 3.673, 6.983, etc.

    * 4 I Vict. C. 15, 2.22

[^92]:    1 The peculiar and privileged position now given to wear and tear allowances is dealt with in my article "Wasting Asoets and Income Tax, ${ }^{*}$ Ecomomic Jownal, March, 1910.

[^93]:    ${ }^{1} 5$ \& 6 Vict. c. 35 , 8. 10r.
    ${ }^{2} 53$ \& 54 Vict. C 8, 8. 23.

[^94]:    ${ }^{1}$ P. 18n.

[^95]:    4. Interest on Invested Funds.-" Income tax must be paid upon all annual interest received upon invested funds, no matter whether the business as a whole be profitable or not.
[^96]:    ${ }^{1}$ It is dealt with in my article " Incidence of Taration of Leaseholds," Econontic Review, Iuly, 1911.
    " Vide "Fines," Sch. A, p. 46.

[^97]:    1 Income Tax Committee Report, s. 65 .

    - Sooble V. Searalary of Siete for Inalim, 4 T. C. 618.

[^98]:    - Ireson, ep cit, pres.

[^99]:    ${ }^{2}$ Quoted by Ireson, op. cif., P. 53.
    " Vide "Goodwill": by P. D. Leake in the Acconntant: also * Depreciation and Wasting Ansets."

[^100]:    ${ }^{1}$ Statistically this point is similar to leaseholds and other cases where a "capital" consideration for rights in future profits is not assessable on the recipient : vide Ecomomic Jownal, 1912, p. 282.

    - Economic Jowmal, March, 1910, P. ro9, and 1912, p. 283. A perusal of the evidence before the Select Committee of 1852 shows that little advance has been made in the arguments used in this matter. The Select Committee on Rating of Mines, 1857, reported: -" It was contended with great force that the principle should be recognised that the working of a mine is the using up of the coopous and not of the mere annual produce capable of reproduction." The advocates of wasting assets allownoes do not discuss the fundamental justice of taring the natural yield, but beg the question as self-evident and attack any schemes which do not carry out the exemption.

[^101]:    1 Ireson, op. cil., p. 53 :-" Generally much less than what is written off by the owners of such property."

[^102]:    2 Vide correspondence, etc., in the Accomenand, 27ih March, 1915.

    - For the changes brought about in the economic aspects of the Taxing Acts by the process of time side articie by the writer in Econumic Roviem, October, rgog.

[^103]:    2 Particulariy Appendix X., P. 44. Vide also my article ${ }^{* 0}$ Econconic Aspects of Income Tax Change, "Ecomonic Resiow, October, Igon

[^104]:    Estimated as under $\$ 5$ per head.
    ${ }^{2}$ S. J., 1905. Vide also S. C. on Co-operative Societies, 1879-80, and the varions year-books for past statistice.
    ${ }^{3}$ I. T. Commíttee, 1905, p. 47. Chief Registrar's Returns. p. 186.

    - Only changes in scope have been noted. Legislative enactments designed to render administration more effective in preventing evasion, ete, over the existing field have been ignored.

[^105]:    ${ }^{2}$ P. 20\%.

[^106]:    ${ }^{2}$ P. 57.

    - This ovidence includes (a) the full analysis given in the Ist Report: (b) footnotes to the classifications in 28th Report: (c) reference to contemporary blank forms in which the various columns indicate the method of treatment: and (d) testimany of retired officials still living.

    In order, thereiort, to make the figures from 1853 to 1873 comparable with those for prior and subsequent years, a sum has to be added, and of what this should be thare is no reocrd. In $1874-5$ the life assurance under Sch. D was $\{464,134$ (out of $(266,942,347$ ) and the life assurance and expeases under Sch. E ESO8,212 (oat of ( $32.540,064$ ), and the sums for previous years have been comperted according to this proportion to the gross for Table Dr.

[^107]:    ${ }^{1}$ Vol. II., Appendix, p. 421.
    2 P. 218.

[^108]:    1 Income Tax Report, 1852, 93. 1,078-1,082.
    : Ibid., $1,1,17^{8}-9$

[^109]:    ${ }^{2}$ 45th Report, p. 173, compared with $44^{\text {th }}$ Report, p. 103.

[^110]:    ${ }^{1}$ By using 44th, 37th, and 25th Reports. For details as to the methods employed in supplying these figures for Table D, see Appendix 1.

[^111]:    1 Several cases of this lind among friends in business have come to my notice, and, though the matter affects only small companics It would have an appreciable effect upon the transfer, and belps to mast the true increase mider Sch. D and to eraggerato the gromth of Sch. 5.

[^112]:    2 For the chief use made of this classification, side Chapter XI., Giffen's valcation.

[^113]:    ${ }^{2}$ Vide evidence by Sir A. West before R. C. on Trade Depression. 1886, Q. 863.
    -The assessments number 95 (1910-11). Cf. the statement by Jeans (Ashiey, "British Industries," 1903. p. 19) that there are 100 concerns in the United Kingdom engaged in open hearth steed manufacture.

    - Vile evidence by Sir Algernon West before R. C. on Trade Depression, 1886, as to the method of charging upon water sopplied beyond limits of compulsory supply, 2.858.

[^114]:    ${ }^{2}$ Vide P. 47.

[^115]:    ${ }^{2}$ Vide particularly Koimh, Lid. v. Clarh, 4 T. C. 549.

[^116]:    ${ }^{1}$ Londow Consty Council $\%$. Attorney-General and Sugden v. Leeds Corporation, 5 T. C. 242; 6 T. C. 21 I.
    ${ }^{2}$ I'ide Chapter XII.

[^117]:    a Vide Chapter II.

[^118]:    2 46th Report, P. 202.

[^119]:    W. H. Mallock ; R. Walsh ; J. H. Schooling (vide quotations above).

    Sir L. Chiozza Money: "Things that Matter," 1912, p. 94

[^120]:    ${ }^{2}$ Vide p. 227. Also review of his book in $S_{.} J_{5}$ January. 1915. - Cd. 1761, p. 102.

[^121]:    2 Minutes of Evidence, 1906, p. 64.

[^122]:    1 Vide Chapter XI.
    Vide Economist, 1913, p. 878.

    * Fimance Act, $190 \%$.

[^123]:    1 Vide p. 228.
    ${ }^{3}$ H. C. 88 and 347-1898.
    ${ }^{3}$ P. 377.

    - Joint S. C. on Monicipal Trading. 1903. P. 233.

[^124]:    ${ }^{1}$ P. 207.

[^125]:    ${ }^{1}$ P. 204.

    - P. 178.
    E. P. 53

[^126]:    ${ }^{2}$ P. 181.

    * E.f. George Howell, "Capital and Labour," pp. 4ix-ra.
    - Vide R. C. an Depression in Trade and Industry. 1886: Sir Algernon West, 0.717.
    $8 \operatorname{Sir}$ Alpermon West, loc. cith
    Sir Algernon West (ien cit, Qs, 752, 804, dic.) would Eot admit a per cent. due to this cause, 1879-84.

    Lec. cih. O. 886.
    and

[^127]:    1 Cd. 1761, p. 454
    ${ }^{2}$ R.C. on Depression in Trade and Industry, Q. 874
    3 Vide W. H. Price, Quarserly Joumal of Ecomomics, February, 1906: Sir L. Chiozza Money. "Fiscal Dictionary," p. IfI.

    * W. T. Layton, Ecomomist, 191 I. P. 442; G. Howell, "Capital and Labour," p. 411.

[^128]:    : 16 \& $1 y^{2}$ Vict. C 34, 3. 1.

    - 5 \& 6 Vict. $a 35,2,146$

[^129]:    ${ }^{2} 16$ \& 17 Vict. C. 34, 2.53.
    : Attormey-Gemeral v. Lancashire and Yorkshire Railnay, 2 H. \& C. 792.
    ${ }_{3}$ Twerner v. Cxusom, 2 T. C. 422 ; Herbert V.MaQuade, 4 T. C. 489.

[^130]:    1 Out of fi30,000,000 not more than fra,000,000 would appenr to be based apon an average of proceding years

    - 56th Report P. 118.

[^131]:    1 56th Report. P. 117
    2 Vide p. 214.

[^132]:    2 Vide p. 238.

[^133]:    : Vide p. 241.
    216 \& 17 Vict. a. 34, 5s. 5 I and 5\%.

    - T.C.65.
    - Charitow v. Commers. of Inlend Revonue, (1890) 17 Sc. L. R. 647 ; but in 1909-10 the allowance for a "study "was granted.

[^134]:    1 Revell 7 . Directors of Elworthy Bros., 3 T. C. 12. 2 Cook v. Knots, 2 T. C. 246. ${ }^{2}$ Bowers V. Harding. 3 T. C. 22.

    - Repayments not shown, and not included.
    - Vide p. 53.

[^135]:    1 P.2Is.

    - P. sit.

[^136]:    " It can include only so much of the gross national income as is liable to taxation under the Income Tax Acts, or as, but for some title to exemption, would be so liable, and in addition a comparatively small fraction of that part of the national income which is not liable to taxation."

[^137]:    ${ }^{1}$ 45th Report. P. 168 . Vide also p. 213 for these additions of * unassessed duty. ${ }^{\circ}$

    - For explanation wile pr 1 ge.

[^138]:    ${ }^{2}$ Only changes in scope have here been noted. Legislative enactments designed to render the administration more effective in preventing evasion, etc, over the existing field have been iseored.

    2 P. 204.

    - P. 211.

[^139]:    I Sir Algernon West's evidence before the R. C. on Depression in Trade, 1886, on the effect of abatement and exemption changes, 1875-6, etc., rather confuses than explains the true position. Vide examples in Appendix 1.

    2 "Changes in Wages in the United Kingdom between 1860 and 2891" ${ }^{2 \prime}$ p. 246.
    ${ }^{2}$ "Growth of Capital," P. Ir. Estimate, $(960,000, ~ " e x c a p i n g$ assessment "through raising of exemption limit ion ane-fifth of the gross asserment affected.

[^140]:    ${ }^{2}$ P. 178.

[^141]:    1 P. 212.

    - Vide p. 88.
    - In later reports as $£ 791,000,000$ (vide explanation in 45th Report).

[^142]:    ${ }^{2}$ See note ${ }^{\circ}$ on p. 888.

[^143]:    (3) Foreign Dividends belonging to Foreign Residents" This exemption refers to interest or dividends, which if payable in the United Kingdom, fall within the scope of Sch. C. . . . Its effect is ( $x$ ) to make statutory the relief which since 1842 has been accorded to foreigners under an administrative concession granted by your lordships; (2) to enlarge and make statutory the relief which since 1856 has been granted to colonists under a similar but more limited concession; and (3) to give like relief to British subjects resident abroad. A time limit is imposed for claims to this
    ${ }^{1}$ See P. 66.
    ${ }^{2}$ See p. 60.

[^144]:    Not including dividend-paying companies

    - Qs. 34 al sep.

[^145]:    286 d 17 Vict. a 34, a. 34

    - 18 * 19 Vict. $c^{35}$ 3. 2 .

[^146]:    1 Abuse of this feature, particularly in regard to supertax, has been the subject of special legislation in the Finance Act, 1915.
    ${ }^{2}$ But see recent modifications, Finance Act, 1915.

[^147]:    - Raised to das in September, 1925.

[^148]:    ${ }^{1}$ s $5^{\text {th }}$ Report, $\mathbf{p .} 168$.

    - Vide p. 295.

[^149]:    ${ }^{2}$ Viche also Sch. D, " Lifo Imsurance" ${ }^{\text {P. } 20 \% .}$

[^150]:    a H. C. 47-1 $\mathrm{SH}_{5}$.

    - Vide Chaptar div.: "Cateroriee of Incoma."

[^151]:    ${ }^{1}$ Restriction to be abolished in future-Mudget of September, 1915.

[^152]:    2 Cd. 2575, p. 7.

[^153]:    ${ }^{1}$ P. 227.
    Loc. cif. P. 1, and Q. 73. This was confirmed by Sir Henry Primrose on the 1906 Committee, Q. 80.
    ${ }^{3}$ Lac. cib.s. P. 20.

    - Q. 118.
    Q. 2.41
    - Q3. 1,099, etc.

[^154]:    1 Vido inder to Report, p. 282, where it is summarised.

    - To be obviated in fature-Finance Act 1915. ant

[^155]:    ${ }^{1}$ Ef., $_{\text {giften, }}$ R. C. on Financial Relations, 1896, Q. 8,128.

[^156]:    1 Giffen, R. C. on Financial Relations, 1896, Q. 8,142.
    The estimate of increased duty was $(5000,000$ in a full year, from which the intorest may be estimated at $\ell 20,000,000$.

    - Vide my article on " Irish Fiscal Autonomy and Direct Taxes," Economic Journal, March, 1912.
    - Vide the action against directors of the Stols Electrophone, Ltd., reported in The Times, February, 1915, in which an ex-alicial gave evidence of such practice. For a discussion of the possible cases and the legality or equity of ovesion see "Can Income Tasx be Evaded ?" (Ecomomist, 1910, p. 697). Also the full discussions on the Finance Bill. November, 1915.

[^157]:    ${ }^{1}$ New Liberal Revicas, April, 1902.

    * "The People's Progress," p. 50.
    - Querterly Jonmal of Ecomomics, February, 1901.

[^158]:    2 Vide particulariy Qu. 2.396, 2.397, etc, 2.408: evasion nuder Sch. B by fictitious partnerships, Q. 2,411.

[^159]:    "The total number of the claims for compensation on the occasion above referred to, which were examined by our officers, was 200 , and in 80 of these surcharges were made and sustained on appeal, that is to say, in 40 per cent. of the cases inquired into the Revenue had been defrauded of its dues. The aggregate of the taxable incomes returned by the parties themselves was $£ 73,642$, and the amount ultimately found to be correct was £ 171,370 , being in excess of the returns by $\mathbf{£} 97,728$, or about 130 per cent. Such a statement as this will naturally suggest the question, What must be the amount of loss to the Revenue in the assessments to Sch. D throughout the kingdom?-and we think that the information furnished by this ipstance of compensation on a large scale does really give us the nleans of forming a rough, but approximate, estimate of the deficiency in our returns. Of course if this were a solitary instance of the kind it would be eminently illogical to build any argument upon it, but your lordships are aware that, as an invariable consequence of claims for compensation, where the actual profits of trades or professions are divulged, we find the income tax returns largely deficient.

    1 No attention was drawn to the frandulent practice of overstating profits for compensation purposes (or even of returning higher profits than were being made in order to put in tax receipts as evidence). which no doubt sometimes existed, and which would pro sanso have discounted the inferences as to real evasion of income tax ; for payment of excessive income tax was a minor matter where a chance of compensation existed.

    8th Report, p. 29. Other interesting references aro-9th Report, p. 24, discussing the American income tax, and 1 Ith Report, p. 25, on the probable deterrent effect of exposure.

[^160]:    " We see no reason to distrust this estimate, at all events no reason to consider that it errs on the side of excess rather than otherwise. We have already stated that we have found every class of contributors to Sch. D liable to the same shortcomings in their returns, and, lest it should be supposed that at least we ought to have excepted public companies and large joint-stock associations, we beg leave to call attention to the following extract from a long list of defective returns by such co-partnership concerns. some of which have been noticed in previous reports.
    " We are far from saying that in all the cases in which income

[^161]:    ${ }^{2}$ Mr. Gladstone's financial statement in 1853 .
    2 "National Income" Pp. 33, 54, 58, 96.

    - S. J., 1888.

[^162]:    ${ }^{1}$ E.f. Alden. "Democratic England," p. 7 (income estimated at (90,000,000 in England). Sociatist Review, March, 1909: J. A. Hobson, A New Era of Taxation," Internationel Resiew. February, 1009: Hallett Fry, Fimencial Reviow of Rcvicms, March, $1909:$ J. Keir Hardie, M.P." A Labour Budget" Finmaial Revice of Kevicus, April, 1906.

[^163]:    1 Report by the Select Committee, 1906, Appendix, p. 261.
    2 Vide p. 338.

[^164]:    ${ }^{2}$ Effect of Life Ingwance Allomances on Super-fax,-1909-10: 150 was the approximate number of persons whose total incomes were broaght below $\mathbf{E 5}$, coc: duty payable if the deduction fir insurance

[^165]:    －Estimated assossments not completed at date of s8th Report．
    1 Vide S．C．on Income Tax，1851－2：and D．C．on Income Tax， 1906，Qs．74－85，963－1，069，1，139－1，151．
    －It was stated by the Chancellor of the Erchequer in his Budget speech．4th May，r915，that the number of super－tax payers is now 26,000 12，000 being already added by the lower limit and that number would probably be inereased to $\times 5,000$

[^166]:    " The only official or other statements which afford any means of testing the accuracy of the two preceding sets of figures are

[^167]:    ${ }^{1}$ Evidence before R. C. on Agricnitural Depression, Qp. 63.368, 63.46n. Lord Milner said the ditference might be 3 or 4 per cent: Q3. 63,938, 64,016.

    3 For a discussion of the various inflnences at work in maintaining ratings at an excessive figure, soe my article ors "Rating Reform" Economic Jouenal, 1910.

    Wide evidence of Lord Milner, Q3. 63.953, 63,960, 64,000, 64,015, and Final Report, p. 23-

[^168]:    - Vim Chapter I

[^169]:    ${ }^{2}$ Ecomomic Rovica, 1906.

    - For numerous details as to Ghaspow property, vide Murray. "Taxation of Land Values," 190\%, quoting tocal authorities.

[^170]:    1 Op.cit

    - Vide p. 63.

[^171]:    ${ }^{2}$ From Cd. 6980, p. 79 (fgures in 1889).

[^172]:    1 Vide p. 46.
    ${ }^{5} 5$ \& Vict.e. 35, 9.60 : Sch. A, No. II., rule 5 (copied substantially from the Income Tax Acts of 1805 and 1806). Vide my article " Incidence of Taxation of Leascholds," Ecomomic Review, July, 1911.
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