

E. T. AFR. PROT

47075

47075

Rec. 24 SEP 17

Rob  
Cooring. 1222

1917

INCOME TAX CLAIMS ON ALLOWANCES MADE BY OFFICERS TO FAMILIES

July 21

Asks Refers. Would be possible to obtain relief. Refers to case of Mr M.W.H. Beach.

Mr. Batters

I will be well to send the paper to the C.A. in the first instance for their views on the reason for Mr. Beach having to pay income tax when a leave for less than 6 months?

We may have write to the Inland Revenue about the particular case.

[Generally, I would not admit that the fact that a wife is kept at home owing to the war is a ground for relief from Income Tax any more than for the payment of any other expenses

Extract to In Rev. Com. 11 Oct 17  
Ans. 196. 28 March 18 / 1008/11

entirely  
at  
1917

Printed on Government Paper.

110

W. Butler

Mr. Beech made the following statements on our income tax forms.

On May End 1916 (for 1915-16) "My wife retains residence in London, but she has always been assessed separately."  
On 8th April 1916 (for 1916-17) "My wife was assessed last year at 134 Westbourne Terrace Hyde Park. She has not been assessed yet - presume she will be separately as before. She is an actress and earns an uncertain income and I, I believe, assessed on 3 years."

It appears therefore that his wife had a residence in the United Kingdom, and no doubt Inland Revenue took this as equivalent to his having such a residence himself and accordingly assessed him for tax for 1916.

They asked us to collect tax from his leave pay, but as he had left this country we were unable to do so, and returned the claim to them to enable them to submit it direct to Mr. Beech in East Africa.

W.B.  
2.10.17.

Mr. Read:

I do not suppose that the Inland Revenue authorities would dream of making any abatement of Income Tax to officers who were have to stay in England because of the war. I doubt whether they could do so without legislation. It is idle to trouble them with the suggestion. And it is, in my opinion, out of the question to have the tax to give compensation to officers so circumstanced.

But we might quite well take up the particular case of Mr. Beach. It is evident that Mr. Beach, with his residence and profession in this country, is subject to the tax, and no doubt this involves the taxing of the allowance paid made to her by her husband. It is not so clear why Mr. Beach was taxed when he was here for less than six months. Perhaps, as the C.A. suggests, his wife's possession of a residence here made him liable. 1916

Send the Board of Inland Revenue paragraphs 3 & 4 of this despatch for their consideration, saying that Mr. Beach arrived in England on leave on the 2<sup>nd</sup> of March 1916 and left on the 25<sup>th</sup> of July 1916 to resume his duties in the Pte, where he now is.

JHB

There are some 10 or 12 papers in this question which had better be looked up before we write at once.  
W.H.P. below:  
4/7/19

AFRICA PROTECTORATE

No. 422

GOVERNMENT HOUSE,  
NAIROBI,  
BRITISH EAST AFRICA

47075

July 21st, 1917.

REC-24 SEP 17

Sir,

I have the honour to enquire whether in the case of officers of the Protectorate service, who owing to the war are compelled to keep their wives at home, it would be possible to obtain relief from Income Tax claims on the allowances made by them to their families, or, alternatively whether some monetary compensation could be made to them from Protectorate funds.

2. It is obvious that officers who have to maintain two establishments are in a worse position financially than those whose families reside with them in the Protectorate and it seems particularly hard that they should be further mulcted in income-tax.

3. A specific case has been brought to my notice in which Mr. M. W. H. Beech, a District Commissioner

RIGHT HONOURABLE

WALTER LONG, P.C., M.P.,

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES,

DOWNING STREET,

LONDON, S.W.


Commissioner in this service, arrived home on leave on March 31st last year and remained in England for between 4 and 5 months. It appears that his wife, who preceded him to England and was unable to accompany him on his return owing to the war, had earned a certain amount of money in 1915, and that Mr. Beech supplemented this by an allowance. On the strength of his arrival in England a few days before the close of the financial year 1915-16 this allowance has been taxed both for 1915-16 and for 1916-17 and income-tax was also deducted from his leave pay during the time he spent at home, though he did not remain for six months nor take a house, which I understand is regarded by the Commissioners as evidence of domicile.

4. The case seems to me a hard one and I am informed that Mr. Beech, who did not anticipate the claim, is unable to meet it. He allows his wife rather more than half his salary and finds it difficult to live on the balance.

I have the honour to be,

Sir,

Your humble, obedient servant,



ACTING GOVERNOR.

Gov / 47075 / S.A.P.  
7

11 Oct. 1917

197

msd 14029/18

Sir,

I am etc. to  
transmit, for your  
of the Board of Inland Revenue  
consideration, an  
extract from a despatch  
from the O.A.G. of the  
S.A.P. regarding claim  
for Income Tax on

Mr. W. H. Beech, a  
District Commissioner  
in the Protectorate.

2. Mr. Beech  
arrived in England  
on leave on the  
2nd of March, 1916  
and left on the 29  
of July, 1916, to resume  
his duties in the  
where he now is.

DRAFT

Secy.  
Board of Inland Revenue

MINUTE

- Mr. S. 9/10/17
- Mr. Bottomley 9.10.17
- Mr. Butler 9
- Mr. Grindle
- Mr. Lambert
- Mr. Keat 9
- Mr. G. Piddin
- Mr. Steel-Maitland
- Mr. Long

Trans 354 of 47075

papers arrived. (Gov/3/27/17) ...  
that the ...  
of ...  
Beech ...  
...

I am etc