

YOUNG TRAVELER ESCAPES PERILS OF LONG JOURNEY

Siberian Widow and Child
Reunited After Year
of Separation.

HAYDEN, Colo., April 24.—After traveling approximately 7,000 miles alone, three-year-old Shiro Chakirido is safely in his mother's arms here, while the lad's stepfather, Louis Charos, ex-soldier, is tilling the soil on a 220-acre plot upon which he has just moved in order to spend their remaining days.

Through efforts of the Red Cross the baby, who has been separated from its mother for over a year, was started on his long ocean voyage across the Pacific. He was met by a representative of the Red Cross in San Francisco and prepared for the last leg of his long journey from Vladivostok to Colorado.

Husband Killed.

Two years ago Mrs. Chakirido and her husband kept a restaurant in a Siberian town. There was the uprising and turmoil incident to the "red terror" that has spelled ruin for so many happy homes. One day during the disturbances the Bolsheviks entered the little restaurant and killed Mrs. Chakirido's husband. By a miracle the wife and baby escaped to her home, near the town of Chita.

When the American army forces entered Siberia Louis Charos, a member of Co. H, 127th Infantry, I was in the party of 1,000, and they were married in February, 1919. Mrs. Charos returned to America with her soldier-husband upon the evacuation of Siberia by Uncle Sam's men, but was obliged to leave her little son behind.

After months of frenzied search and through the aid of the American Red Cross, the Charos were able to get in touch with the boy, and little Shiro was started upon the long journey that has ended in the happy reunion with his mother.

THE PUBLIC PULSE

Communication for this column may be signed anonymously but must be accompanied by the name of the writer to insure good faith. No responsibility for facts or sentiments expressed will be assumed. Honest discussion of public questions is invited, but with the understanding to eliminate vicious and objectionable matter. The column is free. But, be reasonable.

SAYS WE CAUSE UNREST.

South Bend, Ind., April 24. Editor News-Times:

You infer that there has been a wholesale evasion of the payment of the excess profit tax on stock dividends because of the recent supreme court decision declaring stock dividends as a distribution of capital and not of income.

Excess profit tax is only applicable under the present 1918 revenue act to net income earned by corporations, other than personal service, during the fiscal year in excess of a credit adjustment of 8 per cent of the actual invested capital plus \$3,000,000, and operates on a graduated scale.

This tax is in addition to a normal tax of 10 per cent assessed upon all earnings in excess of a credit of \$2,000,000, except an amount equal to the excess profits tax assessed.

You will note that this rate is 6 per cent higher than upon individuals, who are paid by members of partnership which are also assessed as individuals.

Under the present revenue act, prior to the recent supreme court decision, stock dividends were taxable to the recipient in the same manner as cash dividends, i. e., the surtax, which is an additional tax upon a graduated scale of from 10 per cent up to 20 per cent to individuals with a net income in excess of \$5,000,000, applied and was assessed upon the stock dividend when received.

As the supreme court decided, stock dividends are not income, but merely a distribution of capital, and a distribution of the value originally represented by one share into more shares, hence merely cutting down the book, and usually the market value of the shares held and received.

Example: Twenty-five men invested \$500,000.00 in a manufacturing business which is incorporated. This mythical concern was organized in 1909 and subsequent to that time had made a net income of \$100,000 and income of 10 per cent. As the business increases, they needed all the capital available, hence the board of directors declined to declare any cash dividends, and the stockholders did not wish to receive stock dividends as they wished to at some future date receive their share of the earnings in the form of cash dividends, which would have been impossible if a stock dividend had been declared. Also, stock dividends have been subject to the surtax upon the receipt the same as cash dividends, although the stockholder received no value made stock dividends unpopular.

At the end of 10 years, a surplus of \$600,000 had been accumulated and invested in additional plants and needed equipment.

In as much as a cash dividend would not be possible without borrowing the capital, and all is needed in the business; since the stock-

REPORTED DIVORCED IN PARIS



Mrs. Leonard M. Thomas, who has been described as "America's most beautiful woman," is reported to have received a decree of divorce from her husband in Paris several months ago. This report has taken her many friends by surprise.

holder, if he wishes, can cash in, or sell his holdings, and yet is not subject to a tax on the dividend until he realizes a profit, accumulated surplus which were built up over long periods of time are now being declared, and as in the case above frequently a stock dividend of 200 per cent is declared, and to those who read such editorials as yours, who at once come to the conclusion that this was the amount of earnings of one year, and hence someone is to be granted that same.

In the above case, at the end of the 20 year period one of the original shares of stock which originally cost \$100 would have increased in value to \$300, as the one share stock represents one-five thousandth interest in the company, hence is always worth plus its share of the surtax.

When a stock dividend is declared the taxable status of the incorporation does not change; in fact, the only change is that the surplus is transferred to capital stock issued, and forever prevents that amount from being distributed as cash dividends. The net worth of the corporation remains the same. The value of the stock held by the stockholder remains the same, the only difference prior to the declaration of the stock dividend was worth \$300 is now worth one-third as much or \$100. The stock dividend of 2 shares represents two-thirds of the original value, or \$100 each, and all three shareholders together are now worth the same as the original share was prior to the stock dividend.

When the stockholder disposes of any of his holdings, he must report as taxable income all income received in excess of the original cost or its value on March 1, 1913. For instance, if he sold his entire holdings for \$300, the original cost having been \$100, and its value on March 1, 1913, having been \$175, the income reportable would be \$125.

As the supreme court decided, stock dividends are not income, but merely a distribution of capital, and a distribution of the value originally represented by one share into more shares, hence merely cutting down the book, and usually the market value of the shares held and received.

Example: Twenty-five men invested \$500,000.00 in a manufacturing business which is incorporated. This mythical concern was organized in 1909 and subsequent to that time had made a net income of \$100,000 and income of 10 per cent.

As the business increases, they needed all the capital available, hence the board of directors declined to declare any cash dividends, and the stockholders did not wish to receive stock dividends as they wished to at some future date receive their share of the earnings in the form of cash dividends, which would have been impossible if a stock dividend had been declared. Also, stock dividends have been subject to the surtax upon the receipt the same as cash dividends, although the stockholder received no value made stock dividends unpopular.

At the end of 10 years, a surplus of \$600,000 had been accumulated and invested in additional plants and needed equipment.

In as much as a cash dividend would not be possible without borrowing the capital, and all is needed in the business; since the stock-

holder, if he wishes, can cash in, or sell his holdings, and yet is not subject to a tax on the dividend until he realizes a profit, accumulated surplus which were built up over long periods of time are now being declared, and as in the case above frequently a stock dividend of 200 per cent is declared, and to those who read such editorials as yours, who at once come to the conclusion that this was the amount of earnings of one year, and hence someone is to be granted that same.

In the above case, at the end of the 20 year period one of the original shares of stock which originally cost \$100 would have increased in value to \$300, as the one share stock represents one-five thousandth interest in the company, hence is always worth plus its share of the surtax.

When a stock dividend is declared the taxable status of the incorporation does not change; in fact, the only change is that the surplus is transferred to capital stock issued, and forever prevents that amount from being distributed as cash dividends. The net worth of the corporation remains the same. The value of the stock held by the stockholder remains the same, the only difference prior to the declaration of the stock dividend was worth \$300 is now worth one-third as much or \$100. The stock dividend of 2 shares represents two-thirds of the original value, or \$100 each, and all three shareholders together are now worth the same as the original share was prior to the stock dividend.

When the stockholder disposes of any of his holdings, he must report as taxable income all income received in excess of the original cost or its value on March 1, 1913. For instance, if he sold his entire holdings for \$300, the original cost having been \$100, and its value on March 1, 1913, having been \$175, the income reportable would be \$125.

As the supreme court decided, stock dividends are not income, but merely a distribution of capital, and a distribution of the value originally represented by one share into more shares, hence merely cutting down the book, and usually the market value of the shares held and received.

Example: Twenty-five men invested \$500,000.00 in a manufacturing business which is incorporated. This mythical concern was organized in 1909 and subsequent to that time had made a net income of \$100,000 and income of 10 per cent.

As the business increases, they needed all the capital available, hence the board of directors declined to declare any cash dividends, and the stockholders did not wish to receive stock dividends as they wished to at some future date receive their share of the earnings in the form of cash dividends, which would have been impossible if a stock dividend had been declared. Also, stock dividends have been subject to the surtax upon the receipt the same as cash dividends, although the stockholder received no value made stock dividends unpopular.

At the end of 10 years, a surplus of \$600,000 had been accumulated and invested in additional plants and needed equipment.

In as much as a cash dividend would not be possible without borrowing the capital, and all is needed in the business; since the stock-

holder, if he wishes, can cash in, or sell his holdings, and yet is not subject to a tax on the dividend until he realizes a profit, accumulated surplus which were built up over long periods of time are now being declared, and as in the case above frequently a stock dividend of 200 per cent is declared, and to those who read such editorials as yours, who at once come to the conclusion that this was the amount of earnings of one year, and hence someone is to be granted that same.

In the above case, at the end of the 20 year period one of the original shares of stock which originally cost \$100 would have increased in value to \$300, as the one share stock represents one-five thousandth interest in the company, hence is always worth plus its share of the surtax.

When a stock dividend is declared the taxable status of the incorporation does not change; in fact, the only change is that the surplus is transferred to capital stock issued, and forever prevents that amount from being distributed as cash dividends. The net worth of the corporation remains the same. The value of the stock held by the stockholder remains the same, the only difference prior to the declaration of the stock dividend was worth \$300 is now worth one-third as much or \$100. The stock dividend of 2 shares represents two-thirds of the original value, or \$100 each, and all three shareholders together are now worth the same as the original share was prior to the stock dividend.

When the stockholder disposes of any of his holdings, he must report as taxable income all income received in excess of the original cost or its value on March 1, 1913. For instance, if he sold his entire holdings for \$300, the original cost having been \$100, and its value on March 1, 1913, having been \$175, the income reportable would be \$125.

As the supreme court decided, stock dividends are not income, but merely a distribution of capital, and a distribution of the value originally represented by one share into more shares, hence merely cutting down the book, and usually the market value of the shares held and received.

Example: Twenty-five men invested \$500,000.00 in a manufacturing business which is incorporated. This mythical concern was organized in 1909 and subsequent to that time had made a net income of \$100,000 and income of 10 per cent.

As the business increases, they needed all the capital available, hence the board of directors declined to declare any cash dividends, and the stockholders did not wish to receive stock dividends as they wished to at some future date receive their share of the earnings in the form of cash dividends, which would have been impossible if a stock dividend had been declared. Also, stock dividends have been subject to the surtax upon the receipt the same as cash dividends, although the stockholder received no value made stock dividends unpopular.

At the end of 10 years, a surplus of \$600,000 had been accumulated and invested in additional plants and needed equipment.

In as much as a cash dividend would not be possible without borrowing the capital, and all is needed in the business; since the stock-

holder, if he wishes, can cash in, or sell his holdings, and yet is not subject to a tax on the dividend until he realizes a profit, accumulated surplus which were built up over long periods of time are now being declared, and as in the case above frequently a stock dividend of 200 per cent is declared, and to those who read such editorials as yours, who at once come to the conclusion that this was the amount of earnings of one year, and hence someone is to be granted that same.

In the above case, at the end of the 20 year period one of the original shares of stock which originally cost \$100 would have increased in value to \$300, as the one share stock represents one-five thousandth interest in the company, hence is always worth plus its share of the surtax.

When a stock dividend is declared the taxable status of the incorporation does not change; in fact, the only change is that the surplus is transferred to capital stock issued, and forever prevents that amount from being distributed as cash dividends. The net worth of the corporation remains the same. The value of the stock held by the stockholder remains the same, the only difference prior to the declaration of the stock dividend was worth \$300 is now worth one-third as much or \$100. The stock dividend of 2 shares represents two-thirds of the original value, or \$100 each, and all three shareholders together are now worth the same as the original share was prior to the stock dividend.

When the stockholder disposes of any of his holdings, he must report as taxable income all income received in excess of the original cost or its value on March 1, 1913. For instance, if he sold his entire holdings for \$300, the original cost having been \$100, and its value on March 1, 1913, having been \$175, the income reportable would be \$125.

As the supreme court decided, stock dividends are not income, but merely a distribution of capital, and a distribution of the value originally represented by one share into more shares, hence merely cutting down the book, and usually the market value of the shares held and received.

Example: Twenty-five men invested \$500,000.00 in a manufacturing business which is incorporated. This mythical concern was organized in 1909 and subsequent to that time had made a net income of \$100,000 and income of 10 per cent.

As the business increases, they needed all the capital available, hence the board of directors declined to declare any cash dividends, and the stockholders did not wish to receive stock dividends as they wished to at some future date receive their share of the earnings in the form of cash dividends, which would have been impossible if a stock dividend had been declared. Also, stock dividends have been subject to the surtax upon the receipt the same as cash dividends, although the stockholder received no value made stock dividends unpopular.

At the end of 10 years, a surplus of \$600,000 had been accumulated and invested in additional plants and needed equipment.

In as much as a cash dividend would not be possible without borrowing the capital, and all is needed in the business; since the stock-

holder, if he wishes, can cash in, or sell his holdings, and yet is not subject to a tax on the dividend until he realizes a profit, accumulated surplus which were built up over long periods of time are now being declared, and as in the case above frequently a stock dividend of 200 per cent is declared, and to those who read such editorials as yours, who at once come to the conclusion that this was the amount of earnings of one year, and hence someone is to be granted that same.

In the above case, at the end of the 20 year period one of the original shares of stock which originally cost \$100 would have increased in value to \$300, as the one share stock represents one-five thousandth interest in the company, hence is always worth plus its share of the surtax.

When a stock dividend is declared the taxable status of the incorporation does not change; in fact, the only change is that the surplus is transferred to capital stock issued, and forever prevents that amount from being distributed as cash dividends. The net worth of the corporation remains the same. The value of the stock held by the stockholder remains the same, the only difference prior to the declaration of the stock dividend was worth \$300 is now worth one-third as much or \$100. The stock dividend of 2 shares represents two-thirds of the original value, or \$100 each, and all three shareholders together are now worth the same as the original share was prior to the stock dividend.

When the stockholder disposes of any of his holdings, he must report as taxable income all income received in excess of the original cost or its value on March 1, 1913. For instance, if he sold his entire holdings for \$300, the original cost having been \$100, and its value on March 1, 1913, having been \$175, the income reportable would be \$125.

As the supreme court decided, stock dividends are not income, but merely a distribution of capital, and a distribution of the value originally represented by one share into more shares, hence merely cutting down the book, and usually the market value of the shares held and received.

Example: Twenty-five men invested \$500,000.00 in a manufacturing business which is incorporated. This mythical concern was organized in 1909 and subsequent to that time had made a net income of \$100,000 and income of 10 per cent.

As the business increases, they needed all the capital available, hence the board of directors declined to declare any cash dividends, and the stockholders did not wish to receive stock dividends as they wished to at some future date receive their share of the earnings in the form of cash dividends, which would have been impossible if a stock dividend had been declared. Also, stock dividends have been subject to the surtax upon the receipt the same as cash dividends, although the stockholder received no value made stock dividends unpopular.

At the end of 10 years, a surplus of \$600,000 had been accumulated and invested in additional plants and needed equipment.

In as much as a cash dividend would not be possible without borrowing the capital, and all is needed in the business; since the stock-

holder, if he wishes, can cash in, or sell his holdings, and yet is not subject to a tax on the dividend until he realizes a profit, accumulated surplus which were built up over long periods of time are now being declared, and as in the case above frequently a stock dividend of 200 per cent is declared, and to those who read such editorials as yours, who at once come to the conclusion that this was the amount of earnings of one year, and hence someone is to be granted that same.

In the above case, at the end of the 20 year period one of the original shares of stock which originally cost \$100 would have increased in value to \$300, as the one share stock represents one-five thousandth interest in the company, hence is always worth plus its share of the surtax.

When a stock dividend is declared the taxable status of the incorporation does not change; in fact, the only change is that the surplus is transferred to capital stock issued, and forever prevents that amount from being distributed as cash dividends. The net worth of the corporation remains the same. The value of the stock held by the stockholder remains the same, the only difference prior to the declaration of the stock dividend was worth \$300 is now worth one-third as much or \$100. The stock dividend of 2 shares represents two-thirds of the original value, or \$100 each, and all three shareholders together are now worth the same as the original share was prior to the stock dividend.

When the stockholder disposes of any of his holdings, he must report as taxable income all income received in excess of the original cost or its value on March 1, 1913. For instance, if he sold his entire holdings for \$300, the original cost having been \$100, and its value on March 1, 1913, having been \$175, the income reportable would be \$125.

As the supreme court decided, stock dividends are not income, but merely a distribution of capital, and a distribution of the value originally represented by one share into more shares, hence merely cutting down the book, and usually the market value of the shares held and received.

Example: Twenty-five men invested \$500,000.00 in a manufacturing business which is incorporated. This mythical concern was organized in 1909 and subsequent to that time had made a net income of \$100,000 and income of 10 per cent.

As the business increases, they needed all the capital available, hence the board of directors declined to declare any cash dividends, and the stockholders did not wish to receive stock dividends as they wished to at some future date receive their share of the earnings in the form of cash dividends, which would have been impossible if a stock dividend had been declared. Also, stock dividends have been subject to the surtax upon the receipt the same as cash dividends, although the stockholder received