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20,000 British, French and Italian Troops Battle in Constantinople

WASHINGTON HEARS 43,000 TURKISH ENGAGED

Supreme Court Decides 1916 Revenue Law Can't Tax Stock Dividends

WASHINGTON (W) — The Supreme Court today held as unconstitutional the section of the 1916 Revenue Act that provided for the tax on stock dividends.

The court, in a divided opinion, declared that the tax on dividends was a direct burden on interstate commerce and that it could not be sustained as a tax on intangibles.

The case involved the tax on dividends paid by three stock companies, which were represented by counsel before the court.
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