

54. *Missouri ex rel. Burnes Nat'l Bank v. Duncan*, 265 U.S. 17 (1924).

Because the Federal Reserve Act authorizes national banks to act as executors, a Missouri law was ineffective, under the principle of national supremacy, to withhold such powers from such banks.

Justices concurring: Holmes, Sanford, Brandeis, McKenna, Van Devanter, Butler, Taft, C.J.

Justices dissenting: Sutherland, McReynolds

55. *Asakura v. City of Seattle*, 265 U.S. 332 (1924).

A Seattle ordinance that limited the pawnbroking business to citizens was void as applied to a Japanese alien lawfully admitted into the United States and protected by a treaty with Japan according to nationals of the latter country the right to carry on a "trade."

56. *Missouri Pacific R.R. v. Stroud*, 267 U.S. 404 (1925).

When carrier had two routes by which freight might move between two points in a state, the second of which was partly interstate, a suit against the carrier for discrimination in the furnishing of cars which arose out of use of the interstate route in conformity with the carrier's practice was governed by the Interstate Commerce Act, and the Missouri law governing such discrimination was superseded and inapplicable (Art. VI).

57. *Lancaster v. McCarty*, 267 U.S. 427 (1925).

A federal law (39 Stat. 441 (1916)) that authorized carriers to limit liability upon property received for transportation to value declared by shipper, where the rates were based on such value pursuant to authority of Interstate Commerce Commission, superseded Texas law in respect to a claim for damage to goods shipped intrastate between Texas points for the reason that the tariff and classification had been adopted by the carrier pursuant to an order of the Commission requiring it to remove discrimination against interstate commerce which had resulted from lower Texas intrastate rates.

58. *Davis v. Cohen*, 268 U.S. 638 (1925).

When the Federal Transportation Act of 1920 provided that suits on claims arising out of federal wartime control of the railroads might be brought against a federal agent, if instituted within two years after federal control had ended, Massachusetts law allowing amendments of proceedings prior to judgment, could not be invoked to substitute the Agent as defendant more than two years after federal control had ended; the suit in which the substitution was attempted had erroneously been filed against the railroad rather than against the Federal Director General during the period of federal control, and since