out even considering that Amendment, a majority of the Court upheld, as not contravening the Commerce Clause, statutes regulating the transport through the state of liquor cargoes originating and ending outside the regulating state's boundaries.[20]

Regulation of Imports Destined for a Federal Area.—Importation of alcoholic beverages into a state for ultimate delivery at a National Park located in the state but over which the United States retained exclusive jurisdiction has been construed as not constituting "transportation . . . into [a] State for delivery and use therein" within the meaning of § 2 of the Amendment. The importation having had as its objective delivery and use in a federal area over which the state retained no jurisdiction, the increased powers that the state acquired from the Twenty-first Amendment were declared to be inapplicable. California therefore could not extend the importation license and other regulatory requirements of its Alcoholic Beverage Control Act to a retail liquor dealer doing business in the Park.[21] On the other hand, a state may apply nondiscriminatory liquor regulations to sales at federal enclaves under concurrent federal and state jurisdiction, and may require that liquor sold at such federal enclaves be labeled as being restricted for use only within the enclave.[22]

Foreign Imports, Exports; Taxation, Regulation.—The Twenty-first Amendment did not repeal the Export-Import Clause, Art. I, § 10, cl. 2, nor obliterate the Commerce Clause, Art. I, § 8, cl. 3. Accordingly, a state cannot tax imported liquor while it remains "in unbroken packages in the hands of the original importer and prior

---

[20] Arkansas required a permit for the transportation of liquor across its territory, but granted the same upon application and payment of a nominal fee. Virginia required carriers engaged in similar through-shipments to use the most direct route, carry a bill of lading describing that route, and post a $1,000 bond conditioned on lawful transportation; and also stipulated that the true consignee be named in the bill of lading and be one having the legal right to receive the shipment at destination.

[21] Collins v. Yosemite Park Co., 304 U.S. 518, 537–38 (1938). The principle was reaffirmed in United States v. Mississippi Tax Comm'n, 412 U.S. 363 (1973), holding that Mississippi could not apply its tax regulations to liquor sold to military officers' clubs and other nonappropriated fund activities located on bases within the State and over which the United States had obtained exclusive jurisdiction. "[A]bsent an appropriate express reservation . . . the Twenty-first Amendment confers no power on a State to regulate –whether by licensing, taxation, or otherwise—the importation of distilled spirits into territory over which the United States exercises exclusive jurisdiction." Id. at 375. Nor may states tax importation of liquor for sale at bases over which the United States exercises concurrent jurisdiction only. United States v. Mississippi Tax Comm'n, 421 U.S. 599 (1975).

[22] North Dakota v. United States, 495 U.S. 423 (1990) (also upholding application to federal enclaves of a uniform requirement that shipments into the state be reported to state officials).