dealers without well-advertised trade names the benefit of a price differential but that restricted this benefit to such dealers entering the business before a certain date.[1540] In a decision since overruled, the Court struck down a law that exempted by name the American Express Company from the terms pertaining to the licensing, bonding, regulation, and inspection of "currency exchanges" engaged in the sale of money orders.[1541]

Other Business and Employment Relations

Labor Relations.—Objections to labor legislation on the ground that the limitation of particular regulations to specified industries was obnoxious to the Equal Protection Clause have been consistently overruled.[1542] Statutes limiting hours of labor for employees in mines, smelters,[1543] mills, factories,[1544] or on public works [1545] have been sustained. And a statute forbidding persons engaged in mining and manufacturing to issue orders for payment of labor unless redeemable at face value in cash was similarly held unobjectionable.[1546] The exemption of mines employing fewer than ten persons from a law pertaining to measurement of coal to determine a miner's wages is not unreasonable.[1547] All corporations [1548] or public service corporations [1549] may be required to issue to employees who leave their service letters stating the nature of the service and the cause of leaving even though other employers are not so required.

Industries may be classified in a workers' compensation act according to the respective hazards of each,[1550] and the exemption of farm laborers and domestic servants does not render such an act invalid.[1551] A statute providing that no person shall be denied op-

---

[1540] Mayflower Farms v. Ten Eyck, 297 U.S. 266 (1936). *See* United States v. Maryland Savings-Share Ins. Corp., 400 U.S. 4, 7 n.2 (1970) (reserving question of case's validity, but interpreting it as standing for the proposition that no showing of a valid legislative purpose had been made).

[1541] Morey v. Doud, 354 U.S. 457 (1957), *overruled by* City of New Orleans v. Dukes, 427 U.S. 297 (1976), where the exemption of one concern had been by precise description rather than by name.

[1542] Central State Univ. v. American Ass'n of Univ. Professors, 526 U.S. 124 (1999) (upholding limitation on the authority of public university professors to bargain over instructional workloads).

[1543] Holden v. Hardy, 169 U.S. 366 (1988).

[1544] Bunting v. Oregon, 243 U.S. 426 (1917).

[1545] Atkin v. Kansas, 191 U.S. 207 (1903).

[1546] Keokee Coke Co. v. Taylor, 234 U.S. 224 (1914). *See also* Knoxville Iron Co. v. Harbison, 183 U.S. 13 (1901).

[1547] McLean v. Arkansas, 211 U.S. 539 (1909).

[1548] Prudential Ins. Co. v. Cheek, 259 U.S. 530 (1922).

[1549] Chicago, R.I. & P. Ry. v. Perry, 259 U.S. 548 (1922).

[1550] Mountain Timber Co. v. Washington, 243 U.S. 219 (1917).

[1551] New York Central R.R. v. White, 243 U.S. 188 (1917); Middletown v. Texas Power & Light Co., 249 U.S. 152 (1919); Ward & Gow v. Krinsky, 259 U.S. 503 (1922).