

205. *Carondelet Canal Co. v. Louisiana*, 233 U.S. 362 (1914).

Louisiana act of 1906 repealing prior act of 1858 and sequestering with compensation certain property acquired by a canal company under the repealed enactment impaired an obligation of contract.

206. *Smith v. Texas*, 233 U.S. 630 (1914).

Texas act of 1914 stipulating that only those who have previously served two years as freight train conductors or brakemen shall be eligible to serve as railroad train conductors was arbitrary and effected a denial of the equal protection of the laws.

207. *International Harvester Co. v. Kentucky*, 234 U.S. 216 (1914).

Kentucky criminal and antitrust provisions, both constitutional and statutory, were void for vagueness and hence violated due process because a prohibition of combinations that establish prices that are greater or lower than the "real market value" of an article as established by "fair competition" and "under normal market conditions" afforded no standard that was possible to know in advance and to obey.

Justices concurring: Holmes, Hughes, Lamar, Day, Lurton, Van Devanter, White, C.J.

Justices dissenting: McKenna, Pitney

Accord: *International Harvester Co. v. Kentucky*, 234 U.S. 579 (1914); *Collins v. Kentucky*, 234 U.S. 634 (1914); *American Machine Co. v. Kentucky*, 236 U.S. 660 (1915).

208. *Missouri Pacific Ry. v. Larabee*, 234 U.S. 459 (1914).

Kansas statute empowering a Kansas court to award against a litigant attorney's fees attributable to the presentation before the United States Supreme Court of an appeal in a mandamus proceeding was inoperative consistently with the principle of national supremacy, for a state court cannot be empowered by state law to assess fees for services rendered in a federal court when such assessment is sanctioned neither by federal law nor by the rules of the Supreme Court.

209. *Western Union Tel. Co. v. Brown*, 234 U.S. 542 (1914).

South Carolina law making mental anguish resulting from negligent non-delivery of a telegram a cause of action could not be invoked to support an action for negligent non-delivery in the District of Columbia, an area beyond the jurisdiction of South Carolina and, consistent with due process, removed from the scope of its legislative power. The statute, as applied to messages sent from South Carolina to another jurisdiction, also was an invalid regulation of interstate commerce.