

erty, as provided by the 14th Amendment.

Held, that the provision was constitutional, and enforceable against the parties. The right of negroes to acquire and hold property does not include the right to enforce a sale of certain property.

The equal protection clause refers to the state and not to binding agreements between individuals discriminating against negroes. The Court further held that the segregation of negroes, whether by public statute or private agreement was not unconstitutional or against public policy, unless the method denied some fundamental constitutional right. State statutes enacted to enforce the provisions of the constitution afford no more protection than the constitution itself.

BOUNDARIES — BETWEEN STATES — FOLLOWING DECREE ON RIVER—EFFECT OF ACCRETION.

Oklahoma v. Texas, U. S. Adv. Ops., 1923-24, page 675.

This case was a dispute over the boundary line along the Red River, between Texas and Oklahoma. Two commissioners were appointed to decide the issue. A short wing dam had been built on the disputed location. Due to weather conditions, sand and other material were deposited behind the dam. The river shortly thereafter washed away a large section of the opposite bank on the north and shifted the channel to that side. The south side channel soon filled with sand due to a gradual accretion. As a result the river moved northward, and thus the dispute over the boundary line arose.

The Court held, as the boundary between the two states is a river, and if due to the natural process of erosion and accretion the bank is changed, the boundary follows the change.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE—STRIKE AS CONSPIRACY AGAINST.

United Leather Workers' Union v. Herkert & Meisel Trunk Co., U. S. Adv. Ops., 1923-24, page 705.

Defendant, a leather workers' union, demanded that plaintiff's shops be unionized, and due to failure on part of plaintiff to comply with this request, they began a strike. They picketed, assaulted and threatened plaintiff's employees and as a result plaintiff's business was damaged, and they were unable to carry on interstate commerce. The Court held that the plaintiff failed to show that the defendants in their conspiracy to deprive them of their employees, were thus directing their schemes against interstate commerce, and thus it was no violation of the Sherman Act.