AMERICAN PATRIOTISM.—At the recent annual convention of the Commercial Law League of America, held in Omaha, a vote of thanks was moved for the "rough barrier in the for the "royal hospitality" with which the delegates had been received by the citizens of that city, but the chairman had his feelings so jarred by the word "royal" that the objectionable word was struck out, and the word "Ameri-

can " substituted. We quote from the report of the proceedings : The Chairman (Mr. Florance): I would like to ask Mr. Hamilton, if he has no objection, to change one word which always jars upon me.

Mr. Hamilton : I will accept any amendment which makes it (Ap-"American hospitality" to "royal hospitality." American. What I mean is that we have had a bang-up good time.

The Chairman: When I suggested the word "American" I used it as plause and laughter.)

synonymous with a bang-up good time. (Laughter.)

The motion of Mr. Hamilton was then carried by a rising vote.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.—The question as to the constitutionality of Acts prohibiting barbering on Sunday has recently come before three Courts with different results. The Supreme Court of Missouri, in the case of State v. Granneman, held invalid an Act making it a misdemeanor for any person to carry on the business of the formula G_{ranneman} and G_{ranneman} and carry on the business of barbering on Sunday, upon the ground that it is in derogation of the constitution derogation of the constitution prohibiting the passage of local or special laws. The Court, while constitution The Court, while conceding the power of the legislature to pass a general law, compelling the observed all compelling the observance of Sunday as a day of rest, applicable alike to all classes and kinds of lab classes and kinds of labor, denied such power as to one particular kind of labor, holding it to be such labor, holding it to be special legislation prohibited by the organic law. So, also, the Supreme Control of the special legislation prohibited by the organic law. also, the Supreme Court of Illinois, in the later case of *Eden* v. The People, declared the act of the later case of *Eden* v. declared the act of the legislature which provides that it should be unlawful for any one to keep one. for any one to keep open any barber shop, or carry on the business of shaving, haircutting, or any kind of haircutting, or any kind of tonsorial work on Sunday, to be unconstitutional, upon much the same unconstitution upon much the same ground as the Missouri Court, viz., that the Act in question was not binding upon clift Court, "affects one class of laborers and one class only. "The Act," says and his clerks, the restaurant his clerks, the restaurant with its employees, the clothing house, the black-smith, the livery stable the smith, the livery stable, the street car lines, and the people engaged in every other branch of business other branch of business, are each and all allowed to open their respective places of business on fund places of business on Sunday and transact their ordinary business desire, but the barber and h desire, but the barber and he alone is requested to close his place of business. The barber is thus desired to close his place of in direct The barber is thus deprived of property without due process of law in direct More violation of the constitution of the constitution. violation of the constitution of the United States and of this State. over, if the merchant, the butcher, the druggist, and other trades and callings are allowed to open their are allowed to open their places of business and carry on their respective avocations seven days of the avocations seven days of the week, upon what principle can it be held that a person who may be engaged in tperson who may be engaged in the business of barbering may not do the same thing? Why should a discrimination thing? Why should a discrimination be made against that calling and that alone?" — Central Land Land

644