

236 U. S.

Statement of the Case.

congress of the censor board and the boards of other States, is referred to in emphasis of complainant's objection that the statute delegates legislative power. But, as complainant says, such congress is "at present non-existent and nebulous," and we are, therefore, not called upon to anticipate its action or pass upon the validity of § 5.

We may close this topic with a quotation of the very apt comment of the District Court upon the statute. After remarking that the language of the statute "might have been extended by descriptive and illustrative words," but doubting that it would have been the more intelligible and that probably by being more restrictive might be more easily thwarted, the court said: "In view of the range of subjects which complainants claim to have already compassed, not to speak of the natural development that will ensue, it would be next to impossible to devise language that would be at once comprehensive and automatic."

In conclusion we may observe that the Ohio statute gives a review by the courts of the State of the decision of the board of censors.

Decree affirmed.

MUTUAL FILM COMPANY *v.* INDUSTRIAL
COMMISSION OF OHIO.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO.

No. 457. Argued January 6, 7, 1915.—Decided February 23, 1915.

Decided on authority of *Mutual Film Corporation v. Industrial Comm. of Ohio*, *ante*, p. 230.

THE facts are stated in the opinion.

Argued simultaneously with No. 456 by the same counsel on the same briefs.

MR. JUSTICE MCKENNA delivered the opinion of the court.

This case was submitted with No. 456, just decided. In the latter case the complainant in the court below and appellant here was a corporation of Virginia. The appellant in the pending case is a corporation of Ohio, and counsel say "although there are some differences in the way in which their business is conducted, yet the questions involved are the same, the records in both cases are nearly identical, and the court below treated them together, rendering the one opinion to cover both." And counsel have submitted them on the same argument.

On the authority, therefore, of the opinion in No. 456, the decree is

Affirmed.

MUTUAL FILM CORPORATION OF MISSOURI *v.*
HODGES, GOVERNOR OF THE STATE OF
KANSAS.

APPEAL FROM THE DISTRICT COURT OF THE UNITED STATES
FOR THE DISTRICT OF KANSAS.

No. 597. Argued January 6, 7, 1915.—Decided February 23, 1915.

Mutual Film Corporation v. Ohio Industrial Board, ante, p. 230, followed to the effect that state statutes imposing censorship on moving pictures, such as those of Ohio and Kansas of 1913, are valid exercises of the police power of those States, respectively, and do not interfere with interstate commerce, abridge the liberty of opinion, or delegate legislative power to administrative officers.