

locutory injunctions had been allowed. In addition to this, it was shown that the action of the Circuit Court, in granting such injunctions, practically suspended not only "the enforcement of the revenue laws of Illinois against railroad corporations, but the collection of the taxes assessed upon the capital stock and franchises of all other corporations in the State, except so far as such corporations voluntarily pay such taxes." Under such circumstances, it is easy to see that questions of great public interest were involved, and that the operations of the government of the State would be embarrassed, so long as they remained undetermined by this court. Sufficient reason was shown, and the causes were accordingly advanced.

But here no such circumstances exist. The injunction operates only upon the property of a single corporation. The value of the property, or the amount of the revenue to be derived from it, is not shown. No question affecting the power of the State to tax other property is involved. The only dispute is as to the liability of the property of this single owner to taxation. The actual amount in controversy may be, and probably is, much less than that in very many other cases waiting their turn to be heard in the regular call of our docket. No disputed principle of law affecting any other case is, so far as we can discover from the record, presented for our determination.

We are of opinion, therefore, that a proper showing has not been made; but, as we have not before announced in so formal a manner the rule of practice which we have established for our government under this statute, leave is granted to the appellant to renew the motion if the defects which now exist in the showing can be supplied.

*Motion denied.*

---

GAINES ET AL. v. HALE ET AL.

Where, in a suit between some of the claimants to the hot springs in Arkansas, the Supreme Court of that State by its decree refused aid to any of them against the other, except as to the improvements erected by each respectively on the property, and as to them saved the rights of the United States, this court, having decided in *Hot Springs Cases*, 92 U. S. 698, that the United States is the owner of the property, affirms that decree.

ERROR to the Supreme Court of the State of Arkansas.

Submitted on printed arguments by *Mr. W. M. Rose* for the plaintiffs in error, and by *Mr. Albert Pike*, *Mr. R. W. Johnson*, *Mr. J. B. Sanborn*, and *Mr. Frederick P. Stanton*, for the defendants in error.

MR. JUSTICE BRADLEY delivered the opinion of the court.

The decision made by this court in *Hot Springs Cases* at the last term, 92 U. S. 698, has disposed of the principal controversy between the parties in this case, by declaring that neither of them is entitled to the land in question, and that the same belongs to the United States. As the decree of the Supreme Court of Arkansas, in the present case, does not contravene this decision, but refuses aid to any of the parties against each other, except as to the improvements erected by each respectively, and as to these, saves the rights of the United States, we do not perceive any error in said decree on any Federal question.

*Decree affirmed.*

---

SOUTH CAROLINA v. GEORGIA ET AL.

1. The compact between South Carolina and Georgia, made in 1787, by which it was agreed that the boundary between the two States should be the northern branch or stream of the Savannah River, and that the navigation of the river along a specified channel should for ever be equally free to the citizens of both States, and exempt from hinderance, interruption, or molestation, attempted to be enforced by one State on the citizens of the other, has no effect upon the subsequent constitutional provision that Congress shall have power to regulate commerce with foreign nations and among the several States.
2. Congress has the same power over the Savannah River that it has over the other navigable waters of the United States.
3. The right to regulate commerce includes the right to regulate navigation, and hence to regulate and improve navigable rivers and ports on such rivers.
4. Congress has power to close one of several channels in a navigable stream, if, in its judgment, the navigation of the river will be thereby improved. It may declare that an actual obstruction is not, in the view of the law, an illegal one.
5. An appropriation for the improvement of a harbor on a navigable river, "to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War," confers upon that officer the discretion to determine the mode of improvement, and