

which threatens the nation at large. The Relief Society has a mighty work in its divine mission, diligently prosecuted in the past and full of hope for successful fulfillment in the future, of aiding to maintain virtue, integrity, honesty, and truth in the earth.

In the matter of more than spiritual or moral instruction the society also has its work. In the making of pleasant homes a vast amount has been accomplished, and the good work is going steadily on. There is, for instance, in the Fair a suggestion of how this is being carried out. There are straw hats all the way from St. George, made at the instigation of Relief Society workers; and there are numerous other articles of similar nature in different departments of home labor. The cause of local industries has received great encouragement and a strong impetus from the society, which may be relied upon for further energetic efforts in this line.

Looking over the field then, the Relief Society is a power among the Saints that could not be dispensed with without suffering irreparable loss. Therefore in its field it should receive every aid and encouragement available. There should be found none in all the land to raise his hand against it or his voice in deprecation of its efforts. It is engaged in whole-hearted work for the blessing and salvation of mankind. In carrying out its great design, may the choice blessings of heaven rest upon its faithful, devoted workers, the noble Mothers in Is ael!

LESSONS OF THE FAIR.

One great lesson which the people of Utah may learn from the Exposition of their manufactures and products now in progress, is the boundless possibilities which may be accomplished by a united and determined purpose, intelligently pursued. Aside from the zeal, pride and exuberance that usually characterize fairs, the fact stands out in bold and striking relief, as one gazes upon the various exhibits that go to make up the Exposition, that the people of this commonwealth have made wonderful progress in producing and manufacturing at home the supplies, articles and commodities which are used and required by man in a high state of civilization. Notwithstanding the fact that we are not up to the standard that we should be, there probably is not another community in the world, having a population similar to that of this Territory, that could make such a showing of the work of their own hands and brains, and the development of the natural resources existing in their midst, as is exhibited at the Fair now being held in this city. Where is the people, numbering not more than a quarter of a million souls, who can place on exhibition in one aggregation, such samples taken from the soil, mine, loom, factory and workshop, all produced at home, as are being shown at the Utah Exposition this year? If the highest element of greatness in a people is the power of self-sustenance, Utah's position in this regard is an advanced one.

Another lesson illustrated by what is seen at the Fair is this: If the people will demand home made goods, there

are capital, enterprise and skill that will quickly respond in the effort to supply that demand, and the requisite raw materials are at hand in abundance.

Still another lesson is the educational effect of the World's Fair, which is probably reflected in this one, and is, in many ways, shown in the character and arrangement of the exhibits. From this is drawn still another lesson: Expositions of this character, properly conducted, have a marked educational influence upon the people, and stimulate public sentiment in desirable channels.

We trust that the people of Utah will, in visiting the Fair, study the lessons it imparts, and experience, in consequence, a renewal of public spirit and patriotism which will impel them to spend their money at home, and thus encourage in every way enterprises that tend to furnish employment and create wealth for our own people.

JUDGE HARLAN'S DECISION.

The ruling of Justice Harlan, of the Supreme court, at Chicago yesterday (October 1), in relation to the noted strike injunction order issued by Judge Jenkins, contains important matter for the consideration of both employers and employees. In defining the legal rights of the latter with reference to what are known as strikes, the justice presents the case clearly, and his definitions should be studied carefully that their effect may be thoroughly comprehended. The injunction was issued in December last, when the receivers of the Northern Pacific railway sought to reduce the wages of employees, and when a strike was threatened secured an order from Judge Jenkins, enjoining the men from taking the proposed action. The injunction restrained the employees "from combining and conspiring to quit, with or without notice, the service of the said receivers with the object and intent of crippling the property in their custody or embarrassing the operation of the road;" and also "from so quitting the service of the said receivers, with or without notice, as to cripple the property or prevent or hinder the operation of the road."

The first quotation made, Justice Harlan says, should remain as it is; and on this point he overruled the application of the labor unions' representatives, who claimed that it was too sweeping and an infringement of individual rights. But as to the second quotation from the injunction, that part was set aside as being in excess of the law and a contravention of constitutional principles. The effect of this is to maintain the right of employees to strike, that is, to leave the service of employers, either singly or in a body, when the conditions of employment are not satisfactory, but not to allow any interference with those who want to work.

In passing upon this question of the right to quit work, the court says that "if an employe quits without cause and in violation of an express contract to serve for a stated time, then his quitting would not be of right." Taking further hold of the subject, however, where such contract does not exist,

Justice Harlan lays down the rule that a court of equity cannot, by injunction, prevent one individual from quitting the service of another. For a court to do so he says "is not justified by any authority to which our attention has been called, or of which we are aware. It would be an invasion of one's natural liberty to compel him to work for or to remain in the personal service of another. One who is placed in such restraint is in a condition of involuntary servitude—a condition which the supreme laws of the land declare shall not exist anywhere within the jurisdiction of the United States."

It was urged in support of the injunction that the refusal of the men to work for the reduced schedule would cripple the property and prevent or hinder the operation of the road. This feature, the court said, was a matter for the consideration of the receivers themselves, as employers. They made the order for reduction, and its effects in the line suggested were a responsibility of the makers. If the employes, through peaceful co-operation, as the result of friendly argument, persuasion or conference among themselves, chose to assert the right of each and every one to refuse further service under a schedule of reduced wages, such action would not be criminal or illegal, even though they firmly believed such quitting without notice would temporarily inconvenience the receivers and the public. So long as the men peaceably exercised their right of quitting the service, intending thereby to secure better wages, yet not interfering with the free action of others, the loss resulting from their cessation of work in consequence of the refusal of the receivers to accede to the terms upon which the men were willing to remain in the service, would be incidental to the situation, and not chargeable against employees in the exercise of a lawful right.

As to the retention in the injunction of the provision relating to combining and conspiring to quit with the intent of crippling or embarrassing the road, the court held that this was a necessary part of the court's order, and "must be construed as referring only to acts of violence, intimidation and wrong." Among these acts the court includes "force, threats, persecution, or intimidation toward employes who do not join them, or any device to hinder, alarm or interfere with others who take or desire to take their places."

A decision on the subject of strikes from such eminent judicial authority should be highly appreciated by both employes and employers at the present juncture. If the rule laid down by Justice Harlan had been recognized by contending parties in strike contests, there would have been prevented much of the loss of life and destruction of property which have attended such disagreements. It was the rule advocated by conservative people throughout the country, but in very many instances was wholly rejected both by employers and those in their service, each class taking an extreme view. As the matter now stands, the legal aspect of a labor conflict is this: (1) Employers have no right to compel men to remain in their service, under unless express contract, and the aid of courts cannot be invoked to