

**SUPREME COURT CASES-sheet 2**

CASE	FACTS	ISSUE	DECISION	IMPACT
<p><i>Wabash &amp; Pacific RR v. Illinois</i> (1886)</p>	<p>Illinois statute imposed a penalty on railroads that charged the same or more for passengers or freight shipped for shorter distances than for longer distances.</p>	<p>Whether a state government has the power to regulate railroad prices on that portion of an interstate journey that lies within its borders.</p>	<p>Court held the Illinois statute to be invalid and that the power to regulate interstate railroad rates is a federal power which belongs exclusively to Congress</p>	
<p><i>United States v. E.C. Knight Co.</i> (1895)</p>	<p>Sherman AntiTrust Act (1890) was an attempt to limit growth of corporate power. Government used this act to go after Sugar Company that controlled 90% of sugar processed in US.</p>	<p>Whether Congress has the authority to regulate manufacturing &amp; whether Sherman Antitrust Act outlawed manufacturing monopolies.</p>	<p>Court held that federal govt. could not regulate refineries since they were "manufacturing operations" that were not directly related to interstate commerce.</p>	
<p><i>In Re Debs</i> (1895)</p>	<p>Eugene V. Debs, an American railway union officer &amp; one of the leaders of the Pullman Railroad Car workers' strike in 1894, refused to honor a federal court injunction ordering him to halt the strike.</p>	<p>Whether the federal government has the constitutional authority to stop railroad workers from striking.</p>	<p>Authority of federal government to halt the strike was upheld. Strike interfered with the railroad's ability to carry commerce &amp; mail which benefitted the needs &amp; "general welfare" of Americans.</p>	
<p><i>Northern Securities Co. v. US</i> (1904)</p>	<p>The major stockholders of two competing railroad companies set up a holding company to buy the controlling interests of the two railroads. The constitutionality of the holding company was brought into question.</p>	<p>Whether Congress had the authority under the Commerce Clause to regulate the holding company's effort to eliminate competition.</p>	<p>Court found that a holding company formed solely to eliminate competition between the two railroads was in violation of Sherman AntiTrust Act because it unreasonably restrained interstate commerce.</p>	
<p><i>Lochner v. New York</i> (1905)</p>	<p>New York law set limits on how many hours bakery employees could work. Lochner was convicted &amp; fined for permitting employees to work more.</p>	<p>Whether a law which limits the number of hours bakery employees were allowed to work interfered with right to make employer/employee contracts.</p>	<p>Court held that even though states have power to regulate areas of health, safety, morals &amp; public welfare, the law in question was not within "police powers" of the State.</p>	
<p><i>Muller v. Oregon</i> (1908)</p>	<p>In 1903, state of Oregon passed law prohibiting women from working in factories or laundries more than 10 hours in any day.</p>	<p>Whether state of Oregon violated 14th Amendment by forbidding the employment of women for more than 10 hours in a day.</p>	<p>Court held that Oregon law that barred women (who were viewed as a weaker class &amp; in need of protection), as correct &amp; sustained the legislation.</p>	

era of big business