

why only "some part," only "future" increments, and only "urban" values?

CHARLES FREDERICK ADAMS.

NEWS NARRATIVE

The figures in brackets at the ends of paragraphs refer to volumes and pages of *The Public* for earlier information on the same subject.

Week ending Tuesday, June 4, 1912.

The Labor War.

In connection with the London transport strike, a manifesto in behalf of the strikers was issued on the 27th, protesting against the use of police and troops in the interest of employers and warning the public authorities of extreme measures if this policy continues. The number of strikers was estimated on the 29th at 140,000; and they had posted pickets everywhere around the dock entrances in London. In an interview with the Home Secretary the leaders offered to co-operate with the Government in facilitating transportation of necessary food supplies for London; but the Government, regardless of this offer, gave assurances of protection to shippers of food supplies. These assurances were regarded at that date as having made the probability of a national strike more imminent. Even then the port of London was paralyzed—not a truck wheel moving in the streets,—and the shipping companies of Glasgow, Hull and other centers trading with London had been compelled to suspend their sailings. A conference with the Government was scheduled for the 31st, at which representatives of the strikers agreed to be present but which the employing interests announced their unwillingness to attend. The latter met, however, with members of the Ministry on the 30th. Lloyd George presided, and the other Ministers present were Sydney Buxton, John Burns, Reginald McKenna and Sir Rufus Isaacs. This meeting was adjourned to the 3rd. The proposed joint conference of the 31st—the employers, pursuant to their announcement, having refused to attend it—was held with the strikers' representatives alone. It here developed, as reported by the dispatches, that the crux of the controversy is the "closed shop," the organized employers insisting upon employing unorganized men, and the organized men refusing to work along with those that are not organized. [See current volume, page 512.]



Indications of a renewal of the garment workers' strike at Chicago were reported on the 27th. [See current volume, page 369.]

The causes of the Chicago freight handlers' strike produced a supplementary one in Minnesota on the 27th, when the freight handlers at Minneapolis and St. Paul to the number of 1,800 went out. The situation at Chicago on that day was reported as "about the same, with the railroads unable to handle the freight and the shippers and merchants becoming more restless because of the inefficient railroad service." [See current volume, page 487.]



The newspaper strike in Chicago shows no further outward signs, except that it is still somewhat difficult to obtain on the streets any of the evening papers other than the evening edition of the *Daily World*, which has taken the place of the *Daily Socialist* and begun a serious attempt to establish itself as a newspaper. Reports in the other papers to the effect that the striking stereotypers are coming back to work are the only present indication that the larger papers are crippled—the inference being that if they were not crippled there would be no work for the striking stereotypers to go back to. The extent, however, of this return to work does not appear in the reports. Judge Brentano refused on the 27th to enjoin the city authorities from allowing newsstands on the street, deciding that the plaintiffs in the suit had no property interest in the question. A statement in opposition to the pressmen and stereotypers was presented to the Chicago Federation of Labor on the 2d by the Typographical Union. [See current volume, page 512.]



A strike of hotel waiters in New York has extended from the one hotel in which it began, the Belmont, to several others, and has been reinforced by other hotel employees. The Hotel Knickerbocker, for instance, was crippled on the 27th by the unexpected walking out of all the men employed as waiters, cooks, pantrymen, and silver men. At a signal previously agreed upon they stopped work wherever they happened to be and the patrons of the hotel sat helpless at their unfinished meals. Then the men paraded into the street and, joined by other members of the International Hotel Workers' Union, they created excitement in the vicinity of Broadway and Forty-second street which brought on the police reserves, although there were no indications of violence. On the 29th the waiters walked out of the Waldorf-Astoria, the Gotham, the Breslin, and Rector's, in the midst of the evening dinner hours, leaving hundreds of hungry patrons in the lurch. At its meeting on the 29th, the Hotel Men's Association had unanimously voted to increase the wages of all employees 20 per cent and upwards, to abolish fines and make other improvements in working conditions, but protested that this action was

taken irrespective of strikes and without recognition of the employes' organizations. On the next night, the 30th, the waiters, cooks and kitchen help at the Plaza, the St. Regis, the Astor, the Prince George, the Imperial and the Gotham hotels, and Shanley's and Louis Martin's restaurants and the Elks' Club, joined in the strike. Some of the employers forthwith sent to the registrars of Eastern colleges inviting students who are working their way through college and need additional funds, to act as waiters. Arrangements were made by others to bring Negro waiters from the winter resort hotels in Florida, Georgia and the Carolinas, and by others to employ girls. On the 31st the cooks and waiters at Sherry's, the Calumet Club, the Hotel Seville, the Marie Antoinette and the Great Northern walked out. The number of strikers out on the 31st was estimated at 4,000, and there were expectations of a spread of the strike to other cities, especially Chicago and Baltimore at the time of the Presidential conventions.



After his recent visit to San Diego, California, the Attorney General of the State was reported in the newspapers to have said that a special grand jury would be convened and that in his opinion both sides were now satisfied to let the law take its course. [See current volume, page 512.]



Presidential Campaigning.

The most important popular campaigning for the Presidential nominations closed with the primaries in New Jersey on the 28th. On the Republican side Roosevelt won all of the 28 delegates; on the Democratic side Wilson won all but four. The popular plurality for Roosevelt was about 16,000, and that for Wilson about the same. Mr. Roosevelt published a signed statement on the 3rd, in which he asserts it to be "the absolute duty of every progressive Republican to oppose the selection as temporary chairman at Chicago of any man put forward in the interests of the supporters of Mr. Taft in this contest." In the same connection and statement he says of Elihu Root, the candidate of the committee for temporary chairman:

In the past Mr. Root has rendered distinguished service as Secretary of State and Secretary of War. But in this contest Mr. Root ranged himself against the men who stand for progressive principles within the Republican party, that is, against the men who stand for making the Republican party in relation to the issues of the present day what it was in the days of Abraham Lincoln. He stands as the representative of the men and the policies of reaction. He is put forward by the bosses and the representatives of special privileges.

[See current volume, page 511.]

The Tariff Question in Congress.

Sixteen reactionary Senators absented themselves from the United States Senate on the 30th, in order to give the Democrats a majority on the House bill revising the iron and steel schedule of the protective tariff law. Their object was strategical. Regarding the Democratic revision of this schedule as having ignored the Republican principle of tariff revision—"differences in cost of production abroad and at home"—to which President Taft is committed, they desired to give the President an opportunity to write a veto message that would serve as a campaign document. Some of the progressive Republican Senators, on the other hand, wished to amend the House bill so as to make it a revision downward but with reference to differences in cost of production, thereby forcing the Democratic House to conform to the Republican principle or vote against revision and giving the President an opportunity to veto. In consequence of the absence of the reactionary Republican Senators, who if present would have been obliged to vote for the amendment or else against the bill (thereby casting the onus of defeating tariff revision upon the President's faction in the Republican party), the bill was carried in the Senate by 35 to 22. The absentees for tactical purposes were—

Brandegge (Conn.), Briggs (N. J.), Catron (N. M.), Crane (Mass.), Du Pont (Del.), Fall (N. M.), Gamble (S. D.), Guggenheim (Colo.), Lodge (Mass.), Nixon (Nev.), Penrose (Pa.), Richardson (Del.), Root (N. Y.), Stephenson (Wis.), Sutherland (Utah), Wetmore (R. I.).

The progressive Republicans who voted against the bill were—

Borah (Ida.), Bourne (Ore.), Bristow (Kan.), Cummins (Iowa), and Works (Cal.).

Senator Gronna of North Dakota, a progressive Republican, voted for the bill. Senator La Follette was absent from Washington.



On the preceding day the Republicans of the Senate had carried an amendment to this bill by 37 to 27, which would repeal the Canadian reciprocity law, under which print paper is admitted into the United States from Canada free. [See vol. xiv, pages 1001, 1028; current volume, page 324.]



American Report on the Titanic Disaster.

The United States Senate Committee for investigation of the loss of the steamship Titanic at sea, April 15, reported to the Senate on the 28th. Immediate responsibility for the disaster was laid to the captain of the ship, who went down in her, and who seems to have steamed at full speed through a region in which he had been warned that he would encounter ice. Responsi-