

From the *Literary Digest*, March 22nd, 1913:

MAKING COAL STRIKES PAY.

Making coal strikes pay has apparently been mastered by the hard-coal operators, conclude several Eastern papers in view of a report on coal prices and wages which was sent in to Congress as one of Secretary Nagel's last official acts. As the New York *Tribune* summarizes the figures in the report, the advance of twenty-five cents a ton in the retail price of coal was made ostensibly to compensate for the advance in wages following last spring's strike. But, we are informed, "the coal operators paid their miners \$4,000,000 additional during 1912 as a result of the increase in wages and advanced the cost of coal to the public in the same year \$13,450,000. Thus they gained \$9,450,000 in one year as a consequence of the strike." In this way "the miners, the operators, and the retailers all made easy money by the strike and the wage agreement," observes the Springfield *Republican*, "while the public alone has lost money, through higher prices, without any compensation whatever." In New England, a region especially hard hit by high coal prices, another daily, the Boston *Christian Science Monitor*, is indignant at "the apparent deliberateness with which the coal interests involved here set to work with the purpose of trifling with the public. . . . They entered upon this plan of extortion without compunction and without hesitation." And what makes the sin of the operators more grievous, according to the New York *Tribune's* way of thinking, is the fact that this sort of thing has become customary with them:

"After the strikes of 1900 and 1902 they raised wages thirty-two cents a ton and prices to the public one dollar a ton. *The Tribune* last spring estimated their profit from that transaction at more than \$300,000,000 in a decade. When there is so much money as that in strikes, will the anthracite-coal industry ever be free from them?"

The report, which was prepared by investigators con-