

NOT AT ALL SCARED

Scalpers Laugh at the Limited Tickets and Say Only Law Can Break Their Business.

CONGRESS IS CLOSELY WATCHED

Freight Agents Look for Big Shipments To-Morrow When the Reduced Rates Go Into Effect.

BIG BONUSES PUZZLE OIL LAND OWNERS

A Dealer Tells How Grapes Are Bought by Samples in the Auction Rooms.

"All this railroad talk about knocking out the ticket brokers is so much rubbish," remarked a prominent passenger man yesterday. "This has been the pet scheme of the leading railroads for years, and they haven't succeeded yet, and won't, unless Congress passes legislation."

"The ticket brokers have a powerful organization, and they are prepared with money to defeat hostile legislation."

In this connection it may be said that an amendment to the Inter-State law to make the payment of commissions unlawful was pending before Congress. It tied the natural death after they were born. The American Ticket Brokers' Association had two of their best men, Gustav G. Lansing, of New York, and George M. McKim, of Chicago, on the ground all the time to fight the bill. These men prepared a circular which they intended to scatter as a final shot at any time the situation became threatening, and there was no word of the bill passing. Now that the danger is over, the committee concluded to distribute the circular anyhow, and one reached THE DISPATCH yesterday. It says:

Revelations of the Millennium. The plea that twenty-five millions would be saved by the abolition of commissions is used by the advocates of the measure—not that the amount is paid in commissions, but the expense incidental to this payment help to make the sum. The millennium depicted by the friends of the bill is a world in which the millionaires in the larger cities, the depot of those alone in other places, the closing of the numerous agencies and the discharge of the representatives and traveling agents. The inducement to influence passenger traffic being removed, it is claimed that the retroactive agents would be unnecessary. As a capstone to these arguments, it is stated that the dead people shall reap where they have sown in the past. The interests involved in the bill are the twenty-five millionaires who are not selfish, neither are they violative of the law as it stands today. It needs but a retrospective glance to fully realize the tendency of transportation lines to centralization. At the same time the greed of corporations demands higher rates, and as the rate per mile is fixed by charter acts extra fare is charged for passage on "limited trains" and other "special" fares. The aim of those instrumental in effecting the passage of the Inter-State commerce law still falls short of the mark—the prevention of discrimination.

DONNED THEIR THINKING CAPS

Owners of Oil Lands Wondering Why They Get Such Good Bonuses.

There is a vast amount of speculation among people in the vicinity of Bridgeville regarding the probable views of oil men, and their designs regarding that territory. Graham, Potts & Robbins, and the Forest Oil Company have been operating in, apparently, testing way. The former has completed five wells on Miller's land, and the latter one on James Herriott's farm a gaser, one on the Collins' mill property, one on Webster Morgan's property, one on the farm of the late Dr. James Donaldson, and one on Mrs. Dr. Gilmore's farm.

INGENUITY OF GROCERS

How They Provide for Careless Customers and Beat Their Neighbors.

"Well," said a young married man yesterday, "I have learned a few things after a month at housekeeping. The price of Easter bonnets and the cost of dresses paralyzed me, but I have become used to the high rates. But what surprised me most were the devices of the family grocers to avoid in the price nuisance. A man is seldom known to carry a basket, and whether sent by his wife for tea, eggs, oysters or milk, he never thinks of taking a peep along for either. The grocer is expected to provide some sort of a cheap package.

A FREIGHT ROOM EXPECTED

The Reduced Rates From Erie Will Go Into Effect To-Morrow.

Iron shippers are holding back their freight for the new rates to go into effect to-morrow. Since the reduction was announced nothing in this line has been shipped except what had to go. If the freight agents were paid on commission many of them would now be walking around on the proverbial soap. However, the boys have been paid full salaries and they expect to make up for their extended vacation and soft soap in the future. Local representatives of Western roads are looking for a big boom to-morrow.

CONFIRMATION

New styles, new ideas in children's confirmation photographs; 12 elegant cabinet, many of them would now be walking around on the proverbial soap. However, the boys have been paid full salaries and they expect to make up for their extended vacation and soft soap in the future. Local representatives of Western roads are looking for a big boom to-morrow.

STYLISH SUITINGS

For a good-fitting dress or business suit go to Pitcairn's, 434 Wood street.

IRON CITY BE PLEASED EVERYBODY BY ITS

fine fit and pleasant effects. Dealers all alike it.

TRIPPED IN A MOVE

A Detective in the Gilkinson Case Asked to Name His Price

BY A HIGH HOMESTEAD OFFICIAL

The John Myers Ueberger Letter Proves But a Mere Fable.

CONSTABLE MURPHY IS OUT OF DANGER

The mystery deepens about the murder of Detective Gilkinson and the work of the Fitzsimmons gang. Every day the case assumes a new phase. Both the defense and the prosecution are straining every point. The Commonwealth is fearful of being brought out in the light of persecuting the murderer, and for that reason are even afraid to take the man out of jail and have his photograph taken. Both sides are keeping quiet, but startling revelations are promised at the inquest to-morrow. The defense attempted a coup yesterday, but only found a boomerang which will strike back at the inquest to-morrow. One of the leading citizens of Homestead is authority for the statement, and he is willing to make a affidavit to its truth, that yesterday a prominent official of Homestead approached one of the private detectives who is retaining evidence in the Fitzsimmons affair and asked him:

"How much will you take to work for the other side?"

FUN WITH AN OLD LADY

She Lost Her Umbrella, but a Kind-Hearted Conductor Found It.

"I had considerable fun with an old lady the other day," said a Pennsylvania conductor last evening. "Just before my train pulled out I had occasion to go into the depot, and I saw her at the window very nervously buying a ticket for Altoona. Her faded cotton umbrella fell from under her arm, and I wanted to see if she would pick it up before she was lost. As I supposed, and I took it to the train with me and put it in the baggage car.

Had Roads Can't Knock It Out

There is one industry in the rural districts that even had roads cannot depress to any appreciable extent, and that is, that of setting up delegates for political conventions. The candidate who has already begun treating can travel 'cross lots if there is no other way to get to the house of a man who is like to make a reliable delegate.

Very Quiet During Holy Week

"This has been a quiet week for the hotels," said a clerk of one of the local houses last evening. "It shows that men will be least likely to be good for a short period. Drummers have always recognized this trait of business people, and during Holy Week they usually lay off. I expect to see trade revive next week."

Do You Eat?

- I want to prove to all my friends and customers that while I work for my own interest I don't forget them. First to cut prices down last to put them up, and strictly first-class goods, is my aim. Send for April price list and special offer slip. I will give with all regular orders of \$100 dollars and upward: 21 lbs granulated sugar, \$1.00; 23 lbs standard A sugar, 1.00; 20 lbs California grapes, 1.00; 15 lbs best codfish, 1.00; 10 lb kit mackerel, 1.00; 7 lbs roasted coffee (fresh ground), 1.00; 7 lbs choice evaporated apples, 1.00; 4 lbs choice California raisins, 1.00; 3 lbs evaporated raspberries, 1.00; 4 lbs Weyman's tobacco, 1.00; 8 lbs white clover honey, 1.00; 5 lbs tea (in all varieties), 1.00; 20 lb best family flour, 1.00; Large family scales, 1.95; 9 extra fresh mackerel, 1.00; 24 lb new codfish (whole), 1.00; 30 lbs best Lima beans, 1.00; 7 lbs desiccated coconut, 1.00; 6-foot step ladder, complete, .98; 1 chicken brooder (4 quarts; feet), .85; 2 dozen best Cream molasses, 1.00; 1 gallon glass oil can, tin-covered, .20; 4 lbs dried corn, .25; Sugar-cured hams, per lb., .09; 30 lbs best Lima beans, 1.00; 1 can genuine sugar corn, .75; 1 can pumpkin, .75; 1 can split packed potatoes, .75; 1 can best kidney beans, .75; 1 can string beans, .75; Sugar-cured shoulder, per lb., .06; Delivered on all parts of two cities. To private living out of the city will prepay freight on all orders of \$100 and upward. Send for price list.

SPECIAL SPECIAL

Mr. H. J. Lynch, 438 and 440 Market street, will offer for the next 30 days extraordinary inducements in new spring dress goods, English suitings, French plaids, all-wool serge, cashmere, henriettes, nuns veilings and novelty suitings. 3 cases of new plaids, elegant styles, at 25% off.

Easter Monday, To-Morrow

Boys seem to thrive better than any other class around Easter; it's the holiday when they are roused out with new clothing. Our boys' school suits, sizes 12 to 14, at \$2.50 and \$2.50, are grand value. New, new and nobby patterns to choose from in checks, plaids, stripes and mixtures. Every boy resplendent as a peacock in a top-swinging watch and chain or long lash whip with silver whistle.

CONFIRMATION

New styles, new ideas in children's confirmation photographs; 12 elegant cabinet, many of them would now be walking around on the proverbial soap. However, the boys have been paid full salaries and they expect to make up for their extended vacation and soft soap in the future. Local representatives of Western roads are looking for a big boom to-morrow.

STYLISH SUITINGS

For a good-fitting dress or business suit go to Pitcairn's, 434 Wood street.

IRON CITY BE PLEASED EVERYBODY BY ITS

fine fit and pleasant effects. Dealers all alike it.

ONE WAY OUT OF TROUBLE

A Suggestion Offered the County-Hop Public Buildings Could Be Well Supplied With Natural Gas—The County as Its Own Gas Company.

RIOTERS RUN DOWN

Alleged Participants in the Corkworkers' Trouble Arrested.

ONE MORE OFFICIAL CIRCULAR

Contracting Plasterers of the Monongahela Valley Combine.

MISCELLANEOUS INDUSTRIAL NOTES

Information was made yesterday morning before Magistrate Grupp against four of the locked-out corkworkers, for alleged participation in the riot on the Sixteenth street bridge a few evenings ago. Three of them were arrested before noon and placed under lock and key for a hearing to-morrow afternoon.

A PLASTERERS' COMBINE

Contractors of the Monongahela River Towns Form an Agreement.

The contracting plasterers of Charlevoix, Monongahela City, Bellevue, Lucyville and California have formed a combination and have agreed upon a scale of prices for the next year. Any contractor violating the agreement shall be fined \$200, and any contractor who failed to sign the agreement previous to yesterday must pay an initiation fee of \$50.

Worked Like a Charm

The new train of four high rolls described in THE DISPATCH some weeks ago, were put into operation at the Homestead plant of Carnegie Bros. & Co., on Friday. It worked entirely satisfactorily. The new armor plates for the Government are to be made on this train.

Industrial Notes

SECRETARY DILLON, of the Flint Glass Workers' Union, is home from Tiffin, O., where he settled a difficulty in Beauty's factory. President Smith is in Corning.

Easter Monday, To-Morrow

Boys seem to thrive better than any other class around Easter; it's the holiday when they are roused out with new clothing. Our boys' school suits, sizes 12 to 14, at \$2.50 and \$2.50, are grand value. New, new and nobby patterns to choose from in checks, plaids, stripes and mixtures. Every boy resplendent as a peacock in a top-swinging watch and chain or long lash whip with silver whistle.

USE O'Keefe's O. K. shoe blacking

O'Keefe & Co., chemists, 708 Smithfield street.

Beer as a Beverage

Increases in favor every year, and the output of the Iron City Brewery keeps on the increase. Sold by all dealers.

Spring Suitings

The largest and most fashionable stock suitings, trousers and overcoatings at Pitcairn's, 434 Wood street.

ARE YOU GOING TO HAVE A RECEPTION?

Kennedy furnishes everything. Mail Orders Promptly Attended To.

TO ORGANIZED LABOR, GREETING:

The corkmakers' meeting, employed by Armstrong, Bro. & Co., desire to fully inform the organized workmen and women of this locality of the present status of the difficulty with that firm, and ask for your moral support and co-operation.

Telling the Story of the Strike

The operatives of the above factory are organized in the Knights of Labor, and this year, as usual, presented a scale and agreement. The strike on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but asked the apprentices' clause, previously agreed upon, and in the scale the operative were then informed that if the scale was not signed as desired by the firm a lockout would occur on January 30, for certain changes in this agreement, but no scale was signed by the organization, but no scale was signed, by reason of neglect of both parties. Finally, on March 14, the firm demanded that the scale be signed, but