
INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS AND RELATIONS IN PATERSON, N. J.

(For exhibits under this subject see pages 2629 to 2645.)

COMMISSION ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS.

PATERSON, N. J., *Monday, June 15, 1914—10 a. m.*

Present: Chairman Walsh, Commissioners Lennon, O'Connell, and Commons.

Chairman WALSH. The commission will please be in order.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is Mr. Henry Doherty, jr., present?

(No response.)

Mr. THOMPSON. Is Mr. Edward F. Lotte present?

(No response.)

Mr. THOMPSON. Is Mr. Thomas F. Morgan here?

TESTIMONY OF MR. THOMAS F. MORGAN.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Morgan, will you give us your full name, please?

Mr. MORGAN. Thomas F. Morgan.

Mr. THOMPSON. Your address?

Mr. MORGAN. 14 Twenty-second Avenue.

Mr. THOMPSON. And your occupation?

Mr. MORGAN. Loom fixer by trade; secretary of the loom fixers and twisters' association at the present time.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been secretary?

Mr. MORGAN. Seventeen years.

Mr. THOMPSON. Of that organization?

Mr. MORGAN. Seventeen years.

Mr. THOMPSON. Seventeen years?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are located here in Paterson?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Where are the members of your organization working, around Paterson in the silk mills?

Mr. MORGAN. They cover 15 States.

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean your local organization.

Mr. MORGAN. Local organization around Paterson; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What number have you in your organization?

Mr. MORGAN. Four hundred.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is the general purpose and scope of your organization, the international organization?

Mr. MORGAN. Why, to reduce the hours and increase the wages, get better sanitary conditions.

Mr. THOMPSON. What class of workers does it include?

Mr. MORGAN. Loom fixers?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. What class of workers? Do you mean the class he does?

Mr. THOMPSON. All persons who are admissible to membership in your union.

Mr. MORGAN. Loom fixers and twisters. That is two separate trades.

Mr. THOMPSON. That includes all the trades admitted to your union?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you got a copy of your by-laws?

Mr. MORGAN. I have not got one with me; no, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will you furnish the commission with one?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

(The constitution and by-laws were later submitted in printed form.)

Mr. THOMPSON. In that do you state the trades that are admissible to membership, and the requirements of membership?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Around Paterson, you say, you have 400?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Members of your organization?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Some time ago, in this city, about a year ago, there was a strike in the silk mills?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many mills are there, if you know, in this city, silk mills?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, do you mean how many firms or how many separate mills?

Mr. THOMPSON. How many separate mills.

Mr. MORGAN. I should judge about 118 or 120.

Mr. THOMPSON. About 118 or 120?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is it the most important industry in Paterson?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many of those mills have you members of your union in?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, you see there is different branches in the industry; there is ribbon and broad silk. Ours includes only the broad silk. We have got them in about 55 different mills.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many mills are there that are manufacturing broad silk?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, between 55 and 60.

Mr. THOMPSON. Between 55 and 60?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Does your membership practically include all the people in your line in the mills? What per cent organized are you?

Mr. MORGAN. It is like this, some of the firms are so small that they don't employ any of our men; could not afford to employ them.

Mr. THOMPSON. Those mills that you have an organization in, are you there fairly well organized or not?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then practically the people working in the line of industry covered by your union in the mill, large enough to employ your members, are employing members of your organization?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you have agreements with the manufacturers?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You do not?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is there a verbal—

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting). Well, there is a verbal understanding.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is to the effect that the men do not seek employment anywhere else?

Mr. MORGAN. They apply to the organization for the men. Our men do not apply for work.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then you furnish the members of your unions to the manufacturers upon application through the manufacturer?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is there any other understanding between yourself and the manufacturers?

Mr. MORGAN. Only the amount of wages. They all know what that is, and they know when they send to the organization for a man they have got to pay the standard.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you take up any grievances with the manufacturers? Or are they settled with the individual employee?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, if it is a small grievance, very likely it is adjusted with the men in the shop. If it becomes anything like serious they send for me.

Mr. THOMPSON. And the manufacturers will deal with you?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. As the representative of the organization?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. On behalf of them?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Isn't that true generally of all these manufacturers as to the members of your union?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you ever had occasion to present any demands to any of these manufacturers, either with reference to hours, wages, sanitary conditions, or in regard to any special grievance?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. When we decide upon an increase in wages, we generally give 90 days' notice, saying that we expect to increase wages at a certain date, generally in 90 days, and as a general rule we succeed in getting the increase inside of 30 days.

Mr. THOMPSON. You give them notice?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not the individual workers?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir. Well, the individual workers through the shop chairman very often notify a manufacturer they work for.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is to say, you have shop organization?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. But the official representative of your organization hands a notice verbally or gives a notice in writing to the manufacturer?

Mr. MORGAN. Generally verbally; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And the manufacturer generally deals through your officers?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then this is true, so far as your union is concerned in this town to-day?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, with reference to strikes, there have been strikes within the last few years in the silk industry in this city, have there not?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. When was the first strike, and about how long did it last?

Mr. MORGAN. The first strike?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; there were two strikes—one grew out of the other, as I understand?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, when you ask your question like that, it is pretty hard to answer it, because there is always a strike of some size on in this city.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, about a year ago there was a very severe strike here?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. A strike of some magnitude, wasn't there?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did that grow out of a previous strike, do you know, or not?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; it grew out of a strike, I believe, in the Henry Doherty Silk Co., although some three or four others previous to that they were agitating for a general strike, even previous to that.

Mr. THOMPSON. What did this strike in the Henry Doherty mills, out of which the second strike grew, what was that—I don't mean what caused it, but whom did it include and for what length of time did it last?

Mr. MORGAN. It was the weavers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Of course they were not members of your organization?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Your organization, as I understand, could not properly take them in?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long did that strike last, if you know; I don't mean the date—

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting). You mean from the start of the Doherty strike until the strike—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Until finally the first strike was settled or ended.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, it started in the Doherty shop just—I think it was in the early part of February—and did not end until the latter part of July.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then the Doherty strike never was settled, but merged into this larger strike?

Mr. MORGAN. Practically none of them were ever settled; only just petered out, is all.

Mr. THOMPSON. But I mean, first there was a small strike and then that grew into the larger strike?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did it include members of your organization at any stage?

Mr. MORGAN. Naturally, when the weaver stops the machinery stops.

Mr. THOMPSON. And you think you simply stopped work? There was no work for you to do?

Mr. MORGAN. There was no work for them.

Mr. THOMPSON. But they were not participants in the strike?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. At any stage of the strike?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they have any conferences with the strikers at any stage? Any official conferences?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. At the time of the strike did you have any meetings of your men with reference to the strike and its merits and demerits? Were any resolutions passed or any orders of your organization?

Mr. MORGAN. No; only at our general meetings, of course, in a general way, which came up about the trade and the unsettled conditions it was in, but nothing which you might term definite.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were there any meetings of your membership in which you had an understanding that you would keep aloof from the strike and not take any part in it?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the general conclusion of your organization in that regard?

Mr. MORGAN. The general conclusion was this: That it represented—the strike represented—a body of disorganized people, practically speaking. This all occurred after the strike was in full swing. It appeared this way, that the great majority of those that were out on strike had no definite understanding as to what they were out on strike for. In some cases there were shops which came out on strike and told the men that employed them that they had no grievance whatever, but were simply going out in sympathy with the others. Then, of course, after they had been out a couple of weeks they kind of formulated grievances so that by reason of that we could not undertake to act with them, because, practically speaking, there was never any action taken by the body of the weavers themselves.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, when these weavers went out of Doherty's mills, did your organization at that time take an interest in the strike?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. But your men were thrown out of work?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was there any inquiry by yourself or other officers of the organization as to why the weavers were out throwing your men out of work?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, yes; in a formal way.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is what I want to get at, what you did in that respect at that time?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, to get at that time properly you would really have to take up previous to the strike when this three and four loom question that brought on the strike was up in the Doherty Co. before the strike occurred.

Mr. THOMPSON. I don't want to get the right or wrong, I mean as to the intention, but I do want to get at the why of the strike, what caused it. You may state your three or four loom proposition.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, as I stated, previous to the strike occurring I, along with the committee of weavers and also a committee from the warpers, went and notified the Doherty Co. in regard to the three or four loom proposition, and we had several conferences trying to convince him that it would very likely precipitate a strike if he persisted on going on with the fours.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long was this prior to the first strike?

Mr. MORGAN. It may be three or four weeks previous to the strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long had the looms been in force there, or been put into effect, three or four looms?

Mr. MORGAN. They had been running some months previous to that.

Mr. THOMPSON. Some months?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And what specific thing did you take up with the manufacturer at that time?

Mr. MORGAN. Representing the weavers and the loomers, we took up the proposition that if he insisted upon them running three or four looms he would very likely bring about a strike, and tried to persuade him from it. On the other hand he told us of different firms throughout the country where they

were running them, also told of a firm here where they had run four frames 12 years, and he did not see why he should not be allowed to run them.

Mr. THOMPSON. You speak of three or four looms. Tell what that means. It means an attendant taking care of three or four looms, does it?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Tell us in your own way what that meant with reference to the workers.

Mr. MORGAN. Well, it meant this to the workers: If one weaver ran four looms where they formerly ran two, every other weaver would be thrown out of work. That was the principal objection we had to it.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was said to you at that time other than what you have now said, by Mr. Doherty?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, he simply told us it was a question of competition with Pennsylvania. That he was forced into the position to make this low class of goods; that is, that grade of goods; that his competitors in that line of goods were running three and four looms, and if he was going to manufacture that kind of goods he would have to make it on the three and four loom basis.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was that the only conference you had with him?

Mr. MORGAN. We had several conferences.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the result of your conferences?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. At that time you were working with the weavers?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not as part of your organization, but simply because they were working in the same mills with your people?

Mr. MORGAN. Simply trying to avoid trouble.

Mr. THOMPSON. When the strike occurred it was three or four weeks, I take it, after your conference with Doherty?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What then did you do with reference to these same weavers that you represented at these conferences?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, they then merged into practically one mass. You could not hardly call it an organization because I don't suppose there was 5 per cent of them organized when the strike took place.

Mr. THOMPSON. When these same weavers that you represented, while unorganized while working in the mills, what did you do with them when they came out? Did you cooperate with them at that time?

Mr. MORGAN. No. Practically the thing stood dead. That was all. Nothing further, but we were not working and they were not working.

Mr. THOMPSON. But while your people were working and while these weavers were working you took up these matters with Doherty?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. But when they went out on strike and your people were out on strike you stood back and did not carry on further negotiations. Is that correct?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the reason that you negotiated prior to the strike and then stopped negotiating after the strike?

Mr. MORGAN. Because there was nothing further to negotiate about. The mills were shut down. He was going to run three or four looms, as he wanted. What further could we do?

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, your people were out of work.

Mr. MORGAN. We could not make him start the place up.

Mr. THOMPSON. It looks as if there was more reason then, from my point of view, for negotiating than there was before.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. At least, you considered there was nothing for you to do?

Mr. MORGAN. We were ready and willing to do anything we could if they were willing and wanted us to, but if they wanted to continue fighting there was no room for negotiation when they wanted to fight.

Mr. THOMPSON. After the mill first went on strike, how soon after that did you have a meeting of your people or of your officials, or a coterie of your officials, to determine what action, if any, you should take?

Mr. MORGAN. We met on our regular meetings, the first and third Friday, and it seemed everybody knew in the trade that the Henry Doherty Co. was out on strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long did it take for that strike to spread to the other mills?

Mr. MORGAN. I could not say positively. It was a number of weeks, though.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, in a general way, how long?

Mr. MORGAN. Maybe four or five weeks.

Mr. THOMPSON. In about how many mills did it spread?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, they set a given day when they were to claim a general strike. Some responded and some did not; and then it was constantly shifting until they got them all involved in it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, at that time did your organization take any part or pass any resolutions or have any understanding among your members, either yourself or officers with reference to what your attitude should be in that?

Mr. MORGAN. The understanding was the organization having control of the strike, we did not recognize it as a trade-union movement, and for that reason we did not wish to be mixing with them or mixed up with them.

Mr. THOMPSON. This organization, you mean the Industrial Workers of the World?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. How soon after the strike, or if at the beginning of the strike, did they take possession of the strike? Did they start in possession at the time the Doherty people went out on strike, did they call them out?

Mr. MORGAN. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. The people came out?

Mr. MORGAN. The Doherty strike was simply a mix up. There were some belonging to the United Textile Workers in that organization, and the Industrial Workers of the World tried to break in on that shop, so that it was a mix up between the two organizations of the weavers.

Mr. THOMPSON. But the strike itself was not caused by their organization, if you know?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, that would be a pretty hard question to answer. Some said the Industrial Workers of the World called it and some said they did not. Whether they did or not, I don't know. Practically speaking, I think they knew themselves.

Mr. THOMPSON. You don't think they knew? That is your opinion?

Mr. MORGAN. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Let me understand your answer. You mean the people came out without the incitement of the Industrial Workers of the World, or that the Industrial Workers of the World didn't know anything about it?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, some strikes—sometimes maybe half a dozen workers in a shop will decide it will be a good thing to call them out, and with the class of people they have working in the mills at the present time, they simply say, "Come on, stop the looms. Get out. Get out. Get out." So God knows who calls that kind of a strike. I don't.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, you think the mill workers, the Doherty walkout was caused because they could not adjust this three or four loom proposition with Doherty?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; that was the root of it.

Mr. THOMPSON. And after that the other organization came in and helped to spread the strike to the other mills?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And then you withdrew your hands from the situation?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is there any organization affiliated with the American Federation of Labor which could properly take in weavers and loomers and other people that you say do not properly belong to your organization?

Mr. MORGAN. Is there any at the present time, do you mean, or at the time of the strike?

Mr. THOMPSON. At that time?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, at that time, as I told you, some of them were affiliated with the American Textile Workers to the American Federation of Labor, in the Doherty shop; but, as I said, the Industrial Workers of the World broke in on them and practically destroyed that organization in that shop; that is, what little was left of it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, as I understood from your statement in regard to the membership of your organization, it would not take in these workmen?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir; but there was a local of the weavers, understand, at the time the strike took place; that is, what was left of the weavers in the Doherty shop.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was this local consisting of weavers in the Doherty shop working with your organization?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; it was affiliated with the American Federation of Labor.

Mr. THOMPSON. How large an organization was that, and was it active, or was it passive?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, at one time it was quite active; that is, maybe a year previous to that time. Had about 1,800 members. And then it dwindled down to, practically, the Doherty shop, with, maybe, a hundred or less.

Mr. THOMPSON. About how many weavers are there working in Paterson?

Mr. MORGAN. Broad-silk weavers?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. I should judge it would be 6,000 or 7,000.

Mr. THOMPSON. What, if anything, was done by your organization toward the close of the strike to bring about the finish of it, if anything; and what was done by this other organization of weavers affiliated with the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, as I told you, when that strike occurred, practically, that organization which was affiliated with the American Federation of Labor went out of existence, then and there. That was the end of that organization, at the beginning of the strike. You want to know what my organization did toward bringing about a conference or settlement of the strike at any stage of the game?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. I might state, directly—the organization directly—none; but there is the central labor body of Paterson, N. J., which tried to arrange a conference between the manufacturers and the workers—to bring about a conference opening the way for a settlement. And there was a committee appointed by the central labor body, and this committee went and saw the general strike committee, and the general strike committee seemed to think well of the plan, and they appointed 3 from each one of the parts—that is, 3 from the dyers, 3 from the ribbon weavers, 3 from the broad-silk weavers, and 3 from the general; that is, the quillers and winders and things like that, consisting of 12, and with them gained an understanding with some manufacturers in the city that they would be satisfied with a conference, and the strike committee was perfectly satisfied. Everything was all arranged, the committee was appointed, and everything; and just as they were about to adjourn, Mrs. Flynn—"Girls" Flynn—jumped in and knocked the thing sky-high; said they would not have anything to do with anybody connected with the American Federation of Labor—they were a lot of fakers and grafters—and she knocked this committee out entirely. And she came back to the Central Labor Union—this body—with a proposition which she knew could not be carried out, just to discredit the American Federation of Labor. She asked all organized trades in Paterson to declare a 24-hour strike to show they were in good faith; and she knew perfectly well that all trades connected with the American Federation of Labor were working under agreements with manufacturers and could not do it, and that was a card she played to break off this conference, which she succeeded in doing.

Mr. THOMPSON. That ended it?

Mr. MORGAN. That knocked the committee sky-high.

Mr. THOMPSON. You say the strike sort of petered out?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; at the finish.

Mr. THOMPSON. How soon after that did it start to peter out, or had it already started?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, it was a long time after that. That was only while the strike was on about six weeks, and the strike lasted pretty near six months.

Mr. THOMPSON. At that time did the president of your organization, John Golden, come here during the strike?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What effort did he make, if any, in regard to settling the strike or taking these weavers and others into your organization?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, I might state that there was a request from a number of the workers; that is, that the American Federation of Labor should send its representative in here and try and get some of the workers organized together, if they could get them to organize, and try and bring about a conference and bring about a settlement. They called a meeting for the armory up here on Market Street. The meeting was arranged; and there was also, I believe, from

paper reports and from reports of people attending the meeting, that the Industrial Workers of the World decided they were going to go up to that meeting in the armory and break it up, if possible. This meeting was arranged in the armory, and there was something like fifteen or sixteen thousand people in the meeting, and they succeeded, in a way, in breaking it up. It was one of the wildest scenes, and Bill Hayward came hedging through with fellows and tried to cause a disturbance, and he succeeded in causing a disturbance to a certain extent. Then the police had to rush the crowd and drive the 15,000 out. After they got them out five or six thousand came back and held the meeting.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, in reference to the work that Mr. Goldman was able to do here, then, didn't he form any organization of those workers?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir. They claimed unless they could have a majority of the workers who were on strike they would not take the work up under the circumstances.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long did Mr. Goldman stay here at that time?

Mr. MORGAN. I guess he was here, off and on, for two or three weeks.

Mr. THOMPSON. And the result was that he was not able to get a majority, and the matter died?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir; we could not get a majority. We opened headquarters in Market Street and one other headquarters, and as soon as we did the I. W. W. got out pickets and used threats of all kinds to keep them away, and what they would not do to them as they went near the place.

Mr. THOMPSON. During the length of the strike, Mr. Morgan, were any people killed, if you know?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, there was only one man; he was supposed to be a dyer's helper on Riverside. It remains a mystery as to how he was killed.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was he a striker?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir. I think he was one who went in and acted as a strike breaker; but they never found out definitely how he was killed.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was there a great deal of disorder, and what form did it take? Did it take the form of slugging people or breaking of property?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, yes; there was considerable disorder, but with no more than you might generally expect where there were 25,000 people out on a strike. A lot of the papers garbled the reports so as to make it appear that it was something awful. It was not near as bad as some of the papers put it.

Mr. THOMPSON. In your opinion, it was just about the kind of a strike you would expect where 25,000 people were out on strike?

Mr. MORGAN. I think it was very peaceful for a strike of that size.

Mr. THOMPSON. You think it was very peaceful?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did the people conduct themselves in a fairly orderly manner, do you think?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What pictures did the newspapers print at that time of the disorder? You say it was not as bad as they pictured it?

Mr. MORGAN. Out of a very trifling affair they would make it appear that it was a great big riot, and all that sort of stuff.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they do that often?

Mr. MORGAN. Quite often; yes, sir. Some of the papers in particular seemed to take a great deal of delight in firing things at Paterson, anyhow.

Mr. THOMPSON. They did?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. From the reading of the papers, then, one would get a totally different idea of the strike than it was actually?

Mr. MORGAN. From what it was actually; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. They did?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. In other words, the element of disorder and violence was made up and made to appear more rather than less?

Mr. MORGAN. There was a lot of stuff that went on that did not appear of the disorder; threats and intimidation, and all that, that was done very quietly. At the same time it was very effective.

Mr. THOMPSON. At that time you were here in Paterson all the time?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir?

Mr. THOMPSON. You were watching the progress of the strike?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Your men were out of work?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the attitude, if you know, if you observed it, of the authorities, say, the police, toward the strikers?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, I think the attitude of the police was very fair, under the circumstances.

Mr. THOMPSON. You think it was very fair?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; very fair.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they cause many arrests or not, if you know?

Mr. MORGAN. There was quite a lot of arrests, but, at the same time, there was always a certain chance of disorder that they were trying to avoid. I have seen them arrest crowds of 30 or 40, and you would think it was arranged for a moving-picture show. It was such a burlesque, some being taken into the patrol wagons, and some jumping in the patrol wagon, some trying to get in.

Mr. THOMPSON. What would be the occasion of those arrests?

Mr. MORGAN. Too big a crowd congregated together, and they were afraid of disorder.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you see any of those crowds?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; I seen several of the crowds.

Mr. THOMPSON. How would the police come—in the patrol?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. To the place?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What would they do when they got there?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, the crowd that was not dispersed, if the officer who was on watch dispersed them, they would line up a few and put them in the patrol.

Mr. THOMPSON. How did they get in the patrol?

Mr. MORGAN. Some would rush to get in; only too glad to get in, apparently.

Mr. THOMPSON. The officers never had to use any force or coercion to get them in?

Mr. MORGAN. Not any that I seen. There was force according to the newspaper reports, but I didn't see any.

Mr. THOMPSON. You didn't see any?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did the people riot at that time?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir; not what you might term a riot.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they seek to resist the officers?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; going through a crowd like that, there was remarks that were passed to the officers that were very insulting. I seen one down on Beach Street, where a man deliberately spit in an officer's face; and I want to say that officer had all his nerve with him when he stood for it.

Mr. THOMPSON. At those times you saw the people being taken in the patrol wagon, did the people resist and strike back at the officers?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did the people fight back?

Mr. MORGAN. Not that I seen.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did the officers at that time, so far as you saw, do anything to incite the people?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir; as a general thing they would go through the crowds joking with them and in good humor, and try to pass it off as light as possible.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, from your standpoint the people welcomed the coming of the patrol wagon and went with the officers?

Mr. MORGAN. Judging from the way they got in you would think so.

Mr. THOMPSON. At least, that was the way it appeared to you at that time?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the condition of the prisoners when they were taken into the courts, when they were arrested? Or what was done with those people, generally—taken in the patrol wagon?

Mr. MORGAN. Some were taken to jail, and some were sentenced, and sentence suspended; and different things. It is hard to say.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many courts have you here dealing with those matters?

Mr. MORGAN. The recorder's court generally dealt with those cases.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many judges sit in that court?

Mr. MORGAN. One.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was his name?

Mr. MORGAN. Recorder Carroll.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was he sitting at that time through the strike?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you attend the court meetings?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You did not?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What you know about what was done with the prisoners was general information?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; that is all.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you hear of any cases where Recorder Carroll was said to have severely handled the people?

Mr. MORGAN. There were some cases of that kind.

Mr. THOMPSON. Generally, so far as you know, what was the attitude of the strikers toward Recorder Carroll in regard to his dealing with them?

Mr. MORGAN. Kind of antagonistic.

Mr. THOMPSON. Antagonistic?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the reason, so far as you know, for that antagonistic attitude of the strikers?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, in most cases they seemed to think he gave them more than they deserved; that he was too severe with them.

Mr. THOMPSON. What reason do you form in your own mind as to why the people would jump into the patrol wagon and then object to the way the recorder would handle them?

Mr. MORGAN. It then became a more serious matter, later on, to be arrested.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then when it became a more serious matter later on, what was the attitude toward the patrol wagon when they were arrested?

Mr. MORGAN. I don't know; I wasn't there.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then you only saw this during the early period of the strike?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Later on you didn't see them?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is there anything more, Mr. Morgan, that you would like to state in connection with what you have already spoken about?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir; the only thing I want to state is, the reason the big strike came off was, it was a lack of organization.

Another thing, I might say as to why the strike came off, there is a lack of organization, and why there is a lack of organization is on account of the great influx of immigration to this country, where it is impossible with the class of people we have to organize them along the same lines.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is your organization doing now to organize those people?

Mr. MORGAN. To organize them?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. We have tried and attempted different times, but it seems almost an impossibility of getting them right around. There are so many different classes, and they seem to be antagonistic to organization unless you can form an organization that will give them instant action. They want something to strike right away, and seem to think strikes is the only thing to benefit them.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is there an organization among them now of the Industrial Workers of the World?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; I think so.

Mr. THOMPSON. You probably don't know this, but if you do know I will ask you to state whether it is a strong organization or not.

Mr. MORGAN. I don't know that; I couldn't say.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is all I care to ask, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner LENNON. I would like to ask a question.

Mr. Morgan, were many of the members of the fixers and twisters' union arrested during those troublous transactions of which you have spoken?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not many of your members?

Mr. MORGAN. None.

Commissioner LENNON. None of your members?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. Now, a little about the organization. I don't know whether it is clear to the minds of all the commissioners, but your organization is a national organization, but a part of the United Textile Workers?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. That is, you have locals in Paterson and you also have locals where there are silk mills in other parts of the country?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. Did the United Textile Workers have any considerable number of local unions in this city besides those in your union?

Mr. MORGAN. Do you mean—

Commissioner LENNON. Weavers?

Mr. MORGAN. No weavers at all. They have locals in the city, but not in the weaving trade. They have knitters.

Commissioner LENNON. Tell what those were.

Mr. MORGAN. Card cutters, harness builders, warpers, knitters, and these here—there are two locals in the hosiery and glove trade.

Commissioner LENNON. Will these local unions of the textile workers, inclusive of yours, take in the membership of all who are employed in these mills and have a desire to come in?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir. Practically those locals that are organized here have got their respective branch.

Commissioner LENNON. What about these local unions?

Mr. MORGAN. Practically they are locals organized here in their respective branches.

Commissioner LENNON. Are the other people working in the mills eligible to membership in the organization?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; by forming another local.

Commissioner LENNON. Of the same trade?

Mr. MORGAN. Broad silk weavers, or ribbon weavers, or dyers, or anything; they could form a local at any time.

Commissioner LENNON. All eligible to membership in this United Textile Workers?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. And had been for some time prior to this trouble breaking out?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. What about the papers showing up the conditions here during the strike as being much worse than they really were? Do you mean the Paterson papers or the papers in the United States outside of Paterson?

Mr. MORGAN. Outside of Paterson.

Commissioner LENNON. Your local papers, from your viewpoint, dealt very fairly with the contest?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; fairly well.

Commissioner LENNON. What are the principal races represented here—say, the four or five principal races represented in the textile mills?

Mr. MORGAN. Italians and Jews—I guess the Italians and Jews are predominating.

Commissioner LENNON. Are there a large number of English-speaking people?

Mr. MORGAN. No; it is as great as it used to be some years ago. They used to represent practically 80 per cent of the trade; to-day I don't think they represent more than 15 per cent.

Commissioner LENNON. Now, how long has it taken for that change to come about? How long since the 80 per cent were English-speaking people? How many years ago?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, maybe 20 years ago. I might state as the standard of wages went down the class of workers that came in got poorer.

Commissioner LENNON. Now, take these Italians first. Do you know, as a citizen of this city, whether they become citizens of the United States?

Mr. MORGAN. The Italians?

Commissioner LENNON. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; as a general rule.

Commissioner LENNON. As a general rule?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Commissioner LENNON. How about the Hebrews?

Mr. MORGAN. I guess they do, too.

Commissioner LENNON. Then most of these foreigners that come in here do become citizens of the United States in due time?

Mr. MORGAN. That is with reference to the Italians and Jews, they do. I don't know how about these Syrians and Armenians they are coming in now.

Commissioner LENNON. Are they recent employees?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; new ones coming into the industry frequently the last year or two—within the last couple of years, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. What wages would the loom fixer or twister be able to make in the mills in this city?

Mr. MORGAN. Minimum rate of wages \$19 a week.

Commissioner LENNON. How many weeks will they work in the course of a year? Take a normal year—average year?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, I don't suppose that in the normal year they would lose more than six or eight weeks' work on an average.

Commissioner LENNON. Then they work about 40 weeks per year, or more?

Mr. MORGAN. Depends somewhat on how they are divided up. The loom fixer is kept on after the slack period, because it is necessary even though the machine is stopped to keep him there; but that applies to the twister; it throws him out of work because he has got to be just there to put the warps in when they are running; and the fixer has got to be there more of the time.

Commissioner LENNON. Then the loom fixer works a greater number of weeks than the twister does?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. How much more?

Mr. MORGAN. I presume he would maybe get six or eight weeks more out of the year than the twister would.

Commissioner LENNON. What are the number of hours a day established?

Mr. MORGAN. Ten hours a day and five on Saturday.

Commissioner LENNON. That is 55 hours in the week's work?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. Well, does your rule as to wages and hours apply to all the loom fixers and twisters whether they are members of your union or not? Take the nonunion men—

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting). Well, as a general rule the nonunion man don't pay anything, but he gets all the benefits that we fight for.

Commissioner LENNON. What were the wages of the loom fixers and twisters 20 years ago?

Mr. MORGAN. Sixteen dollars and fifty cents a week.

Commissioner LENNON. Then there has been some increase in that 20 years?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. The minimum now is \$19.

Commissioner LENNON. What proportion of the raw silk industry is supposed to be located in Paterson and about Paterson?

Mr. MORGAN. I should judge about 30 per cent of it.

Commissioner LENNON. That is, of the industry in the United States?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. And are New Jersey and Pennsylvania the principal manufacturing districts for that business?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. What about the ribbon mills; are they large mills?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; they are big mills in Paterson.

Commissioner LENNON. Well, is that industry also largely concentrated in Paterson?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. I am not so concerned with the ribbon as the broad silk, as all my experience was with the broad silk. But there is more ribbon in Paterson; that is, in proportion to the men in the trade than broad silk.

Commissioner LENNON. Do the members of your union have to serve any apprenticeship?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. How long?

Mr. MORGAN. Three years.

Commissioner LENNON. Does your union enter into trade agreements with employers?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. Not at all?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir; only to the extent that, as I said before, verbally—that is the understanding that if they want men they have got to send to the organization and have got to pay the minimum rate of wages. Of course, if they have got some in there that won't join the organization, of course, they can keep that kind of men and we will withdraw ours from them.

Commissioner LENNON. Now, just about Paterson, you are speaking in answer to that question; but in other parts of the country do the loom fixers and twisters enter into agreements with their employers?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. The same policy is pursued?

Mr. MORGAN. The same policy is pursued.

Commissioner LENNON. You make out a schedule of what you want, and that is all the agreement you have?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. A verbal agreement?

Mr. MORGAN. That is all.

Commissioner LENNON. How long does it usually run? Would you change that agreement in 30 days if conditions in the trade changed?

Mr. MORGAN. We have changed; the price we have changed four times in 32 years.

Commissioner LENNON. Four times in 22 years?

Mr. MORGAN. Thirty-two years.

Commissioner LENNON. Well, would your organization feel, under the policy it is pursuing, that if you made a verbal agreement, say, of this kind to-day, in two weeks from now you could make another agreement changing those conditions?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. Then you do consider your organization, so far as the agreements are concerned, a stable one for the manufacturer?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. And a policy that can be depended upon for some considerable period of time?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir. I might state that in a great many cases—I would safely say in 35 per cent of the cases—the manufacturers pay more than our verbal agreement calls for; he pays more than that.

Commissioner LENNON. That is a matter that is dealt with by the foreman or manufacturer in that work?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, it is a question of bidding for the better men in the trade.

Commissioner LENNON. How does that come about? What causes that?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, there are what you might call first-class men in the trade, and second-class men and third-class men. If a man is wanting to get hold of a first-class man, he is willing to pay \$4 or \$5 a week more than the rate, and he is naturally bidding for the best men. And the best men naturally work where the best price is paid.

Commissioner LENNON. Now, are any other kind of employees in the silk industry getting the same wages or as high wages as the members of your union?

Mr. MORGAN. The warpers.

Commissioner LENNON. Do they still get higher or about the same?

Mr. MORGAN. About the same.

Commissioner LENNON. And they have also members that get more than their verbal scale calls for?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Commissioner LENNON. Is this true of your members in other parts of the country?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. In fact, the whole trouble is to get men who will leave the center here and go out to those different places, for even when a man gets a higher scale—in fact, I have had jobs I could not supply men for, although they were willing to pay \$5 or \$6 a week above the scale.

Commissioner LENNON. Is there a shortage of loom fixers and twistors in the industry?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir. But the idea is this, you can't get men to go out of town. If you send a man out of the city to work, and he goes to one of these little one-horse towns where there is one mill, if anything happens to that mill or there is any dispute, it means that he may be a long time getting another job and will have to move his family, and if he gets \$5 or \$6 a week more he would have to be there a number of years before he would be compensated for the move; and if he gets out he would have to get a job elsewhere.

Commissioner LENNON. Are there any mills in Paterson which the loom fixers and twistors consider union mills, so far as they are concerned?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, yes; practically all of them.

Commissioner LENNON. Practically all of them?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; of any size. There are some little business places that you can't hardly count.

Commissioner LENNON. That is, they employ members of your union?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. And the agreement is, as you have stated, only a verbal one—as you previously stated?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Do you want to ask any questions?

Commissioner COMMONS. I believe you said that about 15 per cent are now English speaking, did you not?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. That is, of the whole 30,000?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir. That is just an estimate. I have no method of saying positively that is so. That is the only thing I can say, that it is an estimate.

Commissioner COMMONS. By "English speaking" what do you mean? Wouldn't these Italians be English-speaking people?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, yes; some of them.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did you include the Italians speaking English?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; those that are born here and speak English you can hardly detect them any more. They just simply grow up like the rest does.

Commissioner COMMONS. And that would include the other nationalities, in so far as they speak English?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Commissioner COMMONS. Well, you spoke about the decrease in wages. I presume that refers to all other occupations except loom fixers, twisters, and warpers?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Commissioner COMMONS. Have you an idea or could you state anything that would show the decrease in wages in this period that you are familiar with?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, now that needs kind of a technical explanation. You might say, for instance, take the wages to-day and go over it, and you would say the difference ain't so great as what it was 20 years ago; but if you take what each weaver receives per yard for what he produces to-day and what he received 20 years ago you will find that the decrease is over 50 per cent.

Commissioner COMMONS. Well, take the wages which he receives per week and for the year, there would be no decrease there?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; I think there would be some decrease there, too.

Commissioner COMMONS. Have you an idea as to how much the increase would be?

Mr. MORGAN. I should think about 20 years, or maybe 25 years ago, in the broad silk an average weaver's wages ran about \$13 or \$14 a week, and I don't think to-day they will average more than \$9.50 or \$10; that is, take it on an average.

Commissioner COMMONS. That is, we will say, from \$14 down to \$10—

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting). From about \$13 to \$10?

Commissioner COMMONS. About from \$13 down to \$10?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. How long ago was that in comparison with?

Mr. MORGAN. About 25 years ago.

Commissioner COMMONS. What nationalities were working at \$13, at that wage at that time?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, English, French, German, Scotch—was the predominating, and quite a little Italians, but not so much so.

Commissioner COMMONS. And those that now are getting \$10 are mainly Italians and Jews?

Mr. MORGAN. Mostly Italians and Jews. Of course, the Armenians and Syrians are coming in quite fast now; at the present time there is quite a crowd of them.

Commissioner COMMONS. Of these weavers what proportion of the 30,000—and does that include all the employees?

Mr. MORGAN. That includes everything, dyers, weavers—

Commissioner COMMONS. And broad silk?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; I should judge there would be maybe 7,000 broad-silk weavers.

Commissioner COMMONS. And how many, altogether, in the broad-silk industry, or do you distinguish?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, that is pretty hard—to divide them up.

Commissioner COMMONS. How many of the weavers out of the 30,000 employees in all branches—

Mr. MORGAN. I said about 7,000 broad silk.

Commissioner COMMONS. And how about the ribbon?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, as I told you before, I was not so much concerned with the ribbon, as I did not follow that branch. In fact, I think myself, in noticing the line of witnesses here, while the ribbon industry is a big industry, you have not got a man from the ribbon weavers from the labor side; and yet it is bigger than the broad silk.

Commissioner COMMONS. What is the next occupation, with reference to number, to the weavers?

Mr. MORGAN. Dyers.

Commissioner COMMONS. How about their wages—have they changed in the last few years?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, the dyers and helpers, I guess, have increased a little, because they were so remarkably low.

Commissioner COMMONS. The dyers?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; well, the dyers, I couldn't say; but there aren't many dyers in a dyehouse, although there may be a big mass of people working there, but they are mostly helpers than anything else.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you know what the helpers get?

Mr. MORGAN. I guess they get about \$11 a week or \$12 a week now.

Commissioner COMMONS. They get more than the weavers?

Mr. MORGAN. No. You asked me before what was the average wages per week. Now you ask me what the dyer gets. Now, that is not his average. Maybe he gets \$11 a week, and won't work but half the year. That brings his wages down to about \$5.50.

Commissioner COMMONS. The weavers' pay is all by piecework?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, practically all piecework; that is, in broad silk. In ribbons I believe it is mostly daywork.

Commissioner COMMONS. And the dyers are paid by the week?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Well, what can a weaver make on this four-loom basis in the broad silk?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, that is a big question to ask.

Commissioner COMMONS. If he has steady work through the week?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, that's a big question. A great deal depends on the class of work and what kind of a weaver he is. I might say that some of them may be as low as \$12 and some of them run as high as \$28.

Commissioner COMMONS. I am trying to get the extreme range. What would you say would be the highest a weaver would make—a good weaver—on a good machine and having the maximum pay?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, the best of them will run \$25, \$26, \$27, and maybe \$28. Likely you will be hearing before you get done something about these wages; but at the same time there are others that don't make much more than \$12.

Commissioner COMMONS. But the average through the year, counting unemployment, would be about \$10?

Mr. MORGAN. I was not talking about a four-loom weaver. I was talking about the one, two, and three. You asked me the average wage. That would be a big thing to answer.

Commissioner COMMONS. Yes; it is; and I don't want that, but I want the range; but now the issue, as I understand, is between the one, two, three, and four looms?

Mr. MORGAN. That was the issue; yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. The men do now work mostly on three and four looms?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir; mostly on two looms. A great deal depends on the class of work. Some men on some work can't hardly run one, and some will run two, and on the cheaper varieties they may run three and four. On some kinds of work it is a hard job for the weaver to run one loom.

Commissioner COMMONS. Has there been any official report made of wages by the State bureau of labor statistics or any other commission or body that you know of?

Mr. MORGAN. There has been one issued by the United States and sent out here a couple of days ago. I got a copy of it.

Commissioner COMMONS. Does it give these figures?

Mr. MORGAN. Gives the average wages.

Commissioner COMMONS. Does it give the class of wages or different wages?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir; it classifies the weavers, the loom fixers, the twistors and warpers, and all that, and also the difference between the wages here

and in Pennsylvania. The great evil that we have had to fight against has been child labor in Pennsylvania. The wages on an average are 20 per cent lower in Pennsylvania than in New Jersey.

Commissioner COMMONS. When the four-loom proposition came in, did it mean that one man should attend four looms when formerly he had been attending to two?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Had there been improvements made in the loom?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Made a little more automatic?

Mr. MORGAN. A little bit. The new ones have got the warp stock motion on. Formerly they did not use those, but with those, in case a thread breaks out, the loom stops automatically.

Commissioner COMMONS. You are a loom fixer?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. And in your judgment, how many looms can a fixer take care of?

Mr. MORGAN. Just depends on the class of looms they are. Different classes vary—box looms, swivels, and plain looms—and all depends on the class of looms.

Commissioner COMMONS. The loom fixer is responsible for keeping those looms in running condition?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Now, with these improvements that have come in in the last few years, does the weaver have to work harder on running four looms than on running two in these cases where you claim his wages have been cut down?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, that is another hard proposition to handle, because weavers practically answer that there is. Some says it is hard work and killing work, and some that are doing it say that they would rather do that than run two. Which is correct I don't know. I have not worked in the mill for 17 years, though I have watched them; though I know from practical experience that men can run four looms; and I know men that have been doing it for five years in the State of Pennsylvania. I think that as much as anything has caused the competition on cheap grades of goods and has forced the four-loom issue here. That is what I believe has forced it.

Commissioner COMMONS. Well, if the efficiency of the machinery has so greatly increased, it might very well be that the wages would be very much smaller in proportion to the amount of work they did and still the weavers get much more pay? Has that been—

Mr. MORGAN. They get much more pay, but they produce much more cloth and do not get as much more pay.

Commissioner COMMONS. Well, you said on an average they had been reduced?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, there has been a big reduction if you take the amount of yardage they turn out.

Commissioner COMMONS. But not comparing with the yardage?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, that is the only way to compare it. If a man produces something he ought to be paid something for that production. He ought not to get less for producing more.

Commissioner COMMONS. Would these looms be more expensive than the old ones?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, a little difference; not much.

Commissioner COMMONS. Is there more wear and tear on them?

Mr. MORGAN. No, I don't know that there is.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do the companies have to arrange, then, for more efficiency to operate?

Mr. MORGAN. If you operate four looms on a proper basis, yes; the plant has got to be changed entirely. It has got to be changed entirely and equipped for that kind of work; otherwise you couldn't run it successfully. You take our old-line mills, and they started in to run three and four looms on that work that was being done successfully in other mills, and they couldn't do it. It would be impossible for the workers to run them.

Commissioner COMMONS. Then you have got to install that four-loom system, which means a practical rearrangement?

Mr. MORGAN. He has got to equip his plant in its entirety for that kind of work. And I may state that when they started here first off they made a

great big failure. They didn't know really what they had to do, and they had to dig around, and it cost a good many thousands of dollars before they equipped it and got it in shape to run it.

Commissioner COMMONS. Does it take a larger force of loom fixers to take care of those machines?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir; just about the same.

Commissioner COMMONS. But it does take considerable more expense and overhead expense to keep them in operation?

Mr. MORGAN. To equip it; yes—in the first equipment; yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. But afterwards in operating it does not take anything more?

Mr. MORGAN. No; I should not think so.

Commissioner COMMONS. So that the companies did put in some more investment in order to get this increased output for each employee?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. And from that it might follow that the employee would hardly be entitled to all the increased output?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, no; he is not entitled to all of it, I don't suppose.

Commissioner COMMONS. There is a question there of how to divide it?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Would you say that the speed and the strain upon the workers has been increased by these improvements?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; I think it has. And I also think that the strain of a silk worker, upon his eyes especially—that 10 hours a day is too long. It is not heavy work, but it is tedious work, and he has got to be testing his eyes, and by 28 or 30 everyone has got to be wearing glasses, and you come and apply for work with your glasses on and they don't want you, and you take some of these looms with 89, 90, and 100 dent reels and 90 splits of steel to the inch, and you have got to feed these divisions; and it is very hard on the eye; and when it comes to working in there by electric light or gaslight that strain on the eyes is too much, and they should not be compelled to work in artificial light.

Commissioner COMMONS. And you think that strain is increased in running a larger number of looms, and that there is an increased strain?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, if you have got four to watch, you have got more than when you have one or two or three.

Commissioner COMMONS. Are women employed as weavers?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. What would be the proportion between men and women?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, I guess about evenly split up—about 50 and 50 each.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do they earn as much wages as the men?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; as a general rule. They get paid the same rate.

Commissioner COMMONS. There is no physical exertion connected with the work?

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir—well, there is a certain amount of physical exertion.

Commissioner COMMONS. Women can turn out as much as men?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, that is according to the class of work. A man would have the advantage for heavy work in figured and Jacquard work it takes a strong man to run, and the others that are light and easy running any girl of 16 or 18 years of age can run after they learn the business.

Commissioner COMMONS. Has the proportion of women increased or decreased in this 20 years?

Mr. MORGAN. I think the proportion of women has increased.

Commissioner COMMONS. More women now.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. You understand 25 years ago the general class of work that did Jacquard and figured work required, of course, considerable climbing. The Jacquard machines are elevated about 7 feet above the looms, and necessarily the weavers have got to go aloft once in awhile, and a woman necessarily couldn't do that unless she wore bloomers.

Commissioner COMMONS. Why is it the organizers of the American Federation of Labor can not reach these different nationalities? Is it mainly the question of language difficulty?

Mr. MORGAN. I don't know. I will tell you, however, in my opinion it seemed to be that the influx of immigration around in and about New York is so great that by the time you get a few of them together and get them educated along the lines of benefits of trade associations there is another big bunch

in and you have got to educate them, and those you have educated drift off somewhere else.

Commissioner COMMONS. Well, take the Italians. They started in evidently, from what you say, about 20 years ago?

Mr. MORGAN. About 25 years ago.

Commissioner COMMONS. There must be a number of Italians that speak English and are pretty well familiarized with the principles of federated labor?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, yes.

Commissioner COMMONS. Now, don't they serve as leaders and organizers amongst the newer Italians that come in?

Mr. MORGAN. It is a peculiar thing, as I told you before, that I can't understand, but amongst those men when you form an organization they want instant action. Now, you know, as well as any man does if he knows anything about organization, you have got to protect your organization and you have got to educate your people and you have got to build up your fund and you have got to lay your plan how you are going to succeed. But these people seem to want instant action. If an organization is formed to-day, they want a strike to-morrow. That is a proposition.

Commissioner COMMONS. Is this true of the English-speaking Italians?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, there are very few English-speaking Italians—they do not predominate amongst them.

Commissioner COMMONS. I know; but how do they look upon it; are they as hasty as these others?

Mr. MORGAN. They don't seem to be willing to stick to any organization any length of time unless they have a strike. I have seen 50 organizations in my time in this city of all kinds and descriptions.

Commissioner COMMONS. When did the Jews begin to come in in number?

Mr. MORGAN. About 10 or 11 years ago.

Commissioner COMMONS. Are there many of them that speak English?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, yes; quite a lot speak English.

Commissioner COMMONS. How are they on this proposition?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, if they call a meeting of the Jews you don't know whether you come to any settlement if you did, and they would all talk at once. I don't know what it would come to after you got them together.

Commissioner COMMONS. Is that true of the English-speaking Jews?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, I don't know. They all talk in their own language when they talk together and they seem to want to have an organization of their own.

Commissioner COMMONS. Have you any idea that the employers could arrange any system of taking care of these grievances of these non-English-speaking people, these unorganized people, distinct from the recognition of a union?

Mr. MORGAN. That is a hard proposition. You see, for instance, the manufacturers of this city tell us that if it was not for a question of Pennsylvania—if Pennsylvania would come to the nine-hour day, they would gladly do so, but it is a very peculiar feature of the thing that many manufacturers in Paterson have their annexes in Pennsylvania. You can see the point.

Commissioner COMMONS. Is there a tendency to move to Pennsylvania?

Mr. MORGAN. You mean a tendency now to move to Pennsylvania?

Commissioner COMMONS. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. No, sir. We headed that work off a number of years ago, and have done lots of organizing work and got considerable increases in Pennsylvania, and the inducements are not as great in Pennsylvania as they used to be.

Commissioner COMMONS. More nearly equalized?

Mr. MORGAN. It is coming up.

Commissioner COMMONS. Are the warpers organized?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do they have a local of warpers?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. And conducted like the loom fixers?

Mr. MORGAN. Much on the same plan.

Commissioner COMMONS. As to minimum and no agreement?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Why do you not have written agreements?

Mr. MORGAN. What is the use of having them if you get it without them? It always leaves you at liberty. What's the use of going to a firm and asking them to sign an agreement for something you have already got and always have been conceded?

Commissioner COMMONS. Does the firm ever ask you——

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting). To enter into agreements?

Commissioner COMMONS. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. No; it seems to be so long established they take it as a fixture.

Commissioner COMMONS. I have figured that there are on an average eight loom fixers and twisters to an establishment of a hundred—take a factory that has a hundred employees, it will have about eight loom fixers.

Mr. MORGAN. Not that many if it is plain work. The loom fixer will run 50 looms, and that represents 25 weavers.

Commissioner COMMONS. But taking all the force of the establishment.

Mr. MORGAN. Would not be that many. You see, four loom fixers then would employ a hundred and if you add the others there would be about 200, including warpers and twisters and all.

Commissioner COMMONS. Including the weavers and all there is?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. And how many warpers?

Mr. MORGAN. About six warpers, six or eight. A great deal depends on the class of work. Now, on some classes of work you will need three times as many warpers as on a different class of work.

Commissioner COMMONS. Then, from what you say, about 10 people out of 130 that are now organized or capable of being organized in the industry would be about the extent of it?

Mr. MORGAN. About eight.

Commissioner COMMONS. About eight?

Mr. MORGAN. About 8 out of every 100.

Commissioner COMMONS. That you consider are capable——

Mr. MORGAN (interrupting). That is, that we have been successful in organizing. I don't say "capable." We have tried time and time again to form locals for the American Federation of Labor and independent organizations of all kinds and every one of them has seemed to fail, and they all seemed, as soon as organized, to want an instant strike.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you know whether or not these meetings of the federation have been broken up because the organizers are charged with being fakers—I think you made that statement?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, they charge them with everything.

Commissioner COMMONS. Have there in times past been organizers of the Federation of Labor who have proven faithless to these people?

Mr. MORGAN. None; as I know of in this city.

Commissioner COMMONS. No one has ever run away with the funds?

Mr. MORGAN. Well, I might state that there have been little local organizations where I believe the treasurer has been unfaithful once or twice.

Commissioner COMMONS. But you don't know of any case where they have been sold out by their organizer?

Mr. MORGAN. Not that I know of.

Commissioner COMMONS. So you feel that there is no real justification on the part of these people in calling the federation of labor fakers?

Mr. MORGAN. None whatever. They have always tried and have always done their best every time a call has been sent to come here and organize; and if there is any fault it is with the workers themselves. Of course, you go about the streets and you can hear different people talk and say this is so or that is so, and they will maybe make an accusation against representatives of the federation of labor; but you ask them if they will come up to that labor man and tell him that he is a faker and you will find out he will back out and he is not willing to come to the front and tell his story. And any man that tells a story and isn't willing to come to the front and tell it is not worth listening to.

Commissioner COMMONS. Then, respecting all this great proportion—probably 90 or 95 per cent of the workers in the industry—who have not been able to organize, the main difficulty is this excitable nationality?

Mr. MORGAN. It appears to be that; although I still believe in persisting and in trying to get them in line. We might find some way if we keep on trying. Every once in a while you will gather a few more to it anyhow.

Commissioner COMMONS. Have you any information as to the work the employers have done in the matter of what is called welfare work?

Mr. MORGAN. No.

Commissioner COMMONS. Or scientific management or anything of that kind?
 Mr. MORGAN. No, sir.
 Commissioner COMMONS. I think that is all.
 Chairman WALSH. That is all, thank you, Mr. Morgan.

TESTIMONY OF MR. HENRY DOHERTY, JR.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will you give us your name and address?
 Mr. DOHERTY. Henry Doherty, jr., Clifton, N. J.
 Mr. THOMPSON. And your business, please.
 Mr. DOHERTY. Silk manufacturer.
 Mr. THOMPSON. In New Jersey here?
 Mr. DOHERTY. Yes.
 Mr. THOMPSON. What kind of silk do you manufacture, Mr. Doherty?
 Mr. DOHERTY. Broad silks.
 Mr. THOMPSON. How many people do you employ in your mill, or do you have any more than one mill?
 Mr. DOHERTY. Two; one in Paterson and one in Clifton. In the Paterson mill we employ between 600 and 700, and in the Lake View mill we employ about 700.
 Mr. THOMPSON. What is the extent of the silk industry of this city as compared with the industry there, is it larger in Paterson?
 Mr. DOHERTY. Yes; by far.
 Mr. THOMPSON. How many employees are employed in that industry here, if you know.
 Mr. DOHERTY. I don't know. I should judge about 50,000; between 30,000 and 50,000.
 Mr. THOMPSON. If this is a fair question, how does your mill compare in size with the mills around the city?
 Mr. DOHERTY. I think it is about the largest.
 Mr. THOMPSON. What would be the size of the average mill?
 Mr. DOHERTY. The average mill I should judge would be about 50 looms.
 Mr. THOMPSON. How many looms are you operating?
 Mr. DOHERTY. A little over a thousand—about 1,002.
 Mr. THOMPSON. About 1,000 looms?
 Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Take the mill at Clifton; I think you said you had 700 people there?
 Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; about.
 Mr. THOMPSON. About how would that be divided as to classes of employees?
 Mr. DOHERTY. What do you mean, male and female?
 Mr. THOMPSON. Well, how many weavers and how many warpers and how many twistors and how many loom fixers and how many dyers?
 Mr. DOHERTY. Well, the warpers I think we have about 52; and weavers we have about 350 or 400; and the rest are winders, quill winders, and general helpers in and about.
 Mr. THOMPSON. What is the proportion of loom fixers?
 Mr. DOHERTY. One to every 50 looms.
 Mr. THOMPSON. And twistors?
 Mr. DOHERTY. Of twistors we have 31.
 Mr. THOMPSON. And warpers I think you said you had 52?
 Mr. DOHERTY. About 52.
 Mr. THOMPSON. How long has your firm been in existence and doing business here in Paterson?
 Mr. DOHERTY. The Henry Doherty Silk Co. has been doing business here about 14 years. My father has been in Paterson ever since there have been six-hand looms in Paterson, and he used to weave with one of them.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Did you say that 14 years you have been connected with the business?
 Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Doherty, it has been stated here that the weavers of your company made a demand on you in regard to this installation of the four-loom system—three and four loom system. Now, tell us what the condition was before you put that system in; what change was made at the time.
 Mr. DOHERTY. When we built the new mill we adopted the four-loom system, and we built the mill to meet those conditions and we put all the improvements on; and at that time it was a union shop all the way through as to loom

fixers, warpers, and they belonged to the federation of labor; and business got very bad and we laid off—I believe we had only about 150 working for us, and of course, then they got disorganized and went to different places, and some went out on the trolley cars, and some left altogether; and then there came a little spurt; and before that our main thing was hard silk and taffetas; and then we began to make messalines and there was a big demand for those and they were usually made in Pennsylvania and we had uniform prices; that is, the shop price list was 8½ cents for two looms, and then we had a three-loom price and a four-loom price, but for messalines our price called for 8½ cents, whereas in the city of Paterson and other mills were paying 7½. And so we couldn't afford to compete on the two looms, so we put it all on the four looms; so with the two-loom weavers there was a little dissatisfaction and they claimed that they were thrown out of work.

MR. THOMPSON. Now, just a moment before we complete this mill equipment—this mill was equipped with modern machinery so as to work three and four looms?

MR. DOHERTY. All new machinery. We had four mills before that, but we built this new one.

MR. THOMPSON. And you used the same employees in this new mill that you had in the others?

MR. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

MR. THOMPSON. Then these employees that you had put in the new mill had been used to one and two looms?

MR. DOHERTY. No, sir; they were used to two and three looms, and we had adopted this four-loom system when we built the mill.

MR. THOMPSON. How long ago did you build the mill?

MR. DOHERTY. About four years ago.

MR. THOMPSON. Mr. Morgan stated on the stand this morning that there had been a change by which you changed from the one and two loom system to the three and four loom system, and that he, representing or appearing for the weavers, had several conferences with the representatives of your firm in regard to this change of system.

MR. DOHERTY. That was before we ever built the new mill, and they agreed to it and signed an agreement that they would adopt the four-loom system if we started up in Paterson under modern conditions. At that time it existed down East and we went all through their mills down there where they were doing it.

MR. THOMPSON. Mr. Morgan stated this morning that he saw you several times about it last year, about three or four weeks before the strike broke out, which was a little over a year ago. Do you remember those conferences?

MR. DOHERTY. Yes; I remember Mr. Morgan and meeting him several times.

MR. THOMPSON. And he said that he was not able to bring about any result to the negotiation between yourself and the weavers?

MR. DOHERTY. That is right.

MR. THOMPSON. That you said that in Pennsylvania they were using this three and four loom system on this same kind of cheap silk and you couldn't see why you couldn't use it?

MR. DOHERTY. They used it here in Paterson four years before that in the Brilliant Silk Co.

MR. THOMPSON. But I say, was the conversation as he stated it about right?

MR. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

MR. THOMPSON. Then there was an objection on the part of the weavers to an alleged change which they said had taken place, and which he says took place some time before this controversy?

MR. DOHERTY. Now, we always ran four looms in the new mill ever since it was built, and the strike happened a year after—two years after the mill was built.

MR. THOMPSON. Then, at the time Mr. Morgan had these conferences with you, I mean these where the four-loom proposition was discussed, they had already been in use in this very mill for two years?

MR. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

MR. THOMPSON. And you state that part of the institution of this three and four loom system, you had an arrangement or agreement with the union permitting you to do that?

MR. DOHERTY. Permitting us to do that.

MR. THOMPSON. Was that agreement in writing?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; I believe so.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you got a copy of it?

Mr. DOHERTY. I haven't it here; but I can get it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will you furnish it to the commission?

Mr. DOHERTY. I think so; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What other conferences or meetings with your employees did you have after this, to which Mr. Morgan has testified, as taking place between yourself and your firm before the strike began?

Mr. DOHERTY. Of course, as I said, there was one big demand for messalines at the time, so we put them all into four looms and the weavers that were weaving two-loom taffetas, we had the work for them, so we adopted the four-loom system throughout the shop, and that caused some dissatisfaction.

Mr. THOMPSON. You adopted the four looms throughout the shop for taffetas?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; for messalines.

Mr. THOMPSON. You run your whole shop on that kind?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And dropped the taffetas, the two-loom silks, at that time?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What kind of silk were you running at the time of the strike?

Mr. DOHERTY. At the time of the strike we were running principally the messalines.

Mr. THOMPSON. How does that differ from the other silks?

Mr. DOHERTY. A very easy weave. It is a satin weave. It is much easier. It is not a hard work.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is that easier weaving to watch on the part of the weavers?

Mr. DOHERTY. To watch?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. DOHERTY. No; it is no easier to watch, but it does not need as much watching; the ends do not break as easily.

Mr. THOMPSON. Something has been said here with reference to the number of strands to the inch. Will you tell us briefly how one of those new looms are built. How many strands they have across the loom, if you know?

Mr. DOHERTY. How many what is that?

Mr. THOMPSON. They said a great many—70 or 80 strands to the inch.

Mr. DOHERTY. Seventy or eighty?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DOHERTY. No; we never went on the four looms higher than 57-dent, 3-thread.

Mr. THOMPSON. Across the whole loom, how many threads?

Mr. DOHERTY. About 6,100.

Mr. THOMPSON. About 6,100?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would the same number of threads be woven on the two silks?

Mr. DOHERTY. On the what?

Mr. THOMPSON. Two kinds of silks?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes. What do you mean by the—two loom or four loom?

Mr. THOMPSON. No; I don't mean two looms, I mean two kinds of silk.

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is required of a weaver when he performs his work in watching a loom?

Mr. DOHERTY. In watching a loom?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; in taking care of his duties as a weaver?

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, if he was running one loom, I would consider it very hard work, for the simple reason that if you run one loom you have to watch it all the time, where, if you get a loom where you get 80 per cent production out of it, that loom only requires watching twice a day. The weaver only works when the loom is stopped. If the loom is working, the weaver has no work, and as soon as you can get a loom to perfection, as they have in the cotton mills, where they go home and leave the looms running, as soon as they have that done, we won't need weavers.

Mr. THOMPSON. What does he do? He comes there in the morning and takes care of his four looms. What does he do? Does he wait until the looms stop, or does he watch the threads? Who stops the machine, or do they stop automatically?

Mr. DOHERTY. Most of them do on the four looms.

Mr. THOMPSON. They stop automatically?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. How about four looms?

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, 60 per cent of them do on the four looms now.

Mr. THOMPSON. It causes—tell what causes the loom to stop automatically, and what the operator does?

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, this is an improvement on the loom that costs us about \$50 apiece.

Mr. THOMPSON. What stops it?

Mr. DOHERTY. The ends breaking, and that stops it.

Mr. THOMPSON. One thread breaking stops the loom.

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. As I understand you, when the weaver is there he don't have to look at the machines at all while they are running?

Mr. DOHERTY. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Only when they are not running?

Mr. DOHERTY. No. But the principal thing in running four looms is to get good silk. There are three gradings of silk. You can buy Best No. 1, which means—most men do that, and they could not run two looms nor one, and you can buy extra and double extra, and that is the kind we have, and weavers can run more looms.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is up to the manufacturer?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. How often do these looms stop, these automatic looms, with a brake on them?

Mr. DOHERTY. How often?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; how often? Very often?

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, I could tell better by telling the yardage we get off the looms. We get 90 per cent production in some looms; that is only one hour a day that a loom is stopped, during the whole day; that is for changing quills and filler, and everything.

Mr. THOMPSON. If all the weaver has to do is to attend the loom when stopped automatically and fix up his threading, it would seem from your statement that he could tend to more than four, perhaps?

Mr. DOHERTY. What is that?

Mr. THOMPSON. He might easily attend to more than four?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. It doesn't take long only to thread the breaks, does it?

Mr. DOHERTY. No; it just depends on how good the weaver is.

Mr. THOMPSON. And from your statement, apparently, a man could attend probably six or eight looms instead of four?

Mr. DOHERTY. No; I would not say that, because if you had—say you have got 90 per cent production out of a loom; that is one hour per day for one loom; for four looms that would be four hours, and eight looms it would be eight hours, and someone would be standing all the time. If a manufacturer does not get in Paterson 75 per cent production out of a loom he will have to stop; you can go back to two looms.

Mr. THOMPSON. Going back to these conferences with your employees, was there any further conference or notice, either with you—or notice given to you before the men stopped work at your mills, other than this conference you had with Mr. Morgan?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes; I did not finish that other, what I was going to say. In this conference, when we adopted the four looms, it was a strike between the four-loom weavers and the two-loom weavers, because the four-loom weavers were satisfied. They were making big money. So, then, the two-loom weavers, they had a meeting and they came down to the office and met my father, and they said, "We represent the whole mill, this committee." So he said, "If you represent the whole mill, there is nothing else for us to do; you will have to strike. We are going to adopt the four-loom system." So they stopped and got the whole mill out at that time, and I went to the hall myself and met them, and there was only the two-loom weavers there, not any of the four-loom weavers, and the next day, why, they met, and I met them, and I said, "We will promise to do away with the four looms. We don't want to run the four looms, because," I said, "if we can run the two looms as cheap as anybody else, that is all we want, because a man can watch two looms better than four, and we would rather have a man running one

loom, because we might get better work out of it." They said, "If you will try it for 30 days, running two looms, we will accept a price of 7½ cents," which they are paying around Paterson, which was less by a cent than we are paying for two looms, and they all came back and started work again, and they were only working three hours and the four-loom weavers came downstairs and said, "No."

They had a committee, and they said, "Why should we work for \$14 a week when we are making \$21 for the sake of a lot of poor weavers?" And my father said, "The other committee said they represented the whole mill." Then the other committee shut off and they said, "We won't work." And they decided that they would have a strike, so we said, the only thing we will do, we will keep the price list, and they went out on strike, and they were about 60—and the four-loom weavers came out, and they were about 60 workers, and they were not on strike on the four looms, there was no strike at all, but they had a demonstration in front of the mill and brought them out. We turned them out ourselves, in fact, the four-loom weavers, so that there was not any strike on four looms in Paterson. It was the two-loom weavers, generally, all through Paterson, causing the trouble, being they were on four looms. That was the biggest—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). The two-loom weavers went out on strike?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And the four-loom weavers stayed in your place?

Mr. DOHERTY. No; they followed them out. They attended the meeting in the hall; we had to put them out, in fact. They were arguing all the time in the mill.

Mr. THOMPSON. I understood from you that the two-loom weavers were willing to accept the 7½-cent price?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. That the four-loom weavers said, "We won't do that; we are making \$21 a week, why should we accept \$14 for the poor workers?"

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And when the strike was called, however, they all went out on strike?

Mr. DOHERTY. No. When we attended the meeting the committee was made up of two-loom weavers, and we asked them, "Do you represent the whole mill," and they said, "Yes," but there was not a four-loom weaver on the committee. So they did not represent the whole mill; they only represented the two-loom weavers. Then we agreed to try it for 30 days if they would accept and go on the two looms and would do away with the four looms. And they came back, and the four-loom weavers came back, and said no; we are accepting and giving up \$7 a week."

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand that, but I want to get at as to whether, when they came to strike, did they strike together, unitedly?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes. They held meetings in the hall, different meetings, trying to fix it up among themselves, and then the strike took place, and lasted two days, and the four-loom workers came back at the end of two days, and I believe a good many warpers and fixers were working at the same time, and there was no strike on the four looms.

Mr. THOMPSON. You said you have 350 weavers?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many of those two-loom weavers and how many four-loom weavers?

Mr. DOHERTY. There were more two-loom weavers than four-loom weavers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, about what proportion? One hundred and fifty four-loom weavers and 200 two-loom weavers?

Mr. DOHERTY. That would be a pretty hard question, because that is the time we were adopting and putting the weavers on four messalines. I believe 60 per cent of the four-loom weavers came back.

Mr. THOMPSON. Sixty per cent?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes; 60 per cent of them.

Mr. THOMPSON. I thought just 60 of them?

Mr. DOHERTY. No; 60 per cent of the total number.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then 40 per cent stayed out on strike?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes; not that they did not want to come back, but I would not work myself during the strike, to tell the truth.

Mr. THOMPSON. From what you have stated, your wages that you have been paying are above the average in the city here?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes; we have a pay-roll book that if anybody wants to go over it we will produce it and show it to them. Every one in the mill, take hangers and quillers and winders, and little boys, everything, the average is \$16.40 a week. We were in business 14 years before that, and our average used to run about, when we first started in business, about \$11.

Mr. THOMPSON. After these two days, when part came back—60 per cent of the four-loom weavers—how soon did the rest come back?

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, they—one or two, I think, they came, but after, I should judge, about 100 weavers; that is all four-loom weavers. They were all four-loom weavers that came back.

Mr. THOMPSON. All of them came back?

Mr. DOHERTY. Not all, because there were——

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Well, about how long—two or three weeks altogether?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes; they kept coming back right along. Out-of-town weavers kept drifting in, and taking their jobs.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many weavers have you got altogether at the present time? Did you say 350?

Mr. DOHERTY. About that, I should judge.

Mr. THOMPSON. When did these extra men start to come back? Were they your old two-loom weavers?

Mr. DOHERTY. When the strike was declared off; that was, I think, July 27 or 29.

Mr. THOMPSON. And the strike occurred in February?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes; in our place they started the strike in January.

Mr. THOMPSON. In January?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then you say these two-loom weavers stayed out until the strike was terminated?

Mr. DOHERTY. No; not—you mean the two-loom weavers?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. This difference, you stated, between the two bodies sort of kept up throughout the strike?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes. The reason why the two-loom weavers kept away was because we had no use for them on that class of work, which we haven't to-day. We won't make it on two looms. That was our equipment. We can't afford to do it.

Mr. THOMPSON. When they came back, who came first, the four-loom weavers?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes; that is what we are running there now.

Mr. THOMPSON. And paying your rate of 8½ cents now?

Mr. DOHERTY. No; that was the two-loom price, and we paid on four looms 6½ cents, and pay for it at the same price to-day.

Mr. THOMPSON. During the time the strike was on, did you have an association of master weavers in this town, manufacturers?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir. Several meetings; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you got an association of silk manufacturers?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. About how many members have you?

Mr. DOHERTY. I don't know; I couldn't tell you. Some of the other members could.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did it pretty generally consist of the membership of the manufacturers here?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; only a good many of them have annexes in Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am trying to get at your organization. You had an organization of silk manufacturers here?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And generally it embraces the silk manufacturers of this city?

Mr. DOHERTY. Oh, no; there is only a small majority represented on the silk manufacturers here in Paterson; the biggest majority are not in the association at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is there an association composed of the larger or smaller manufacturers?

Mr. DOHERTY. Larger.

Mr. THOMPSON. What percentage of the production of silk do they represent?

Mr. DOHERTY. I would not want to say, because I don't know.

Mr. THOMPSON. Half?

Mr. DOHERTY. Oh, I should think——

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). I am not asking you for accurate figures.

Mr. DOHERTY. About half, I should say; oh, over half.

Mr. THOMPSON. Has the organization a printed constitution and by-laws?

Mr. DOHERTY. That I don't know; I am not a member myself; my father is a member.

Mr. THOMPSON. Your firm is a member?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Who is the secretary of the organization, do you know?

Mr. DOHERTY. Why, McCollin.

Commissioner COMMONS. Rosenheim is down here.

Mr. DOHERTY. Rosenheim is down here?

Commissioner COMMONS. Yes.

Mr. DOHERTY. No; I don't know who is secretary. I never attended a meeting myself of the manufacturers.

Mr. THOMPSON. You do not?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. About how many weavers, or other people, were out on a strike; Mr. Morgan stated about 25,000. Is that about right?

Mr. DOHERTY. That is what the papers estimated; about 25,000.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you think that is probably correct?

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, I thought there would be—take the silk business all over the city; I think there would be more than that.

Mr. THOMPSON. More than that?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you out and around in the city during the strike?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; I kept pretty well to myself in my own place.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you ever threatened with any violence?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; not to amount to anything.

Mr. THOMPSON. Of your own knowledge, do you know much about the state of the community at that time, as to whether or not there was a great deal of disorder?

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, for that amount of people being out on strike, when you get such a large number as that, I would say no.

Mr. THOMPSON. You would say no?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; not from what I saw.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you know, or do you know——

Mr. DOHERTY (interrupting). I should say the police handled them very nicely. I think they kept them in shape.

Mr. THOMPSON. In your opinion, the police ran the strike very successfully?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; I think they did.

Mr. THOMPSON. What do you mean by handled it nicely?

Mr. DOHERTY. I mean to say, kept them in check. I don't think they stirred them up in any way. In a great many cities they would drive them out of the city, arrest them and try to lock them up; but they kept them away from the mills, kept them scattered, and had all the firemen doing patrol duty, and kept the mills well protected.

Mr. THOMPSON. In other words, they kept the strikers away from the mills?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was there or was there not much slugging of the people working?

Mr. DOHERTY. Of the workers?

Mr. THOMPSON. People working in the mills at the time of the strike?

Chairman WALSH. Were there any cases of violence against the men working in the mills?

Mr. DOHERTY. They were well protected when they went to their homes.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is what you have to say about the nice handling of the police?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. How did the police get along with the strikers, if you know?

Mr. DOHERTY. How did they get along with them?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; was there much friction or not?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; I would not call it much friction for such a large strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were there many arrests?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; not considering the number there was on strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you follow that pretty closely?

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, no. I was at Clifton Township. We had a different police department altogether; a smaller department, but they handled the crowd very nicely.

Mr. THOMPSON. How far is Clifton?

Mr. DOHERTY. About 2½ miles or 3 miles.

Mr. THOMPSON. About two miles and a half?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, so far as you were concerned you did not have much trouble and did not see much trouble, if there was any?

Mr. DOHERTY. No; we didn't have much trouble.

Mr. THOMPSON. And your ideas in reference to the way it was handled by the police and the number of arrests made is formed from what you heard mostly?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were there any of the people working in your mills beaten up and molested?

Mr. DOHERTY. Two. There was one fellow who was put in the hospital; he had his head cut open. Another fellow had his wrist sprained, and myself had a gun drawn on me coming to work; an Italian drew a gun on me, but we chased him and caught him. It didn't amount to anything; he didn't shoot.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALSH. Mr. Doherty, it was stated by some person that your father had carefully thought out a plan, or some machinery by which to minimize, or put a stop to, industrial disputes. Do you know anything about that?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; we tried before they went out on strike; we tried to make cooperation, but they turned down the proposition.

Chairman WALSH. Briefly, to cooperate in what manner?

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, that we would take a certain percentage of the profits, even went as low as 5 per cent.

Chairman WALSH. You offered to give them publicity, to show them what your cost was?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; they could appoint all their own bookkeepers and everything.

Chairman WALSH. To whom did you submit that?

Mr. DOHERTY. We even agreed they could have a form of board and run the place, have their own foreman and everything else.

Chairman WALSH. To whom did you submit that?

Mr. DOHERTY. I think Morgan was one of them; Mr. Star, a warper; the weavers, was none of them represented.

Chairman WALSH. Was there a representation from the various classes of employees on some committee to whom you made the proposition?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; the committee that came down and wanted to go on strike.

Chairman WALSH. Represented all of them?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. That was how long before the main strike took place?

Mr. DOHERTY. Two weeks. My father is in favor of organized labor, my father is, and a strong believer if it is organized right.

Chairman WALSH. Are there any questions?

Commissioner COMMONS. I would like to ask about the effect on wages of introducing this four-loom system instead of the two-loom system; that is, you were paying 8½ cents and now you are paying 6½?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; 6½.

Commissioner COMMONS. Will you explain how that affects the earnings per week of the weaver?

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, I should say a two-loom weaver in our place—of course, it is a different class of work now. A two-loom weaver in our place will average around \$15 a week, and a four-loom weaver will make from \$18 to \$31; \$31 he has made; that is high wage; but the general average—when the commission was accounted for by the Government they went over the pay-roll books—the average for weavers was, on four looms, \$18.90 per week.

Commissioner COMMONS. Now, as to this statement about the change that has gone on—your experience runs over about 10 years or 14 years?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; I was foreman of Doherty & Wadsworth before that time. I used to be a weaver myself.

Commissioner COMMONS. As to the change in nationality that has gone on under your observation, what has been that change?

Mr. DOHERTY. More foreigners than used to be. The English-speaking people now are bosses.

Commissioner COMMONS. And the foreigners are what?

Mr. DOHERTY. Workers.

Commissioner COMMONS. The Italians and Jews?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; we have a good many Italians and a good many Jews working for us. I consider the Italians very good weavers.

Commissioner COMMONS. Has there been any reduction in the earnings in that 14 years of those doing the weaving work?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir. There has been a big increase in weaving, there has been a big increase in loom fixing, and there has been a big increase in working. When I was a weaver I got \$12 a week and the loom fixers were getting \$16.50, and anybody would leave weaving to be loom fixers. Now the loom fixers get \$20.

Commissioner COMMONS. What were the weavers getting then?

Mr. DOHERTY. I don't believe they averaged any more; I should say about \$10 a week. I have made as high as \$15 a week, which was considered a very good wage, and they always said I had the pick of the job, because my father owned the place.

Chairman WALSH. They always said what?

Mr. DOHERTY. They always said I had the pick of the job, because my father owned the place, and I made a pretty good average; but now I don't believe you can hire the weaver—if anybody will furnish me weavers I will guarantee them work all the year around, if they run four looms, at \$15 a week.

Commissioner COMMONS. That would be of the Italians or Jews?

Mr. DOHERTY. Any good weaver; I want a good weaver.

Commissioner COMMONS. You consider there is not much difference between nationalities, then?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; there are good Italian weavers and good Jews and good Americans. I consider the Italians very good weavers.

Commissioner COMMONS. As I understood the statement made by a preceding witness, the average had gone down in 20 years from about \$14 to about \$10, counting the year through, unemployment, and all such things.

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, my father used to work in Paterson, and he kept his average. He was considered a very good weaver when it was considered they made so much money, and the highest average he ever made, when Paterson was at its height, was \$11.90. We can show you that, and he has been in Paterson ever since there were six hand looms in Paterson, and those big wages were all a dream.

Chairman WALSH. The good old days?

Mr. DOHERTY. Good old days.

Commissioner COMMONS. What years were those when he was making \$11?

Mr. DOHERTY. A good many years ago.

Commissioner COMMONS. In the seventies?

Mr. DOHERTY. My father is 65 years old, and he came to Paterson when he was a boy.

Commissioner COMMONS. That was the old hand-loom system?

Mr. DOHERTY. The old hand-loom system.

Commissioner COMMONS. Take the power loom when it started in; they would make a good deal more with the power loom than with the hand loom?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; he was a power-loom weaver, too.

Commissioner COMMONS. According to your idea, then, in the last 14 years the average for weavers would have gone up from about \$10 to \$15?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. That is your statement regarding your own establishment?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Not generally.

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; that is generally all the way through. I think the wages have gone up. The cost of living has gone up. The people used to walk to work and now they ride on the trolley car. Everybody rides that comes to our plant. It costs money to ride.

Commissioner COMMONS. When you speak of 80 to 90 per cent production to a loom, will you explain what you mean?

Mr. DOHERTY. I mean to say, if I could get 20 yards a day off—I might get 18. If you get 20 yards a day off of a loom, never stop, you will get the loom to such perfection that the loom never stops. When you get 20 yards a day, that is the maximum production; if you get the 20 yards a day, you don't need a weaver. You have got—we have got it as high as 18½ yards a day off the same loom. The loom could not be stopped very much and a weaver never works when his loom is going; he only works when his loom is stopped.

Commissioner COMMONS. Have you made observations to see whether there is a greater strain or effort on the part of the weavers with the four looms under this arrangement than there was before?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; when I was weaving I run two Jacquard swivel looms, and that was over 16 years ago, and that was harder than this. Now, if you run four looms, like a good many weavers will give you an argument, if you will run it on plain work, we will say, you do it on fancy work; that is their idea, if it starts on plain work it will end on fancy work, but you can not do that until you get the looms so perfect that you can get the production out. If you took an order out now to deliver in June, and told them they had to run those looms out, how would you get the work out? The manufacturer would be the loser, and not the weaver.

Commissioner COMMONS. How do you figure the rate at which you will add returns to a man's work?

Mr. DOHERTY. If I can get looms up to 90 per cent production, or over 80 per cent, I would give him another loom. If he falls below it, I will take it off.

Commissioner COMMONS. If you get four looms up to 80—

Mr. DOHERTY. That is 80 per cent on double extra silk.

Commissioner COMMONS. And if you had the inferior silk you would have two small—

Mr. DOHERTY. I would be satisfied, maybe, with 60 or 65.

Commissioner COMMONS. If you got it to 80 on the double extra, that would mean one man could take care of four looms?

Mr. DOHERTY. One man could take care of four looms.

Commissioner COMMONS. That means eight hours a day of work for that man?

Mr. DOHERTY. Eight hours a day for that man.

Commissioner COMMONS. Then you allow the other two hours—

Mr. DOHERTY (interrupting). Well, he is working all the time. I would not say eight hours; if the loom stops he will have to start it up again; the loom will stop.

Commissioner COMMONS. You take the chance on two looms being idle at the same time?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; and there is where you are liable to lose running four looms. We have tried four looms at places where we would be losing money. We have places where it only runs one loom.

Commissioner COMMONS. Because it breaks often?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; and there is not any weaver who is running the four-loom job that does not ask for the four looms, and there is not any weaver running four where you can take the four off and give him two.

Commissioner COMMONS. It is figured out very accurately on what you call the loom's production?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; and the quality of work.

Commissioner COMMONS. That is based on the quality of work and your observation?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. You are not able to tell about the association?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; I am not enough familiar with that.

Chairman WALSH. I would like to ask a question or two.

When did you work as a weaver, Mr. Doherty?

Mr. DOHERTY. When did I work as a weaver?

Chairman WALSH. When did you quit working as a weaver?

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, about 15 years ago. I was foreman for a year, that is all.

Chairman WALSH. Mr. Morgan stated that the first foreigners who came in in large numbers were Italians. That is correct, is it not?

Mr. DOHERTY. I think so.

Chairman WALSH. And there has been for a generation or so of those—he says they came in 25 years ago?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Have those men largely assimilated with the population? He said they became citizens generally?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; I think so.

Chairman WALSH. Do their children attend the public schools?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Did you notice a drift of their children into the same industry, or have they scattered out into other branches of industry?

Mr. DOHERTY. Scattered into other branches of industry.

Chairman WALSH. Become Americanized and assimilated with the population?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Have you observed that those people have taken part in public affairs, held public offices, and their children become school-teachers, and the like?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; I have heard of different cases.

Chairman WALSH. Do you notice any difference, if you have observed, between their assimilation into the body of the population than that of other foreigners?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Than that of other foreigners?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. The English, the Irish, the Scotch, and so forth?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; I have not.

Chairman WALSH. The next large numbers, I understand, were the Jewish people?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Do they likewise assimilate with the population, except having the ordinary religious rites?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And take part in public affairs?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Do their children attend the public schools?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. They have their own religious institutions here and things of that sort?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Has there been any effort on the part of the employers of labor to have foreigners come into Paterson to obtain work in the mills?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; not that I know of.

Chairman WALSH. They just naturally come in with the tide of immigration, as you observed it?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Have you ever observed any effort on the part of promoters to bring them into the community?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. The Italians, I notice in some other industries, it is claimed they have a padrone system, by which they assemble them after they come to this country and bring them into industry. Have you observed anything of that kind in Paterson?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. The older Italians—did they locate in centers by themselves largely and stay there; that is, neighborhood communities?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; the Italians are pretty well scattered all around.

Chairman WALSH. How about the Jewish people?

Mr. DOHERTY. They are more in one center, I should say, down on River Street, in Paterson.

Chairman WALSH. How about the drift of Syrians and Roumanians and other people in the last couple of years as to numbers?

Mr. DOHERTY. Well, there is quite a few of them.

Chairman WALSH. Have there been nationalities or races other than the Italians and the Jewish people from which you could determine as to their assimilative capacity; that is, whether they came into the life of your town and into the life of your community or not?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Those are the largest ones?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And you can not tell how those Syrians and others are going to assimilate?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; I could not.

Commissioner LENNON. Could you, for the record, tell us what you mean in the trade by a broad silk?

Mr. DOHERTY. Broad silks?

Commissioner LENNON. Where is the dividing line? What does it mean? Tell us what it means.

Mr. DOHERTY. Broad silk is silk for dresses. But even tie silks—that is wide across; the other is for fancy work; it is jacquards; but broad silks, I would call it a very plain weave made for dresses—all dress goods.

Commissioner LENNON. Does it ever mean so many inches wide or anything of that kind?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; anything over 28 inches. Runs 24 inches up to anywhere.

Commissioner LENNON. All dress goods?

Mr. DOHERTY. All dress goods.

Commissioner LENNON. What is the market for your goods—United States or foreign countries, or both?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; only the United States. New York is the principal market.

Commissioner LENNON. A general interstate business, is it?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. Do you do business through jobbers, or do you sell direct to retailers?

Mr. DOHERTY. Sell direct, through jobbers; through commission houses, anyway. We do a very large direct business.

Commissioner LENNON. You have men on the road, then, to sell goods?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. Do you believe that the best interests of the trade would be served if contract organization was had on the part of the employers and also on the part of the working people, so they could have collective agreements?

Mr. DOHERTY. I don't quite get that.

Commissioner LENNON. Well, do you believe in collective bargaining between the employer and the workman?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; I think so.

Commissioner LENNON. Well, would collective bargaining be effective without organization? Could it be effective without organization?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; not very well.

Commissioner LENNON. Then, evidently, as you favor collective agreements, you recognize the necessity for organization back of it?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. That is all I care to ask.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Mr. Doherty, has there been any reduction in hours since the time you worked in the mills 15 years ago and the present time?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes; 10 hours.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. A day, then?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; just before I went to work it was 60 hours, and was reduced to 55.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. They had a shorter week by Saturday being a half holiday?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. But the same day?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. You have been back for a number of years upon the 10-hour day?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Is there anything that you would like to volunteer to the commission? Or is there anything you would like to amplify or explain—anything that you have said?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. That is, have you any suggestions as to what might be done by the Government, either State or Nation, to allay industrial unrest?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; there is one thing I would state—I think my father mentioned it—and that is, if a man's wage is set by commission I think it would do away with strikes, because—I don't care whether a man started a mill up—if you could get help working in another town cheaper than you could here you would go there. That is natural. If a man's wage set by commission—by

a commission—I don't care where you would go, you would have to pay the same wage. And so far as foreigners that are not put on the market, it would be a question of skilled people. You would bring people who understand the language, and it would not make any difference so far as the hours in a day are concerned. I am a great believer in that; I believe in eight hours.

Chairman WALSH. You believe that is long enough?

Mr. DOHERTY. Yes, sir; only if you do it in Paterson and do not do it in Pennsylvania you will put Paterson out of business.

Chairman WALSH. Do you think any of the trouble has been due to the workers' inability to speak the language and understand customs?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. I mean the foreigners. Do you believe they are so represented by interpreters and have sufficient intelligence in their own language to understand what you are driving at and how you are dealing with them, and all like that?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; I am a little against foreigners, because you take the manufacturing of plain goods, if a man is a very wealthy man he might go in a little town, he might get those foreigners, and you can teach them to weave in three weeks, and you might get them to work for 3 or 4 cents less than they are paying in Paterson.

Chairman WALSH. I noticed the gentleman who preceded you on the stand stated that all weavers wore glasses, that the high strain was very severe, but that when a weaver applied for a new job he was not taken if he wore glasses?

Mr. DOHERTY. I would differ with him there, because I don't think there is anything harder on your eyes than when I was a weaver. We used to have 12 candlepower lights; that was all they would give us. Now we have 25 candlepower and some 60 watt; and as far as wearing glasses, you can look around this room and find pretty near every fifth man wearing glasses. Then, again, you used to see cross-eyed people, but now you do not. It is science.

Chairman WALSH. You do not look upon the eyestrain as being peculiar to the weaving business?

Mr. DOHERTY. No, sir; not more than it ever was. Not as much. Conditions are better.

Chairman WALSH. That is all I have.

Thank you, Mr. Doherty.

Call your next.

TESTIMONY OF MR. EDWARD F. L. LOTTE.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Lotte, give us your name, your address, and your business.

Mr. LOTTE. My name, you have it correct, Edward F. L. Lotte; 581 Broadway, Paterson, N. J. My business is silk dyer.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are you manager of the National Silk Dyeing Co.?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. The dyeing of silk is an important industry around Paterson?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes, sir; the dyeing of silk is important; it is the coloring of silk before going into goods.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you here as manager at the time of the so-called silk strike here?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did the employees of your silk houses go out on strike?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. How soon after the strike began did they go out?

Mr. LOTTE. The first of them went out about the 26th of February. That was just. I should say, a couple weeks after the strike had started; two or three weeks, probably.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many dyehouses are there around this city?

Mr. LOTTE. I couldn't tell you how many there are. There may be 20; I am not sure; there may be more. I have not looked into that thoroughly.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many employees have you in your establishment?

Mr. LOTTE. In Paterson?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LOTTE. About 1,000.

Mr. THOMPSON. About 1,000?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. About how does your firm compare in size to the others, is it the largest?

Mr. LOTTE. In Paterson?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir; they are not the largest in Paterson. There is one more that has more than we have in Paterson.

Mr. THOMPSON. About how many silk dyers are there in this city?

Mr. LOTTE. You mean how many workers?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LOTTE. I should judge probably 3,000, although that is only a guess.

Mr. THOMPSON. Of those 3,000 you employ 1,000?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Your house went out in February, about two weeks after the strike?

Mr. LOTTE. I should judge it was. It was about February 25 when they first went out, and some went out as late as March 3.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they all go out of your place at once?

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir; some few stayed in each plant—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Prior to their going out, did they make any demands on your firm?

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir; they made no demands at all. In fact, those that our foreman conversed with claimed they were satisfied.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they make any statements, either to the foreman or to the firm, as to the reason they went out?

Mr. LOTTE. Before they went out?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. LOTTE. Absolutely none.

Mr. THOMPSON. They just simply left their work and went out?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes; in fact, most of them on account of the agitation among the silk mills, and so on; we tried to find out whether they were satisfied or whether they wanted to go out, because we had considerable silk in process, and all responses that we got was that they would stick and were satisfied; it was the weavers' quarrel, and they had nothing at all to do with it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they quit either by not coming in the morning to work or did they quit while they were at work?

Mr. LOTTE. They quit while they were at work.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the cause of their quitting, if you know?

Mr. LOTTE. There was no cause that we could find out on the first that went out. It was arranged by some signal or other, turning on the steam, and then a large number of them walked out of there.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you know at that time, or have you found out since, how this signal was arranged?

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Who arranged it?

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir; we have not.

Mr. THOMPSON. So far as you know, the cause, except generally, the cause that led your people to leave is unknown to you?

Mr. LOTTE. It is unknown, except, of course, it was known there was lots of agitation, and it seemed to be, I might say, in the air. Some of them said afterwards that they went out feeling that they could come back very soon and the thing would blow over.

Mr. THOMPSON. The only connection which your people had with the weavers, or that your firm had with silk weavers, is that you furnished silk to them?

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir; we dye the silk. They give us the silk to dye. We dye it on a commission basis, so much per pound. The manufacturer sends his silk to us, and we dye it and return it to him.

Mr. THOMPSON. So that the strike in your place was what was known as a sympathetic strike?

Mr. LOTTE. I would call it so. That is what it started out with.

Mr. THOMPSON. What action, if any, did the dye employers take at that time?

Mr. LOTTE. Well, they, like the others, thought it would be over very soon, and they thought they would wait a week or two, which they did, and, of course, we kept on with the employees that stayed there and took the silk and finished that all up. Those men worked all the time, finished the work and got it out, and, of course, then we did not start on the feeling that we would wait a week or two to see what the result of the strike would be.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, what did you do after that, if anything?

Mr. LOTTE. After that we started to look around and put help on, break help in.

Mr. THOMPSON. You continued the operation of your dyeing establishment?

Mr. LOTTE. We continued the operation; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you find any difficulty in finding men?

Mr. LOTTE. Well, we found a good many would come to us, but said they were afraid, and simply said they would work if we would—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). About how many men did you have working for you during the strike?

Mr. LOTTE. Well, that varied, because the strike started to grow. At first we had probably 10 per cent, then after a week or two was up, that was during that time, we had probably that many, and as it went on and saw we were compelled to employ new help, then the others were afraid to come in, it gradually grew on up until the end of the strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was there any violence at your place during the strike?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes, sir; there were some men hurt on the road home, and three or four houses blown up; that is, bombs put under the steps and shattered; and one of our men—there were some stones thrown through the window and broke the window, and almost kill his child that was sick.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many men were hurt?

Mr. LOTTE. How many men were hurt on the road?

Mr. THOMPSON. That worked in your place?

Mr. LOTTE. Probably three or four; that is all.

Mr. THOMPSON. How were they hurt?

Mr. LOTTE. They were hurt walking home from work; attacked from the back.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were they seriously injured?

Mr. LOTTE. One of them was seriously injured, but came around all right afterwards.

Mr. THOMPSON. Your dye works is located in Paterson here?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What action did the police take in reference to the strike, so far as you are concerned—your establishment?

Mr. LOTTE. The police gave us all the protection they could; and if we heard—of course, we got a number of notices, and so on, and threats, and if there was any threats of a man going to be hurt, or threats of a house being blown up, or anything at all like that, we handed those over to the police.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were the police around your establishment during the strike?

Mr. LOTTE. They were around the outside of the establishment; yes, sir; all the time.

Mr. THOMPSON. All the time?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes, sir; they had somebody there night and day.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you see any collisions between the police and bodies of strikers or other people on the streets?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes, sir; I saw some.

Mr. THOMPSON. Where were they, around your factory?

Mr. LOTTE. Right near our factory; yes, sir. They occurred in the morning or evening, mostly; there was very little during the day.

Mr. THOMPSON. That was when those other people were going to and from work?

Mr. LOTTE. When they were going to and from work.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the nature of those collisions, were they serious or not?

Mr. LOTTE. They did not end serious; but I think it was largely through the way the police handled it, because they used every effort they could not to hurt anyone.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you see the police use any violence on any of the strikers?

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir; I didn't see them use any violence.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you see the strikers use any violence toward the police?

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir; I was not where there was any violence; just right near the works; but I was inside and did not see that. They did throw stones at my own machine, but it did not hurt me any. It hit the top and did not hit me.

Mr. THOMPSON. In reference to any trouble there might have been between the strikers and the police, what form did it take?

Mr. LOTTE. The police asked them to move on, and if they moved on there was nothing more said. If they did not move on, they called the patrol wagon and put them in.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did the people go willingly or peacefully into the wagon, if you know?

Mr. LOTTE. Not at the last; the last collision between the police, they did not; but they loaded up two trucks, the patrol wagon, and put them in, and after they were in most of them left, but there were some that stayed and wanted to give battle, so they rounded them up and put them in the—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Did you ever appear in court at any time when an arrest was made?

Mr. LOTTE. I did not.

Mr. THOMPSON. You did not?

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you know in what way the court acted on the cases?

Mr. LOTTE. How?

Mr. THOMPSON. Whether he acted leniently or severely, or how?

Mr. LOTTE. Well, from my own observation, at the beginning, of course, it looked to me as though it was rather lenient.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was that attitude changed?

Mr. LOTTE. They got a little less lenient as the strike went on and the people were threatened more, and it looked more dangerous.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you know what action the courts took?

Mr. LOTTE. I didn't follow that up.

Mr. THOMPSON. You didn't follow that up?

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir; I was busy with other matters.

Chairman WALSH. At this point the commission will stand adjourned until 2 o'clock. We will meet promptly at 2 o'clock.

You will kindly resume the stand at that hour, Mr. Lotte.

Mr. LOTTE. All right; thank you.

(Whereupon, at 12.30, an adjournment was taken till 2 o'clock p. m.)

AFTER RECESS—2 P. M.

Chairman WALSH. The commission will please be in order.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Lotte.

TESTIMONY OF MR. EDWARD F. L. LOTTE—Continued.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Lotte, you were telling us something about your company, and I think you were telling us something about the organization you belong to. You have an organization, have you not?

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Silk dyers?

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You have not?

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Has your company any agreement or understanding with any organization of labor?

Mr. LOTTE. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you know whether or not the men working for your company are organized or not?

Mr. LOTTE. We don't know.

Mr. THOMPSON. You don't know?

Mr. LOTTE. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. You have had no dealings with this textile union, have you?

Mr. LOTTE. With what?

Mr. THOMPSON. The United Textile Workers?

Mr. LOTTE. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you ever come in contact with any other organization in carrying on your business?

Mr. LOTTE. No; only at the time of the strike here, when there was a committee.

Mr. THOMPSON. What organization did you hear of at the time of the strike?

Mr. LOTTE. The I. W. W.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is the Industrial Workers of the World?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What contract did you have with them, if any?

Mr. LOTTE. All the contract we had was that there was a committee came and presented the demands, and that was after the men had been out for some time.

Mr. THOMPSON. Who composed that committee? How many were there?
 Mr. LOTTE. There were two or three committees came.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Take the first committee, then?
 Mr. LOTTE. They represented from different works.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Had the members of that committee been working at your establishment?
 Mr. LOTTE. They had.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Were there any members of that committee who had not been working at your establishment?
 Mr. LOTTE. No.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Was that true of the other committees that called on you from the I. W. W.?
 Mr. LOTTE. Yes; they were all working for us.
 Mr. THOMPSON. They all were or had been working for you?
 Mr. LOTTE. Yes.
 Mr. THOMPSON. What demands, if any, did they present; were they verbal or in writing?
 Mr. LOTTE. They were in writing.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Do you know what they were now? Do you remember?
 Mr. LOTTE. Yes. Eight hours a day, 44 hours a week.
 Mr. THOMPSON. That was the demand?
 Mr. LOTTE. That was the demand.
 Mr. THOMPSON. What were you then working—your hours?
 Mr. LOTTE. We were working the same as we are now, 55 hours a week.
 Mr. THOMPSON. What answer did you make to their demands?
 Mr. LOTTE. We told them that we could not accede to them.
 Mr. THOMPSON. That you could not reduce them?
 Mr. LOTTE. No. They did not ask us. We told them we could not accede to their demands.
 Mr. THOMPSON. How long were those conferences, in point of duration?
 Mr. LOTTE. Oh, about 15 or 20 minutes.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Have you got a copy of the demands?
 Mr. LOTTE. No; I have not.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Could you furnish the commission with a copy?
 Mr. LOTTE. I am not sure that I could.
 Mr. THOMPSON. You are not sure?
 Mr. LOTTE. No. I could look, but I am not sure that I could.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Do you know what became of them, or were they just mislaid, or something?
 Mr. LOTTE. They only came—each committee came once and presented the demand, and I am not sure now whether we kept it or whether they took it back with them.
 Chairman WALSH. Would you kindly look that up and see if possibly you can furnish it, or a copy of it, to the commission?
 Mr. LOTTE. I will do that; but I am not sure whether the committee took it back or not.
 Chairman WALSH. If you will kindly look it up and let us know if you haven't it we will be obliged.
 Mr. LOTTE. I can let you know within a half hour after I am away from here.
 (Mr. Lotte subsequently furnished the following data:)

DEMANDS OF DYEHOUSE WORKERS.

1. Forty-four hours shall be a week's work.
2. Eight hours shall constitute a day's work.
3. Overtime shall be paid for at the rate of time and a half.
4. None shall work more than one hour overtime in one day.
5. Twelve dollars per week shall be the minimum wage for dyers' helpers.
6. Dyers shall receive no less than \$15 on one box, \$18 on two boxes, \$21 and over on three boxes and over.
7. The shop committee shall decide when a learner is necessary.
8. All learners must be at least 16 years of age, and they shall receive no less than \$9 per week for the first six months; after that they shall receive the dyers' helpers' wage of \$12 per week.
9. Workers at whiz and washing machines shall receive not less than \$13; finishers, \$15; dye-room workers, \$12; and dressers, \$13; and also shaker out, \$13.

10. Men working in the yard shall not be allowed to work in any department inside.

11. The shop committee shall have the right to investigate that all belong to the union.

12. No discrimination against anybody for taking part in the strike.

13. Box fixers shall be paid no less than \$13 per week.

14. Night men to be paid at the rate of \$13 for 44 hours.

(Seal of the Industrial Workers of the World, Silk Workers' Local No. 152, Paterson, N. J.)

Mr. THOMPSON. So far as you dealt with these people on this committee at the conferences, was it of a friendly character?

Mr. LOTTE. It was of a friendly character; yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were any threats made against you or against your company?

Mr. LOTTE. Not at those conferences; no, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were there at any time, so far as you personally know, any threats made against your company or yourself or any of the officers or workers?

Mr. LOTTE. Against the workers; yes; there were several threats made to us—some written.

Mr. THOMPSON. Anonymously or signed by any individual?

Mr. LOTTE. No; they were not signed by individuals; all anonymous.

Mr. THOMPSON. So far as you saw the strike and the way it was conducted I believe you stated, the matter of disorder in the way it was carried on, I think you have already stated fully, have you not?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes; I have.

Mr. THOMPSON. And you have had no dealings with any sort of labor organization?

Mr. LOTTE. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then from your own knowledge of matters you have no opinion as to the character of the I. W. W. or of the United Textile Workers?

Mr. LOTTE. Not of my own; no, sir. Only—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Did the men who came to you on these committees ask for a contract from you or just for the granting of the demand?

Mr. LOTTE. No. They said they were sent to present those demands, and that was all; they would have to report back.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they say where they had to report?

Mr. LOTTE. What?

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they say where or to whom they had to report?

Mr. LOTTE. No; they did not say as to whom or where. They just said they had to report back, and they have no power except to present.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you ask for their authority?

Mr. LOTTE. They said that was all their authority. There was an I. W. W. stamp on it, and they said that was all the authority there was.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you discuss with them the proposition of making a contract?

Mr. LOTTE. No. We discussed with them the fact it was not at all feasible to make any changes at that time. We discussed with them, too, the way that they went out and left the works, in the condition they were, and what they had done, and those things we went over with them.

Mr. THOMPSON. What did they say to you when you told them about the conditions they left the work in?

Mr. LOTTE. They said that it was not right, but they were told to do it, and they did it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did this question of the condition of the work come up at the various conferences?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes; at each conference we explained to those men—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Was there anything more said about it than what you say on your part?

Mr. LOTTE. No; there was nothing further said.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was anything further said about it on their part?

Mr. LOTTE. No; they said nothing.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they say to you that they had approved their method of carrying on a strike?

Mr. LOTTE. No; they did not say that. They said they were told to do it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they say that in their opinion it was the justifiable thing in order to win their struggle?

Mr. LOTTE. No. They said they did not feel it was right.

Mr. THOMPSON. What opinion have you, from what you have heard from others and what you saw from this, in the newspapers and the like, as to the organization then in charge or apparently leading the strike in Paterson?

Mr. LOTTE. I don't know just what you mean.

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean the I. W. W.

Mr. LOTTE. What opinion I have of their methods?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; as a laborer organization and as to their methods of conducting a struggle, and so forth?

Mr. LOTTE. Their method, as I understand, is what they call direct action to cripple the plant first and then get what they can afterwards.

Mr. THOMPSON. What do you mean by crippling—just stopping labor?

Mr. LOTTE. Stopping labor and walking out.

Mr. THOMPSON. You never had any contract with your employees?

Mr. LOTTE. No; we had no word concerning it at all; absolutely, no.

Mr. THOMPSON. They had that right before?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes; they had the right.

Mr. THOMPSON. Wherein do you make a division between the rights your employees previously had and the policy of the I. W. W.?

Mr. LOTTE. In forcing others out that don't want to go.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have they any special method of doing that?

Mr. LOTTE. Well, they threaten them, and some of them get letters, and threaten them in the works.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is usual of all strikes, whether conducted by the I. W. W. or not, isn't it?

Mr. LOTTE. I could not say.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are only speaking now of your information and your opinion?

Mr. LOTTE. Well, I mean this was my first experience in a large strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. I simply wanted to get from you if you could state where, in your opinion as an employer of labor, you made a line of demarcation between the old-line organizations, if we may call them such, and the I. W. W.—whether they presented a different angle of the labor problem to you?

Mr. LOTTE. Well, as we have our employees, of course, an employee can go out, but he goes out of his own volition, and under the I. W. W., or under the Industrial Workers of the World, they compelled everyone to go out, whether they wished to or not, or tried to or attempted to.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALSH. I believe you stated that you had never had any labor organization in your plant prior to this time?

Mr. LOTTE. Well, I did not. I said that we had no dealings with labor organizations.

Mr. THOMPSON. Had no dealings with them?

Mr. LOTTE. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you have any strikes in your plant previous to this time?

Mr. LOTTE. No; I have been here five years and we had none prior.

Chairman WALSH. So that you have no personal basis of comparison between the methods used by the old-line labor unions and those which were used in this case by the Industrial Workers of the World?

Mr. LOTTE. I have not.

Chairman WALSH. That is all.

Mr. LOTTE. I just want to—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). I was going to ask you if there is anything you would like to volunteer, any explanation or amplification of your testimony? You may now do so and we will be glad to hear it.

Mr. LOTTE. I just wanted to explain one thing that I noticed that was said here, that the dyers' average wages was \$5.50; that they worked—I have gone over our employees that we have here and their average was 52½ hours, and the average wages of the thousand, or about a thousand, was \$12.62.

Chairman WALSH. Covering what period of time?

Mr. LOTTE. Covering this year. Of course, we could not take the strike period. I took this year.

Chairman WALSH. Take this year and tell us if you will what was the highest wage paid during that time.

Mr. LOTTE. You mean the highest amount?

Chairman WALSH. The highest amount?

Mr. LOTTE. Well, the highest amount would have amounted to about \$13. That is, taking the average of everybody.

Chairman WALSH. I am trying to leave the averages for the present. How large was the highest any employee received?

Mr. LOTTE. I don't just catch what you mean, because we have——

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Well, you say you made a survey of how many employees?

Mr. LOTTE. Of 1,000. That is all.

Chairman WALSH. Covering a period of one year?

Mr. LOTTE. No. Covering a period of this year, practically.

Chairman WALSH. Up until this time. Is that from the 1st of January?

Mr. LOTTE. It comes from about the 1st of February.

Chairman WALSH. And you struck an average by taking all the amounts received?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes. We took the total number of employees and the total amount that they received and divided that by the number of employees, and the average for the dyehouse was \$12.60. You see, our lowest wage we pay in general is \$12, except the men that start. When the men start the first three months they get \$10; the next three months \$11, and if they are apt they get the \$12 sooner. The lowest we have is \$12. Then we have what we call the machine men, what we call washing-machine men. They get \$13 and \$14. And then we have finishers who get \$15. Now, taking those as the averages. Our week is 55 hours; the average that we made is 52½ hours. We have very little overtime. And the average wage received for all, boys and everybody, was \$12.62.

Chairman WALSH. Now, was the work steady during this period for those five months?

Mr. LOTTE. I am explaining they worked 52½ hours out of 55.

Chairman WALSH. I see, that difference.

Mr. LOTTE. What is that?

Chairman WALSH. Now, then——

Mr. LOTTE (interrupting). If we do have any time that is apparently dull, we generally close down on Saturday. That is a five-hour day.

Chairman WALSH. Could you tell me what the lowest wage paid was among these 1,000 employees since the first of the year?

Mr. LOTTE. Well, now, just let me ask you, do you mean the lowest wages paid to the men? You don't mean a boy, do you?

Chairman WALSH. I mean anybody that you include in that number from which you strike this average?

Mr. LOTTE. Well, the lowest we pay, we have about a dozen boys in which the lowest wage we pay is \$5.

Chairman WALSH. The lowest is \$5 a week?

Mr. LOTTE. But those are office boys. But all our men——

Commissioner O'CONNELL (interrupting). Have you women or girls included in that?

Mr. LOTTE. No; we only have about three or four girls. They are stenographers.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. No women working in the business?

Mr. LOTTE. No; we have not.

Chairman WALSH. You were going to say what was the lowest wage paid to an adult?

Mr. LOTTE. The lowest wage paid to an adult, as I said, is \$10. That is when he started at the trade, but those that we have that are paid \$10 won't amount to over 30 men, 30 to 40.

Chairman WALSH. How many do you have in that number during that period who received \$15 a week?

Mr. LOTTE. The \$15 a week are about probably 100.

Chairman WALSH. About 100?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. About how many \$14?

Mr. LOTTE. Fourteen dollars would be—that would be hard to answer. It would be somewhere between 80 and 120.

Chairman WALSH. And you approximate it between 80 and 120?

Mr. LOTTE. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. So that there are about 800 of them where the wage would range between \$10 and \$14?

Chairman WALSH. Now, you say there were 30 at \$10. Could you approximate how many there were at, say, \$11, if you have such a wage?

Mr. LOTTE. We have very few at \$11, because they don't stay very long at \$11. If they get pretty good, we give them \$12.

Chairman WALSH. They get \$12?

Mr. LOTTE. Because if a man don't work and is not very good we prefer not to keep him at all, so if he is pretty good we give him the \$12, and some men get \$12 at the end of two months instead of waiting six.

Chairman WALSH. About how many have you at \$12?

Mr. LOTTE. At \$12 we would have about 700, I should judge; around that.

Chairman WALSH. That is all.

(Witness excused.)

TESTIMONY OF MR. ADOLPH LESSIG.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Lessig, give us your name, your address, and your occupation.

Mr. LESSIG. At the present time I am living in the city of Boston, or I should rather say a suburb of Boston, the city of Everett, across the Charles River. At the present time I am secretary of the National Industrial Union of Textile Workers, affiliated with the I. W. W. or Industrial Workers of the World.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are there two organizations that take the name of I. W. W. in this country?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes; there is. There is one that claims to be the original I. W. W.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, which one is that one; the one you are affiliated with?

Mr. LESSIG. No. I am affiliated with the Chicago faction; what is generally called the Chicago faction.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LESSIG. And the other one is what is called the Detroit faction.

Mr. THOMPSON. During the strikes in Paterson last year, the silk strike, do you know how many of the membership of your faction, or your organization, were involved?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we had approximately about 900 at the day that the strike broke out. We had in the meantime, between the 1st of February and the 25th of February, practically organized about 500 additional, or 400, that were working in Henry Doherty's mill, and we had had a stable organization of 500 for a period of about 12 months.

Mr. THOMPSON. Just going—leaving out the Paterson situation, but taking the general organizations—do you know the numbers in the organization you belong to, the Chicago branch or faction, and the membership of the Detroit branch all over the country?

Mr. LESSIG. No; I could not tell you that.

Mr. THOMPSON. You don't know?

Mr. LESSIG. No; I don't know that.

Mr. THOMPSON. Could you approximate?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I really could not give any idea because I had never concerned myself at the time, and I have always heard it was more or less fluctuating, going up and down.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many members have you in your branch?

Mr. LESSIG. At the present time?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; your own textile workers?

Mr. LESSIG. The textile workers, according to the books, have now approximately 6,500 paid-up membership.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is mostly in Massachusetts or—

Mr. LESSIG (Interrupting). Well, that is through New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Maryland, and South Carolina.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you here in Paterson at the time of the silk strike a year ago?

Mr. LESSIG. I was; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And you say at that time, or previous to that time, you had about 500 members in your union?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. But in February during the strike you increased your membership by the addition of 400 more in Doherty's mills?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was that prior to or after the strike was begun?

Mr. LESSIG. It is usually customary that as soon as the strikers go out on strike, or a bunch of employees, they generally want to organize then, and when they were on strike they came and joined the organization, and of course I am including them in that.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were the 500 men scattered throughout the different mills, or were they located in any particular mill?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, there were two mills that were thoroughly organized, I should say, with a membership of about three hundred and some-odd; the balance was pretty well scattered.

Mr. THOMPSON. When did you come here with reference to the strike? Have you been located here before then, or did you come on at the time of the strike?

Mr. LESSIG. I was a striker myself.

Mr. THOMPSON. You were a striker?

Mr. LESSIG. I was working in a silk mill at the time of the strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. What mill were you working in?

Mr. LESSIG. Benjamin E. David.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was that one of the mills that was thoroughly organized or not?

Mr. LESSIG. I think we had that mill pretty well organized; probably 80 per cent.

Mr. THOMPSON. When did that mill come out with reference to the Doherty mill? How long afterwards?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, that was on the 25th day of February.

Mr. THOMPSON. That your mill went out?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. About two weeks after the strike began?

Mr. LESSIG. No; that was about five or six weeks after the Doherty strike had started.

Mr. THOMPSON. At the time your mill went out how many other mills had gone out on strike?

Mr. LESSIG. I think when we came down to the hall that morning we found there were about 25 per cent had responded to the general call for that day, for that morning.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you take any part in the organization of the Doherty workers?

Mr. LESSIG. I did.

Mr. THOMPSON. When you had the 400 workers organized what did you do with reference to having any interview with the firm?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, it has always been a policy in our organization that those who are not directly working in a mill shall not go in and attempt to make a settlement, but leave it to the workers themselves employed in that particular mill.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, did the workers, after you had organized them, send any committees to Doherty's mill?

Mr. LESSIG. They did, on various occasions.

Mr. THOMPSON. And, if you know, what did they go there for? What was the purpose of the visit?

Mr. LESSIG. The purpose was to try to decide and adjust the grievances.

Mr. THOMPSON. And, if you know, what were those grievances at the time?

Mr. LESSIG. Particularly the stopping of the three and four loom system.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you here when Mr. Doherty was on the stand to-day?

Mr. LESSIG. I was; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You heard what he said about the two-loom system and the three and four loom system?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is he correct, so far as the facts are concerned in that respect?

Mr. LESSIG. When he states that he had looms—some weavers running three, some four, some two looms—yes; he was correct.

Mr. THOMPSON. You may state the grievances and also any additions you wish to make to Mr. Doherty's statement in that respect, in respect to the loom system.

Mr. LESSIG. Well, the proposition, as I remember it, was this: The workers were beginning to realize that the four-loom system was becoming extended throughout the entire mill, which meant that one man would do the work of two and the other man would be eliminated. It was becoming a physical impossibility for some of them to run four looms. They were practically given their choice of running two looms at the four-loom price or quitting the job, and when they saw the condition of affairs, that is what started the revolt, and we were called upon at that time to come and assist them in whatever way we could, and I will admit I took a pretty prominent part in assisting them in any way I could.

Mr. THOMPSON. To what extent, Mr. Lessig, did the two causes operate? Which was the most prominent, the fact that the introduction of the three or four loom system might reduce the force by one-half, or the fact that it did not pay enough money to those who remained? Which was the most important position of the union or your organization?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, all the weavers realized that if the thing became general throughout the trade, the three and four looms, it meant the filling of the streets with unemployed, which would mean a general reduction in wages, and that is what all the weavers realized, all the workers. Now, we had in the meantime within a year from practically two mills that had adopted that three or four loom proposition there were 27 mills, large or small, that had adopted that three and four loom system, and the workers were becoming generally panic-stricken from that cause.

Chairman WALSH. Did you have any other grievances that you presented? You said after you became organized you appointed shop committees or committees in that particular industry to present grievances. Were there any other grievances presented except this one with reference to the change?

Mr. LESSIG. There was also a grievance in regards to some of the prices. Of course, they wanted that when the two-loom system was restored—that the old four-loom price would also be restored at the same time.

Chairman WALSH. Was there any other grievance save the change of the looms and the price to be paid therefor?

Mr. LESSIG. None that I know of.

Chairman WALSH. Nothing in regard to sanitation or to hours or general conditions, nothing but those two?

Mr. LESSIG. Nothing at that time.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, going back to what I was questioning you about. With reference to the proposition that the changing to the three and four loom system would put the men out on the street, was that the strongest point from the standpoint of the worker?

Mr. LESSIG. That was the main issue.

Mr. THOMPSON. If the rates of pay offered to the workers who would remain had been sufficient, would there still have been a complaint that the weavers would have refused to have the new system?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, the workers all realized that it was only a matter of time; that the wages must come down if they were going to have that army of unemployed. They were wise enough to see that.

Mr. THOMPSON. And that is the statement, as you looked upon it, of the reasons for the strike?

Mr. LESSIG. The principal reason for the strike in the broad-silk industry.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am going to ask you a hypothetical question now, which you can give your opinion on it if you have one: If the strikers had believed that the pay would not have been reduced of those remaining at work upon the introduction of the three and four loom system, would they still have struck, in your opinion, because it would have turned men out of work?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, whether it would have become as general, I question, but it was largely also a question of physical impossibility on the part of many to run four looms.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, that would be a question somewhat up to the proprietor or the employer, if the business was not run properly?

Mr. LESSIG. He would have to seek the men that were physically able to run four looms, or women.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would you want to say, now, that the mere fact of the introduction of this newer machinery simply turned men out of work, free from other reasons, was the predominant cause of the strike?

Mr. LESSIG. You say the introduction of newer machinery?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LESSIG. Well, that is not true. There has been very little real improvement made upon the square loom in the last 20 years, to my knowledge, outside of the electrical motion to stop it when one end breaks out. Outside of that there has been practically no real improvement on a square loom outside of the Northrop loom.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, when Mr. Doherty said this morning that they rebuilt their plant and put in this new machinery that was capable of being operated on the three and four loom system, and that they could not do it without the introduction of this new machinery, then he was mistaken, is that your attitude?

Mr. LESSIG. That is my opinion.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, again to bring up that question, you feel that the question of the introduction of the three and four loom system was not solely the question of turning men out of work, but it had with it these other allied questions, and you can not separate from it the things of one proposition from another. That is to say, referring to the turning of every other man out of work, and in the next place it would give them physically harder work to do, and in the third place it would reduce the wages of those remaining. You can't separate these elements?

Mr. LESSIG. Positively not.

Mr. THOMPSON. As to the other things of the strike?

Mr. LESSIG. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, how quickly and to what extent did the strike spread throughout the silk mills of Paterson?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, in three days we had practically the entire broad-silk plant tied up.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many people worked from your organization to bring that about, if you know, and did some of them come from outside the city of Paterson?

Mr. LESSIG. The entire work was done largely—in fact, all of the preparatory work was done by those on the inside here in the city of Paterson.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is, yourself and others?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would you care to name those who were engaged in that work prominently?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, some of them are working in the mills and I should not care for them to lose their jobs.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, name some that are not connected with the mills?

Mr. LESSIG. I should not care to mention anybody's name outside of those that to-day are free from losing their position.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was Koettgen actively associated with you in your work?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was he here at that time?

Mr. LESSIG. He was the organizer.

Mr. THOMPSON. He was not connected with any mill?

Mr. LESSIG. No; at that time he was not working in the mill.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was he the one who organized your mill?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I don't know. I suppose he helped. He and I did it together.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long had he been located in Paterson before the strike occurred?

Mr. LESSIG. Why, he had been living here some 15 or 16 years.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long had he been working as an organizer of the I. W. W. before the strike?

Mr. LESSIG. About, I think, 10 or 11 months.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was that his sole business at that time?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir; so far as I know.

Mr. THOMPSON. What other people came in here, other officers of your I. W. W., to help organize and conduct the strike?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we had written to Miss Flynn and Mr. Preska and a few others to come over and address meetings and help us to perfect and get the organization together.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they come?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did some others come afterwards?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, there was on and off different ones who would drop in and give us a speech.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, did Hayward come here?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, yes; he came.

Mr. THOMPSON. And was here most of the time, wasn't he?

Mr. LESSIG. No. He stopped two or three days every week, and would go back again at night to New York and attend to whatever business he had to attend to over there.

Mr. THOMPSON. And come back again?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And did that during the course of the strike?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. At that time did there exist two divisions of the I. W. W. as there are to-day?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes; there was two divisions at that time.

Mr. THOMPSON. And did a division occur here or had it occurred before the strike came on?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes; had occurred about four years ago; prior to the strike three or four years.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you heard of Rudolph Katz?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. He is an organizer of the Detroit branch, is he not?

Mr. LESSIG. So I believe.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was he here then?

Mr. LESSIG. I believe he was in town at that time, so far as I remember.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, if you know, did the striking weavers and others join also this Detroit branch as well as yours, some of them?

Mr. LESSIG. Some may have.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was there any difficulty between your organization and the Detroit organization at that time?

Mr. LESSIG. No; during the strike there were no differences.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you have any conflict of any kind or any meetings with them?

Mr. LESSIG. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. There was no attempt either to fight or to get together?

Mr. LESSIG. No attempt whatever.

Mr. THOMPSON. And, so far as you know, they did come here and do some work, did they?

Mr. LESSIG. They may have done some work.

Mr. THOMPSON. How was the strike financed, so far as you are concerned? Did you pay those out on strike a certain strike benefit or certain strike moneys, or what was your method of conducting the strike so far as taking care of the people?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, the strike committee had appointed a relief committee, and they appealed to the country at large for funds in order to take care of that great mass of people.

Mr. THOMPSON. In appealing to the country at large did you make any specific appeal to any labor bodies as such?

Mr. LESSIG. No. We appealed to the working class in general; to the labor organizations, of course, in particular.

Mr. THOMPSON. At that time did you come in contact with Mr. Morgan, the organizer of the United Textile Workers?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I never came in contact with him directly.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did your organization have any dealings with him at that time, do you know?

Mr. LESSIG. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. THOMPSON. And you probably would know if they did, would you not?

Mr. LESSIG. I would have known, I think.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, as a result of that appeal to the country, did you get funds and were distributions made to the employees on strike or not?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, there wasn't any money distributed. It was distributed in the way of food and clothing.

Mr. THOMPSON. How, generally, did the strikers maintain themselves from in January, when the first strike started, until the strike was ended, some months later.

Mr. LESSIG. Well, in my opinion, I think they had conducted themselves—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). I mean how did they maintain themselves so far as food and provisions?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, you mean food. Well, I suppose some of them had a few dollars on the side, and others lived through the contributions and donations received from the relief committee.

Mr. THOMPSON. As an organization, you have no systematic method of relief?

Mr. LESSIG. No; it was impossible to get one in shape.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many people did you have out on strike at the time when the strike was at its height, we will say?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, it has been estimated there were 22,000 and 25,000. Whether this is absolutely correct I could not say.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many of them became or were members of your organization?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, during the course of the strike there were about 9,000 enrolled as members.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did those men go back to work again when the strike ended?

Mr. LESSIG. So far as I know, they all did.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are they still members of your organization, if you know?

Mr. LESSIG. No; not many of them are now.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you care to state how many members you have now in Paterson, or do you know?

Mr. LESSIG. According to the last report there were some 1,300 in good standing in the city of Paterson.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, during the strike—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). When was the last report?

Mr. LESSIG. That was last month, just before I left here.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, during the strike what methods did you use to carry the strike on and to win it? In each case did you have a committee meet the employers as you did in the case of Doherty?

Mr. LESSIG. We were ready at all times, and the strikers were always advised if the employers wished to hold a conference or anything looking toward a settlement or bringing about a settlement they should always respond and hear what was offered.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, did you approach the employers specifically, or did these committees approach the employers from time to time?

Mr. LESSIG. Some of them did, I understand. I was so informed.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was there any systematic effort made by them, by the organization?

Mr. LESSIG. I think on one occasion the strike committee had decided that all the shops should hold meetings to appoint committees to go to their respective employers and ask them what chance there was for effecting a settlement.

Mr. THOMPSON. You have spoken of a strike committee. Of whom did that consist, and how was it formed?

Mr. LESSIG. The strike committee was organized from the delegates, one or two from each shop, from each particular mill or shop.

Mr. THOMPSON. And about how many did that make?

Mr. LESSIG. In the neighborhood of about 250 or 300.

Mr. THOMPSON. How often did that committee meet, and did it have any other smaller committees to handle from moment to moment the affairs of the strike?

Mr. LESSIG. And then there was the executive board, a smaller board; but the strike committee met every night.

Mr. THOMPSON. Every night?

Mr. LESSIG. Every night for the first three or four months.

Mr. THOMPSON. Who appointed this executive committee or strike board?

Mr. LESSIG. The executive committee was from the union itself, but the strike committee was composed of members and nonmembers of the organization.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, from the union itself, how many members had this executive committee?

Mr. LESSIG. I am not sure whether there were 15 or 20; but I think there were 20.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were they all local people in Paterson?

Mr. LESSIG. All local men from the city of Paterson.

Mr. THOMPSON. What part on that committee or any committee did Mrs. Girlie Flynn and Mr. Hayward and other people who came from the outside have?

Mr. LESSIG. None at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. An advisory capacity only?

Mr. LESSIG. That is all.

Mr. THOMPSON. What other things did you do with reference to the progress of the strike toward having the workers win? What did you do with reference to people who were still working in the mill?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, the committee, of course, the strike committee, usually delegated some one to try and induce these people also to join the ranks and make the ranks solid and close up everything tight.

Mr. THOMPSON. In many mills many people continued to work, did they not, throughout the strike?

Mr. LESSIG. It was reported some were working here, and again it was reported it was not true—some manufacturers used to start the looms up and

open the windows and make it appear that there was somebody working there, but it was only a lot of empty looms running.

Mr. THOMPSON. But there were some places where they were working?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes; probably here and there some members of the family.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you hear what was said by Mr. Doherty this morning, that 60 per cent of their men worked throughout the strike?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, it was always reported that that was not true—that there were not more than 8 or 10.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, what method of picketing did you adopt with reference to the people who still worked or wished to work in the plants? How did you operate that? Who had charge of that, and how was it worked?

Mr. LESSIG. The shops usually decided the method of picketing when they would hold a shop meeting. If their shops needed picketing, they would decide among themselves as to the method of picketing to be used.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the method usually adopted?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, they usually sent about half a dozen people to walk up and down and see who went in, and to try to approach them and urge upon them to stop working.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was done in case the people refused to stop working, but persisted in going ahead?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I don't know of any particular way that was used, to my knowledge.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, what was the policy of your organization? What is the policy of your organization in cases of that kind?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we simply told them that, so far as committing violence on one or two working in a mill, that it simply would not do them any hurt; that one or two people could not run a shop; and we advised them that all during the strike to keep their hands in their pockets and do nothing.

Mr. THOMPSON. In other words, you counseled peace?

Mr. LESSIG. We counseled peace.

Mr. THOMPSON. And the abstaining from violence?

Mr. LESSIG. Positively.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is that the general policy of your organization strikes?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You don't believe in violence?

Mr. LESSIG. We don't. We believe the most violent thing the workers can do is when they quit work.

Mr. THOMPSON. And that the violence should be limited to such action; is that the general policy of your organization?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. In other words, you take the attitude of a peaceful strike—the cessation of work and the persuading of others not to go to work?

Mr. LESSIG. That is the idea.

Mr. THOMPSON. And further than that you take your hands off; is that right?

Mr. LESSIG. That is what we adopted throughout this last strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. And is that the policy of your organization?

Mr. LESSIG. That is generally the policy that is adopted. Of course, there are always a few hot-heads, I dare say, who are not willing to follow that counsel.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, if there are any members of your organization who say that is not the policy, they are not right; is that so?

Mr. LESSIG. That is the way I always understood it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is Vincent St. John one of the officials of your organization?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is he the chief official?

Mr. LESSIG. He is the general secretary-treasurer.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is he acquainted with the policy and purposes of your organization?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I think he ought to be.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, then, if he held or stated differently—made a different statement from what you did in regard to that fact—would he be apt to be correct or would you be apt to be correct?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we would simply disagree upon methods, that is all.

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean, if he stated there was a policy of your organization to win a strike by whatever it was necessary to do to win, or if it was necessary to cripple a worker they would do it and that simply the means to be used were judged solely by the end in view, if he stated that and stated that

was the policy of your organization, then, so far as you understand it he has made a mistake, is that true?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I would not advocate that.

Mr. THOMPSON. You would not advocate that?

Mr. LESSIG. I would not advocate that.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would you make a statement now with reference to what your organization would do in that respect? He was speaking about the organization. The policy was as I have stated, but you do not understand that to be the policy of your organization, is that correct?

Mr. LESSIG. That is the way I always understood it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, as I understand you again, at no time during the course or progress of this strike did any of your officers or did any of this committee counsel and advocate the commission of violence?

Mr. LESSIG. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they counsel or advocate the destruction of property, if you know?

Mr. LESSIG. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is the destruction of property part of the recognized warfare of your organization?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I have never heard of it as such.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, if in your opinion, or if in the opinion of your organization a strike could be won by blowing up a mill, would it be the policy of your organization, so far as it has announced its policy, to do it or advocate it?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I believe that would just depend on that situation, and I believe it would be dealt with at that time.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, assuming that that would intimidate or in any other way bring about a settlement of the strike favorable to your people, would you then advocate it?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we probably would not hesitate to pursue that course then.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, in that respect then, if Mr. St. John said that was part of your policy, he was correct?

Mr. LESSIG. To a certain degree.

Mr. THOMPSON. And he and you agree as to the policy of your organization in that matter?

Mr. LESSIG. To a certain degree.

Mr. THOMPSON. In your strike in Paterson did your organization carry out that policy?

Mr. LESSIG. We did not.

Mr. THOMPSON. It has been stated on the witness stand that three or four houses were blown up here in Paterson during the strike. Was that done in carrying out this policy of your organization or not?

Mr. LESSIG. So far as we could ascertain that was done by people on the outside of the organization.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes. In other words, so far as you know your organization had nothing whatever to do with it?

Mr. LESSIG. Not with those cases.

Mr. THOMPSON. And so far as this strike, at least, is concerned your organization did pursue a peaceful policy?

Mr. LESSIG. Absolutely.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the reason you were pursuing in this case a peaceful policy as the method to be used, as distinguished from the methods used in other strikes?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we considered we had things pretty generally tied up, about 95 per cent was tied up good and fast, and we did not think that the—with such general solidarity we thought we could win our demands without any other methods being pursued.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, during the progress of that strike, did you have any trouble with the authorities of this county and city?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, how and with whom?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I was arrested on the 30th day of March.

Mr. THOMPSON. How is that?

Mr. LESSIG. I was arrested on the 30th day of March when I was leaving Paterson, walking along the street, Mr. Haywood and myself.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was this 30th day of March?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, the committee had went and arranged for the purpose of holding a meeting on the baseball ground, called the Lafayette Oval.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, where is that, with reference to the courthouse here?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, that lies in this direction [pointing northeastward], about a mile and a half.

Mr. THOMPSON. Within the city limits?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. In the residence neighborhood?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, in somewhat open big baseball field there, and some farms in the rear, and the river adjacent to it, I would say within half a mile.

Mr. THOMPSON. What day of the week was it?

Mr. LESSIG. On Sunday afternoon.

Mr. THOMPSON. Tell us what occurred there and what you were planning there.

Mr. LESSIG. Well, it appeared that the committee had decided that we should hold a Sunday meeting out there.

Mr. THOMPSON. What committee—the executive committee?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir; the executive committee had arranged for it, and we had advertised it and spread the word, generally, that we were holding a meeting. On Saturday afternoon, about 5 o'clock, the chief of police sent for me and informed me that we could not hold that meeting. I told him I was only one man and that I had no authority to call it off, and I would have to see the rest of them, and told him that it was advertised in the papers for the next day, and he said, "Well, they had contradicted it," and he told me it would have to be called off.

Mr. THOMPSON. This Lafayette Oval, is that private grounds or public grounds?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, as far as we inquired who the lot belonged to, we were informed that we could hold a meeting there, and when the chief informed me that, I saw Mr. Haywood and Mr. Treska, and informed them and told them that I thought there was going to be a great deal of violence, and probably somebody get hurt; and we decided we would hold no meeting, but knowing that the people were going out there to assemble, we went there and marched down to this Lafayette Oval, and then marched down toward Haledon.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is on the outside of the city limits?

Mr. LESSIG. That was on the outside of the city limits.

Mr. THOMPSON. How far had you succeeded in getting before you say you were arrested?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, now, we had marched down Lafayette Street and were crossing over, and were within 500 feet, I am informed of the boundary line between Paterson and Haledon, when we were arrested.

Mr. THOMPSON. And when you were arrested, who was with you at the time?

Mr. LESSIG. Mr. Haywood and myself marched up toward the front—about 40 or 50 people in front of us.

Mr. THOMPSON. Any people behind you?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, yes; probably eight or nine hundred, marching in all fashions.

Mr. THOMPSON. What occurred then?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, the patrol wagon came running up, and Sergt. Ryan and a few other officers jumped off, and told Mr. Haywood and myself that we were under arrest.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did he tell you the reason why?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, no.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was done then?

Mr. LESSIG. We were brought down here to the station house and we stayed there over night.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then what occurred?

Mr. LESSIG. Then, the next day, about 2 or half past 2, we were brought before the recorder.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then what was done?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, the police got up and testified—about a dozen of them—and we got six months.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, what did the police say when they testified?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, they testified that we had blocked the highways; that people had to get out into the street; and that we were disturbing the peace.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they say how you were disturbing the peace?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, the charge was disorderly conduct.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, did they say what the disorderly conduct consisted of?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, disorderly conduct; and that we were marching along the street and that people who were trying to come in the opposite direction could not pass us. Now, two of us were together, and the rest of the people

were along, some in front and some out in the street, and they maintained that the people had to step out in the street in order to get past.

Mr. THOMPSON. How were the people ahead of you proceeding, in a marching order or any way they happened to be?

Mr. LESSIG. Any way; like a crowd naturally would march.

Mr. THOMPSON. And the people were following you, and how?

Mr. LESSIG. In the same manner—no prearranged method or manner—just simply marched. All we wanted was to get there.

Mr. THOMPSON. Had any statement been made at the time you adjourned the meeting at the Oval as to where you were going or—

Mr. LESSIG (interrupting). We had not adjourned the meeting at all; didn't even open the meeting. Simply walked around and told people that there would be no meeting. And we walked on and the people followed on the pavement.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the reason the people followed on?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I suppose they thought there would be a meeting held somewhere, and some of the people hollered "Go on to Haledon."

Mr. THOMPSON. And everyone seemed to take it for granted that you would go on to Haledon?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes; we thought we would march right on and it would be the easiest way to get them away from there and save trouble.

Mr. THOMPSON. You say you were given six months?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You made a statement of the case, then.

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we neither one testified. Our attorneys—they simply gave notice of appeal; and then, when we thought we were through with that, we were brought back again and another charge of unlawful assemblage made and \$5,000 put against us.

Mr. THOMPSON. By the recorder?

Mr. LESSIG. I don't know whether by the recorder or by the sergeant who arrested us.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, some of the authorities, anyway?

Mr. LESSIG. Some of the authorities, anyway.

Mr. THOMPSON. You were in jail over night?

Mr. LESSIG. I was in six days.

Mr. THOMPSON. What else? But first, why did you want to go to Haledon?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we figured it this way, that the people would only lie around there and perhaps some one might start some trouble, and it might be that some one there in the crowd would be only too anxious to start something, probably from the other side, and we figured if we marched that way the people would go there and that would take them away from that district.

Mr. THOMPSON. How about the district of Haledon?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, that was over on the other side, and they had a Socialist mayor there and he would not have any objections to us coming there and holding a meeting.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, in what other manner did you come in contact with the authorities during that strike, and what was done?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I never came in contact with them after that until, I think, it was some time toward the end of April, I was rearrested.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was that for?

Mr. LESSIG. I was indicted by the grand jury that afternoon on the charge of unlawful assemblage, which I had already been discharged on; one case by the justice of the peace. They returned a charge of unlawful assemblage, and I hadn't done anything that day except at a meeting of the strikers which assembled at half past 8 or 9 o'clock on that morning.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was that case tried?

Mr. LESSIG. I am still under that indictment. All the others have been discharged.

Mr. THOMPSON. Your other case was appealed?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir; it was taken to the higher courts.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was done with that appeal?

Mr. LESSIG. The judges reversed the decision of the lower court.

Mr. THOMPSON. And discharged you?

Mr. LESSIG. We were discharged.

Mr. THOMPSON. In what other cases did either you or the strikers, or their officers, officially come in contact with the authorities, if you know?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we had about 1,800 strikers, as far as I can make a calculation, that were arrested during the strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, start out and give the facts about that, when the first arrest was made and for what purpose, and by whom.

Mr. LESSIG. Well, the first arrests, to my knowledge, I believe, was on the first day of the strike. I believe there were a few boys arrested for marching, if I am not mistaken, and I believe they were subsequently discharged.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many, if you know, were marching at that time?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, according to the report, it was stated that there were some three or four hundred. Whether that is true or not I don't know; that's all I know about it; I was not with them.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many were arrested, if you know?

Mr. LESSIG. As far as I know, I believe there were only two or three, and I believe they were subsequently discharged, if I am not mistaken.

Mr. THOMPSON. What next arose, or what was done by the authorities during the strike?

Mr. LESSIG. After that they arrested some for walking around the mill, picketing.

Mr. THOMPSON. What were the pickets charged with doing and what was the result of those arrests?

Mr. LESSIG. Unlawful assembly, disorderly conduct; they usually got 10 days or \$10. If they hadn't the \$10, they got 10 days.

Mr. THOMPSON. What other cases were there that were arrested other than charges as to unlawful assemblage and disorderly conduct?

Mr. LESSIG. Those were the usual charges, either unlawful assemblage or disorderly conduct.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you present when those arrests were made?

Mr. LESSIG. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. You say from the beginning of the strike to the end of the strike there were about 1,800 people arrested?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many were fined and how many were jailed?

Mr. LESSIG. In the beginning quite a number started to pay their fines and to offset that and stop it, we told the people to go ahead and crowd the jail until they hadn't room, and to stop paying fines; that if we paid the \$10 every time they were arrested the city officers would only be too glad to enrich the city treasury and that the only way to do away with that was to crowd the jail—and that they did to the queen's taste.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then you don't know what proportion of the 1,800 were fined, and what proportion were discharged?

Mr. LESSIG. No; I believe the council could give you more information on that.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, anyway, in what other manner of respect did you come in contact with the authorities of the city, or with any other authorities?

Mr. LESSIG. We never came in contact with them, except as I came into the halls; because if I walked on the street it would simply mean six months, for they would take me over in the patrol wagon—I knew that was a foregone conclusion.

Mr. THOMPSON. Why do you make that assertion?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, it seemed that they were laying for those who were taking an active part in the strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. What makes you think they were? What did they do any time that you were arrested, you and Mr. Haywood? Who else was arrested for taking an active part?

Mr. LESSIG. Mr. Treska, the Italian speaker, was arrested about five times; Patrick Quinlan was arrested probably four or five times, Mr. Haywood was arrested, and Miss Flynn was arrested four or five times.

Mr. THOMPSON. And when these parties were arrested, were they discharged? Or how were they treated?

Mr. LESSIG. Most all were placed under bail.

Mr. THOMPSON. Police bonds?

Mr. LESSIG. Police bonds, to appear at the higher court.

Mr. THOMPSON. And have those cases been tried or were they tried?

Mr. LESSIG. One or two of them were tried, and the majority are still pending. Mr. Scott, Mr. Boyd, and Miss Flynn were tried, and some were discharged. At Quinlan's first trial the jury disagreed, at the second trial he was convicted. In Scott's case it was left, I believe, to the judge to decide, and I think his case was reversed by the higher court.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did your people on this strike have any feeling toward the city authorities? What was the attitude of the strikers and of your officials toward the city authorities?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, at times our people were very hostile, in fact, they threatened to become so, and we had a great deal of trouble to hold them in check.

Mr. THOMPSON. Why did they become hostile, if you know?

Mr. LESSIG. Why, at some of the times the officers became very brutal.

Mr. THOMPSON. Tell us of a case?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, there was one or two cases of the strikers being brutally treated, and a case where a striker's wife was also assaulted by the officer, and the strikers became very highly incensed.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were those the only cases?

Mr. LESSIG. And then there was an outsider—not a striker, but an outsider—shot on his doorstep in the riverside section.

Mr. THOMPSON. What other case incensed the people, if you know?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, several of the officers seemed to discriminate in certain ways as to arresting Italians and Jews, principally.

Mr. THOMPSON. This was a strike involving 25,000 people?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And such cases as those you have mentioned were numerically very few?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes; that is so.

Mr. THOMPSON. But yet just a case or two like that would not incense them?

Mr. LESSIG. But every day we were having more or less difficulty; sometimes there were cases that were not reported; sometimes the officers acted very brutally; and sometimes there were arrests of 50, 60, and 70 people in a batch for picketing a mill.

Mr. THOMPSON. That was the general attitude of the police, you mean to say?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you keep any record of what they did at that time?

Mr. LESSIG. No; I have not.

Mr. THOMPSON. But this general attitude of the people, did you share in that yourself?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I don't know that I did.

Mr. THOMPSON. How did you feel; did you feel that the police conducted themselves as you would do as a policeman, or not?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I thought I could have winked the other eye on many occasions. Many of them were silk workers themselves a few years ago.

Mr. THOMPSON. What do you mean by "winked the other eye"?

Mr. LESSIG. Looked the other way.

Mr. THOMPSON. Why?

Mr. LESSIG. Give the other fellow a chance.

Mr. THOMPSON. What to do?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, walk up and down; he was really doing nothing. They were simply too strict. No doubt about that.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the strictness of the police due to, so far as you know, generally, was it due to their own attitude toward the strikers as men, or did it come from other sources?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I think a great deal of it was mostly the animosity against the foreign nationality of the people.

Mr. THOMPSON. What were the police; weren't the police foreigners, too?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I daresay a great many of them don't regard themselves as such. They had been here a little bit ahead of the other fellow, that's all.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the attitude of the strikers, if any, toward the officials of the strikers and the members of the city departments, if you know?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I don't know if I ever heard any, outside of grumbling here and there that this one and that one would probably do something in order to bring about a settlement with the mills, and bring the strike to an end.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, did you at that time have any specific complaints against the city authorities as such?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we were very well satisfied that the manufacturers could get anything they wanted from the police department.

Mr. THOMPSON. I know, but that is a conclusion. What was that based on?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, take, for instance, the day that I got six months; I saw a manufacturer come walking out of the recorder's room.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the name of the recorder?

Mr. LESSIG. Judge Carroll.

Mr. THOMPSON. Judge Carroll?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was Judge Carroll's attitude toward the workers?

Mr. LESSIG. Always against them; because many times many of them would get \$10 or 10 days when they hadn't done anything, by the facts in the case, whatever.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, is this feeling that you state a general feeling entertained among the workers?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were there any other officials the workers had in mind?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, there might have been one or two mentioned at different times whom the people were sort of embittered against, thinking he was, perhaps, responsible for their troubles.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you looked up the records to see what the fines were against your people?

Mr. LESSIG. No; I have not.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think you stated that after a while you did formulate some demands. Were those general demands against the mills as a whole? And if so, what were they?

Mr. LESSIG. The general demands that were drafted were for a shortening of the workday, the abolition of the three and four loom system, and were driving a price list as near uniform as we thought it was possible to get. And the workers presented it to the bosses for their consideration.

Mr. THOMPSON. And the workers in each mill?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Presented it separately to each boss?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the result of those demands?

Mr. LESSIG. The usual reply was that they would have nothing to do "with you nor hold nor give you no answer until you come back in the mill as you went out, and then we will treat with you."

Mr. THOMPSON. Was that the final conclusion of the matter?

Mr. LESSIG. That was the final conclusion of the matter; that was the reply that they always received.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did the strike end?

Mr. LESSIG. It did not.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is it still on?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, the—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Has the strike ended?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, the strike, to my mind, has not ended yet.

Mr. THOMPSON. It has not?

Mr. LESSIG. No, sir; simply deferred.

Mr. THOMPSON. The workers generally have gone back to work?

Mr. LESSIG. Generally, the workers have gone back to work.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are they using any other methods of striking other than quitting the work?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, yes; what we call passive resistance.

Mr. THOMPSON. What form is that taking?

Mr. LESSIG. Sometimes they strike on the job.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LESSIG. Stay in the mill and refuse to work for a couple of hours; send a committee down to see the firm; and, if they can not get any satisfaction, continue to work a couple days and repeat the same system the next day.

Mr. THOMPSON. What else?

Mr. LESSIG. I don't know, unless some might be slackening up on production a bit.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is it within the policy of your organization to destroy goods in the making; for instance, do poor work?

Mr. LESSIG. You say is—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Where you have a grievance and it has not been adjusted to your satisfaction, is it a part of the policy of your organization, as you say, to quit any job and do slow work—lessen production? Is it also a part of your policy to make poorer goods—try to destroy the goods in the making?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we do not make any hesitancy sometimes to say to do those things in order to gain your demands. We have been frank to admit it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. LESSIG. Other people have done it, but have not admitted it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is it part of the policy?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was that carried on in any of the mills here at the time of this strike, after people had gone back to work?

Mr. LESSIG. Not to my knowledge. It was never brought to my knowledge, at any rate.

Mr. THOMPSON. When you say the strike is really on still, what do you mean?

Mr. LESSIG. We have two strikes on here in Paterson now.

Mr. THOMPSON. Part of the original strike?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, they have been extended over from one thing to another; where a promise practically given was not accepted.

Mr. THOMPSON. Where your members were worn out and had to go back to work, and they went back to work with a reservation?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Intending to take up the struggle later on?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Has the strike resulted, so far as you know, in any benefit to the workers?

Mr. LESSIG. In some cases. In some cases they have secured a shorter workday.

Mr. THOMPSON. What, for instance?

Mr. LESSIG. We have some mills running nine hours.

Mr. THOMPSON. What mills?

Mr. LESSIG. Schuh & Michels; another concern on Broadway is running nine hours.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many do they employ?

Mr. LESSIG. In the neighborhood of 45 or 50.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many hours before the strike?

Mr. LESSIG. Fifty-five.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many hours do they work on Saturday?

Mr. LESSIG. Four and one-half.

Mr. THOMPSON. Four and one-half?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What other mills?

Mr. LESSIG. Schuh & Michels and Van Raalte; there is the Dean, in Summit, the silk mill down there, which is a part of this organization here; they gained a shorter workday; and Taylor & Friedsam; the United Silk Co. had the nine-hour day and they are fighting to retain it. They are compelled to go on strike again. The Rosenheim, the Augusta silk mill, they have been running nine hours a day, and they wanted to put them on 10, and succeeded for awhile and are now striking for nine hours. There were a number of shops induced them to come back on the promise that they would get nine hours, and they were foolish enough to fall and were put back on 10.

Mr. THOMPSON. About how many of the people in the shops you have named get nine-hour days?

Mr. LESSIG. Where the weavers get it, they all get it now.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many would that include?

Mr. LESSIG. In the neighborhood of 250 or 300; that is, including all employees. But there are other places outside of Paterson that gained the nine-hour day; for instance, New York and Compton; they are running nine hours now as a result of the struggle here.

Mr. THOMPSON. Referring again to the activities of the police, you mentioned something about a hall that you had a meeting in. What was that? I don't believe you brought that out. You mentioned something about the difficulty in the meeting hall.

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we used to hold a meeting every day in Turn Hall, and we had leased that building, and paid so much a day, so much a week, and the police used to come over there sometimes, and at various times they made themselves very obnoxious. I know on one particular occasion I expected a riot to break out over the bad judgment of a couple of men in the rear part of the hall, and they went so far as to close the hall, forbid the proprietor from allowing us to hold meetings in that hall.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you stopped from holding your meetings there?

Mr. LESSIG. The halls were locked against us. We were forced then to meet out in the open air.

Mr. THOMPSON. Out in the open air?

Mr. LESSIG. We had no choice.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you molested there?

Mr. LESSIG. They used to send their officers on the ground.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Commissioner LENNON. When did you join the I. W. W.?

Mr. LESSIG. When I joined it?

Commissioner LENNON. Yes.

Mr. LESSIG. I joined it around back in 1905.

Mr. THOMPSON. Had you been a member of any labor organization before that?

Mr. LESSIG. I think I had been a few years before that. I was a member of the United Textile Workers.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are a textile worker in your business?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. Did any of the men who spoke in public for the I. W. W. campaign here advocate violence in their speeches?

Mr. LESSIG. I never heard any of them advocate violence in their speeches.

Commissioner LENNON. They did not advocate what you call sabotage, or anything of that character?

Mr. LESSIG. I believe one man was charged with having stated to the workers that they should use sabotage, but I believe that that was the week that I was up in jail.

Commissioner LENNON. You were in jail?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. That is not surprising, if you were in jail.

Mr. LESSIG. I didn't hear that. Otherwise, I was chairman of the meeting every day.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are you working in Massachusetts now?

Mr. LESSIG. I am acting as secretary of the National Union of Textile Workers at the present time.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are up there temporarily?

Mr. LESSIG. Temporarily.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. What was the cause of the split in the I. W. W. that caused this Chicago and Detroit faction, those two factions?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, it was the question of a political clause in the preamble.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. What was that?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, that the working class must come together on the political as well as on the economic field, and that clause was stricken out.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Doesn't your faction believe in a political field?

Mr. LESSIG. We do not bother our heads about it.

Mr. THOMPSON. You bothered your heads to the extent of disagreeing with the Detroit faction?

Mr. LESSIG. That was in order to have peace in the organization.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. And they organized a new faction of the I. W. W. simply because the older faction would not put in its constitution the political action that was necessary.

Mr. LESSIG. That convention had eliminated that clause?

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Does your faction believe in it or not?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we don't bother about it. We leave every man to use his own judgment, if he wants to go to politics.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Has the Detroit faction got political action in its platform?

Mr. LESSIG. So I believe.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. One of your officers of your organization, as I recall it—I may not quote him correctly, but he appeared before the commission in New York and said that the I. W. W., as he remembered it, did not believe in political action of any kind, and would not trust the affairs of their organization or of themselves individually to politicians or to politics. Is that your position?

Mr. LESSIG. That is my position.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Then the only difference between your factions is a question of political action?

Mr. LESSIG. That is all.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are you acting together or otherwise?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I believe otherwise we get along pretty well together.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did this split in the national organization have anything to do with the trouble here in Paterson?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, no.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did the American Federation of Labor organizers, or the United Textile Workers, send any organizers down here during the trouble?

Mr. LESSIG. Only so far as I know about that meeting they arranged up there in the armory, and I believe they made an attempt at that time to get people enough to put on some semblance of an organization, and through them that they would then go and settle the strike without the sanction of the great mass who were on strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think it was stated here this morning that that meeting was broken up by one of your organizers or speakers.

Mr. LESSIG. Well, that statement was incorrect in this way: They stated that we had come down there for the evident purpose of breaking the meeting up. That was not true. We had advised the people to keep away, but they insisted they were going to go there to hear, and when we got up there, when they got up, they could not get any semblance of order and they requested our organizer at the time to get up on the platform and get the crowd to order for them, and when he got up on the platform he did get order, but he asked them in the meantime, "Will you give us a hearing," and they said, "No; you can't be heard here." And he notified the crowd to that effect, with the result that they all marched out of the hall with the exception of probably a thousand or two who stayed to linger and really did, perhaps, to some extent, interrupt the meeting.

Commissioner COMMONS. What is the issue between your organization and the United Textile Workers?

Mr. LESSIG. The only issue is in the form of organization. We believe in one big union, and they believe in dividing the workers up into various crafts—and I believe that is, well, not the principal reason.

Mr. THOMPSON. But still they provide for organizing everybody in a short time into different locals of the same general organization.

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir; but that does not agree with our idea of organization. We say that where there is an injury to one there is an injury to all.

Commissioner COMMONS. They have a local, say, of loom fixers, weavers, twisters, and all the way down. You would not distinguish between them? You would have the loom fixers in the same room with the weavers?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Is that the way you conduct all your meetings, then, have them all together?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir; we tell them an injury to one is an injury to all; that one branch can not expect to better its condition at the injury to another branch, and they simply resolve themselves into jurisdictional quarrels.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you find that the Italians and Jews are difficult to organize and keep in an organization?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, to a certain extent they are, for the reason they are unfamiliar with the language, and it is the fear of losing their job; job cowardice. They are not so familiar with the language to go around and ask for jobs at different places, and the bosses make every attempt to crush any effort or attempt at organization. They simply stick to and won't allow it to exist if they can possibly help it.

Commissioner COMMONS. Why do you say that the police attacked the Italians and Jewish people more than other nationalities?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, every one blamed it on the Jews and Italians for having been responsible for the strike. The year before there had been a strike and they called it a Jew strike, and last year they called it an Italian strike.

Commissioner COMMONS. What proportion of your membership here are English speaking?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, about 10 per cent; that is about all there is, 10 per cent English speaking.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you have speakers for each of the languages?

Mr. LESSIG. As near as we could get them. Of course, we had never had any Roumanians or Syrians; once we had a Syrian, I believe, or a Roumanian.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you find as a matter of fact that English speaking and the skilled trades, work together in the same organization, cooperate, in your organization? You say you believe in one big union, all meeting together and doing business together?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you find they work together?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we believe they can be made to harmonize when they understand.

Commissioner COMMONS. You are a weaver, I believe?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you find that the Italians and the other weavers work together with English-speaking weavers?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, they work together. You will find different nationalities line up, one alongside of the other, mixed and jumbled together—Jew, Italian, German, Polack, Austrian, Syrian, Roumanian, Irish, English, they all look alike.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you have any policy of making any agreements with the employers?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, we have come to the conclusion that it was not good policy to make an agreement, because they would not keep it anyway.

Commissioner COMMONS. That is your only reason, is it?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, principally. We don't believe we ought to have our hands tied. We believe we ought to be free to take advantage of every opportunity, the same as he does.

Commissioner COMMONS. Is your reasoning like that which the loom fixers have? They make no agreement—is it a similar reasoning?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, the loom fixer seems to occupy for the present time a little position of advantage, and if some fellow will offer him a dollar or two a week more, he will drop this fellow and go some place else and get it. If the employer can get some one to take his place it is all right. But he practically tells him, "Give me the money and I will stay here."

Commissioner COMMONS. What is the difference between their agreements or their attitude toward agreements and yours?

Mr. LESSIG. In some cases they sign agreements; like the one they signed up in Henry Doherty's, the textile workers. At any rate, they are one of the organization.

Commissioner COMMONS. They signed an agreement for the loom fixers?

Mr. LESSIG. I don't know whether the loom fixers took part, but the United Textile Workers, with which they are affiliated, signed that agreement.

Commissioner COMMONS. That covered the weavers?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. You stand opposed to such an agreement covering the weavers?

Mr. LESSIG. Positively.

Commissioner COMMONS. Would you expect to get an employer to give you the conditions that you ask for unless he has some understanding that you will furnish him work steadily as long as the agreement lasts? How can he afford to make any agreement with you at all if you take that position?

Mr. LESSIG. How does he do now when he has no organization in his place? He never knows whether he is going to have a walkout or not, when he has no organization.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you know if he has an organized shop that stays during the period of the agreement?

Mr. LESSIG. Not only that, but even if they had no agreement, if they were organized, the chances are they would try to arrive at some settlement before they would strike, whereas if there is no organization they simply have no choice in the matter but to strike first and demand afterwards. They are no—they have no choice. They are not allowed to organize.

Commissioner COMMONS. Then your position is that seeing that the loom fixers do not make any agreement, they can settle up their disputes with the employer before they strike, is that it? Now, if you could organize the shop you would do the same as the loom fixers do?

Mr. LESSIG. Perhaps I would; we might be able to at least have more order and system in organization. That is the reason why we have double the proposition in maintaining order and system.

Commissioner COMMONS. Because you do not have control over the shop?

Mr. LESSIG. That is the idea; you can not get it. As soon as the employer finds out that his workers are organized, he immediately begins to weed them out, and that frustrates all attempt. There is only one attempt to organize them, and that is to get them on strike and take the chance of organizing and winning.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you attach any importance to this point made by the employers, that the conditions are such, so much worse in Pennsylvania that they can not afford to give your demands here?

Mr. LESSIG. And they own the mills in Pennsylvania. They own annexes. Commissioner COMMONS. Well, they might move their entire businesses over to Pennsylvania.

Mr. LESSIG. Like the New England manufacturers moved them down South. Commissioner COMMONS. You attach no importance to that, do you?

Mr. LESSIG. Positively not.

Commissioner COMMONS. You say they could accept your demands and go ahead and do business here?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you think that the sole reason for refusing to accept your demands?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I have never heard it stated. They simply would make, give no other answer. There were various meetings that were called by the city officials for the purpose of trying to see if some settlement could not be brought about, and their only reply was they would have nothing to offer.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did you operate four looms?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I think I did operate four looms, but it was not called a four-loom job; it was called a two-loom job. About 10 or 12 years ago one man used to run one of those looms, and I was running two. They started there by putting in first two 24-loom; they started that, with a Jacquard, five or six shuttles. If that was not a four-loom job, I don't know what was.

Commissioner COMMONS. You refer to the more recent operation of putting on the cheaper work with the four looms in place of two. That was simply, as I understand it, a complicated kind of Jacquard loom, it was hard work?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, that is where they make the start. It is just as Mr. Doherty stated, you only start it on plain work, as an entering wedge, and there is no limit to what a man can do. We know that he got them up there, weavers came and gave me the list of goods they were making in there, and told me the weavers were lying down between the looms between 12 and 1 and trying to get some rest. That was the reason for the strike. It was a question of two looms at the four-loom price or quit.

Commissioner COMMONS. You consider running a loom, as a weaver, is very trying work?

Mr. LESSIG. Positively it is.

Commissioner COMMONS. In what way?

Mr. LESSIG. It is tedious work, and a man's nerve must be on the tense all day, and he has to be right there on the job with the work he does. First, we put on 15 inches wide, then 24 inches wide, and then 36, and now they run three thirty-sixes in one loom. Some, they have two thirty-sixes, and now they are going to give them four 36-inch looms. They have doubled up in the work in every way, and to no advantage to the weaver.

Commissioner COMMONS. Have not the looms been improved during this process of increasing the amount of work?

Mr. LESSIG. I have been weaving for the last 30 years, and I have seen little improvement in the loom since 1880. Stop motion on the outside if the thread breaks out it has been the only great one.

Commissioner COMMONS. Isn't that a very great one? It stops a machine as soon as the thread breaks.

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir; but in some of the looms you can not use that. It interferes with the fabric.

Commissioner COMMONS. You say, then, that the intensity of the work, the hardship of the work, has greatly increased, do you?

Mr. LESSIG. It is a sure thing that a man can not do two things as easy as he can do one. Twice the amount of work that his father or forefather did 25 or 30 years ago; you do twice the amount. They used to run one loom; now they are running two, three, four.

Commissioner COMMONS. What wages did you get as a skilled man, when you called yourself a skilled man 30 years ago?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, I was not working in the silk then; I was working in cotton.

Commissioner COMMONS. Go back to when you started on silk.

Mr. LESSIG. I never became a weaver until I was probably twenty-odd years old, but I was working around the mills all the time.

Commissioner COMMONS. How long ago since you started silk weaving?

Mr. LESSIG. I came to Paterson in 1902.

Commissioner COMMONS. What were you earning then, in 1902?

Mr. LESSIG. I guess about the same as last year. There wasn't much difference.

Commissioner COMMONS. What were the earnings by weeks?

Mr. LESSIG. I used to average \$13.50 or \$14 a week.

Commissioner COMMONS. On broad silk?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. What did you average prior to this strike?

Mr. LESSIG. I believe the last six months I had figured it out and found I run a little above the average, probably \$1.

Commissioner COMMONS. About \$13.50?

Mr. LESSIG. About \$14.50; but then I had bigger and heavier jobs.

Commissioner COMMONS. So that in 10 years your wages increased about \$1 a week?

Mr. LESSIG. If you say increased; I was doing much more work.

Commissioner COMMONS. You say the work was doubled, but I want the wages.

Mr. LESSIG. About \$1.

Commissioner COMMONS. You claimed you worked double, and yet are increased \$1?

Mr. LESSIG. Not much more; only about a dollar.

Commissioner COMMONS. Only about a dollar?

Mr. LESSIG. That is all.

Commissioner COMMONS. At that time you were running one loom, were you?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Now, at this time, how many were you running?

Mr. LESSIG. Two.

Commissioner COMMONS. You were running two looms?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Those two were automatic?

Mr. LESSIG. No, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. What?

Mr. LESSIG. No, sir; the same kind of a loom.

Commissioner COMMONS. The same loom?

Mr. LESSIG. The same loom.

Commissioner COMMONS. Was it the same kind of goods? The same quality?

Mr. LESSIG. Practically the same class of fabric.

Commissioner COMMONS. The same fabric?

Mr. LESSIG. Practically the same.

Commissioner COMMONS. Was there any difference in the size of the cloth as it went through; the same picks?

Mr. LESSIG. No, sir. I think it has run about pretty near uniform, same number of picks and same grade of goods.

Commissioner COMMONS. What firm did you work for 10 years ago?

Mr. LESSIG. I think 10 years ago about this time I believe I was working for a firm known as Barstow, McCollum & Post, and they were making plain goods.

Commissioner COMMONS. That is where you were getting that amount of wages?

Mr. LESSIG. About that, I judge.

Commissioner COMMONS. What firm were you working for just before the strike?

Mr. LESSIG. Benjamin E. David.

Commissioner COMMONS. And the work on the two kinds of work was practically the same?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, no. There is quite a big difference between one and the other.

Commissioner COMMONS. I mean the kind of work and on the machine was practically the same?

Mr. LESSIG. No, sir. Two different styles of loom. One plain loom and the other was a box, with three or four shuttles on each side, box raises up and closes down in order to let the different colors go through to make stripes.

Commissioner COMMONS. You could turn out twice the output and had to work twice as hard?

Mr. LESSIG. If you run one to-day and run two the next, you must do twice the same amount of work.

Commissioner COMMONS. It may mean the machine has to do too much work?

Mr. LESSIG. You have one running in front of you and one running in back of you and you have to watch them both. If you work with one and watch it you can't at the same time be watching another one back of you.

Commissioner COMMONS. How did the employers ever get you to the point where they forced you to run two looms where you formerly had been running one?

Mr. LESSIG. By the same methods and process Mr. Doherty is using to-day, by appealing to the hungeriness of the worker and making him believe that he is always going to continue on making that amount of money, but letting him make \$10 or \$15 a week more for a short period and after awhile when the streets are full here weave 4 yards for the same price as they are weaving two to-day. And when he stated he was paying six and a half he was paying six and a half, he had reduced the price of 10 cents down to five and a half and then put it up again to six and a half. He wants to tell the truth.

Commissioner COMMONS. You say he did that at the same time without having to put in any substantial improvements in the machinery?

Mr. LESSIG. Not materially worth considering.

Commissioner COMMONS. That is all.

Chairman WALSH. Where were you born, Mr. Lessig?

Mr. LESSIG. I was born in Philadelphia.

Chairman WALSH. How long have you lived in Paterson?

Mr. LESSIG. I came to Paterson, I believe, in the fall of 1902.

Chairman WALSH. Have you a family and children?

Mr. LESSIG. Only a wife.

Chairman WALSH. No children?

Mr. LESSIG. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. How long was the grand jury in session, if you know, during the time the strike was in progress?

Mr. LESSIG. I believe the grand jury was in session all the time, if I am not mistaken.

Chairman WALSH. Were there any members of your organization upon the grand jury?

Mr. LESSIG. Oh, no.

Chairman WALSH. Were there any of the men who had been working in the mills, but who had gone out on strike, on the grand jury?

Mr. LESSIG. Not to my knowledge.

Chairman WALSH. Were there any members of your organization on any of the petit juries that tried those cases in any of the courts?

Mr. LESSIG. Not that I remember. I don't remember having seen any, and I was up there at those trials.

Chairman WALSH. Is there any statement that you wish to volunteer to the commission, touching upon the industrial situation in Paterson, what might or might not be causes of industrial unrest? Or do you desire to amplify or explain your testimony heretofore given in any way? If you do, you may do it now.

Mr. LESSIG. I don't think I have anything further, outside of which I stated that the cause of the strike was overwork and underpay. I am positive that if all those weavers were making \$25 a week I don't know of any silver-tongued orators that could have brought them out on strike on the 25th day of February.

Commissioner LENNON. Mr. Lessig, I have read in a number of publications, alleged to have come from people that you represent—the organization that you represent—the silk manufactures in some instances, at any rate, in and about Paterson, was made of a considerable part of other material than silk. Is that true? Is any such statement warranted?

Mr. LESSIG. I only know what from the other dyers who worked there stated, that they adulterated it with different ingredients, what they called dynamite, iron, red iron.

Commissioner LENNON. You have no knowledge of the matter yourself?

Mr. LESSIG. They themselves admitted that they used what it contained. They tried to justify it because the customers wanted it.

Commissioner LENNON. You mean the employers admitted the statement?

Mr. LESSIG. That they adulterated the silk. They got 3 pounds back when they sent a pound to be dyed.

Commissioner LENNON. What does adulteration mean?

Mr. LESSIG. Adulteration of silk simply means they send a pound of silk to the dyehouse. If it is dyed, it means they won't get more than a pound back, and you may lose; but if they send back 2 pounds or 2½ pounds or 3 pounds, it means that they have added something to make that silk heavier.

Commissioner LENNON. Does that add to the appearance so that a customer in buying would prefer that to the silk that had been dyed without any such adulteration?

Mr. LESSIG. Well, it is about the case, some one, if you go into a cotton-cloth mill, and when the cotton comes off the loom it is very fine, but after it has been sized and weighted it makes it feel quite—about twice as heavy. A pure-dye silk is very fine, but when you get it with adulteration you think you have got about three times the amount of silk, but when you hang it in the closet for about three months there is ribbon left instead of broad silk.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Have you published any pamphlets giving the cost of your strike?

Mr. LESSIG. No, sir.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. By voluntary receipts and otherwise?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. And expenditures?

Mr. LESSIG. Yes, sir.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Where the money went?

Mr. LESSIG. Not a clear itemized report, because it would have cost about \$1,200 to issue it.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Have you got anything in printed form or manuscript form that you could turn over to this commission?

Mr. LESSIG. We have the published accountant's report.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. In what shape is that? Is that just one record filed with you?

Mr. LESSIG. One report; he had gone over everything and found everything satisfactory and correct that we had spent.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Where is that?

Mr. LESSIG. That can be found, I believe, at the headquarters.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. In Chicago, headquarters in Chicago?

Mr. LESSIG. No, sir; here in Paterson.

Chairman WALSH. Are there any more questions?

(No response.)

Chairman WALSH. Call your next witness.

TESTIMONY OF MR. RUDOLPH KATZ.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will you please state your name, your business, and your residence?

Mr. KATZ. Rudolph Katz; Maywood, N. J.; organizer of the I. W. W. of Detroit.

Mr. THOMPSON. I didn't hear you, Mr. Katz.

Mr. KATZ. You will hear me presently. My residence is at Maywood, N. J.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is the Detroit I. W. W., as you call it here?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir; all over the country.

Mr. THOMPSON. When was that organized?

Mr. KATZ. The organization was organized in 1905, in the city of Chicago. There was only one at that time.

Mr. THOMPSON. You have heard what Mr. Lessig said as to the division between the two factions, haven't you?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Or groups?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is that a correct statement of that clause relating to political action?

Mr. KATZ. That is not all. The organization that I am affiliated with has to-day the same declaration of principles as the original organization did. That is, they were here not only to demand from Mr. Doherty not to have the four-loom system but they were here for the purpose of organizing the working class to get all they produce finally; that is, to wrest from the capitalistic class the possession of the machinery and the factories.

We take the stand that this can only be accomplished if the workers are organized both politically and economically; but if we repudiate political action at this stage we place ourselves in a position where we reject the civilized path of action. We are going to have the machines. We are either going to take them by force or we are going to take them when we have a majority at the ballot box. Our organization maintains that it is absolutely necessary, since we are an organization not like the American Federation of Labor, that claims to be looking out for a fair day's wage for a fair day's labor, since we want all the workers produce, we maintain we must call upon the workers to

organize politically to recognize the necessity of political action without indorsing any political party at this time.

Mr. THOMPSON. So far as the demand is good, pay the worker all he produces?

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. The two branches are in common?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And they are in common in the Socialist Party?

Mr. KATZ. Well—

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean on that point?

Mr. KATZ. Well, that is to be qualified, because the Socialist Party and the American Federation of Labor and the Chicago I. W. W. may to a very great extent want that. The American Federation of Labor and the Socialist Party are the obverse and reverse of the same medal; they are trimmers and politicians. That is all they are, of course, which I have documents here to substantiate, if you call upon me.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. What are the documents?

Mr. KATZ. Yes. Any point that I make I will be glad to show documents for. Chairman WALSH. Ask him what the documents are.

Mr. KATZ. I have documents as I go along on the various points. If I make any specific statement, I have the documents to leave with the commission.

Chairman WALSH. Indicate what the documents are, and then leave them without reading.

Mr. KATZ. I do not intend to read them.

Chairman WALSH. For instance, what they are—the name of the publication and the author of the article, the portion quoted?

Mr. KATZ. You spoke here this morning and this afternoon about the Doherty strike. I have here the Strike Bulletin which was published by the strikers when first the strike took place, which was in 1910—1911, rather, beginning on November 10. That was the first Doherty strike.

Can I continue?

Chairman WALSH. Yes.

Mr. KATZ. The strikers, then, had just left the American Federation of Labor for this reason: Mr. Doherty has himself stated, after building up that new mill in Lake View, tried to introduce the four-loom system. The men then belonged to the organization which Mr. Morgan is affiliated with, the American Federation of Labor, and when the four-loom system was introduced the officials of the American Federation of Labor rather sided in with Mr. Doherty. I was told by men who worked there that Mr. Golden came here and told them that the four-loom system indicated progress. They claimed in the New England States, that were running six and eight looms. The people did not look upon it in that manner. They called upon me. I was then the local organizer at what we—local organizer of the I. W. W. here—and we called a mass meeting, and they surrendered their own books to the I. W. W., which we also have in possession, and I could let the commission have some.

Chairman WALSH. Give us a sample.

Mr. KATZ. Then they made the demand for the four-loom system to be abolished. Mr. Doherty claimed he couldn't do that because of the fierce competition in Pennsylvania, and things looked rather threatening in the city—that there would be a general walkout. I was called before the board of trade in this city; and I believe we met in this building, if it was not in this hall, and they asked me what could be done to prevent this general unrest; that we could save Paterson and have prosperity in Paterson. I pointed out that the only thing to do would be to abolish the four-loom system here, establish a uniform minimum wage scale through the city, and if the wages here were somewhat higher than the rest of the States, like Pennsylvania, the thing to do was to have the men sent from here, from the union here, to those various places and raise them up to the better standard rather than to have the Paterson workers come down to the lower standard of Allentown and other places. I pointed out to the subcommittee of the board of trade—among whom was Dr. Hamilton, a minister of the gospel—pointing out that the morals of the workers out in those low-paying towns were far below Paterson, and asked him if he agreed with such conditions, and he turned his eyes toward the sky and said he did not.

Then I pointed out that the only thing to do would be to not come to the Pennsylvania standard but rather try and raise it. Mr. Doherty did not agree with us, and a strike was declared in the Doherty mill. The men walked out and the women on November 10, 1911. The loom fixers and twistere came out about

two months afterwards and stayed out several weeks; but were working underhandedly continually to have the bulk of the people return to work. That was overcome, until finally Mr. Doherty, who understands the business so far as the capitalists are concerned, succeeded in filling the shop with strike breakers.

And here I want to call your attention to a document in this Strike Bulletin, which was published at that time, that the police officials in that little town called Clifton were entirely controlled by Mr. Doherty. There is a statement there—persons are named who are at any time willing to give testimony under oath that they were arrested for standing in front of the mill without interfering with anyone, and Mr. Doherty's automobile was furnished to bring them to jail. Then this strike was practically lost; the shop was filled. The silk workers throughout the city were indignant, because they realized that Mr. Doherty runs four looms, and the four-loom system will reach them presently. A general strike movement was started. There were two strikes. I am speaking of the strike of 1912, with which I had all to do, but not with the last strike of 1913. That strike finally came about on about the 25th of February—the broad-silk workers alone. We did not have the other branches; simply the broad-silk workers, numbering about 7,000 or 8,000.

On the 25th of February they walked out of the mills, and it was not done in a disorderly plan. We had a plan according to which the men were advised to act. We had printed price lists. I will also leave one with the commission. That was the minimum scale; each committee in each shop, after walking out, were to go to the office and leave this price list with the firm, requesting they were to pay that rate. That was for the purpose of establishing a uniform scale, because Mr. Doherty claimed that the rest of the manufacturers were paying less, and the rest of the manufacturers were claiming that each of them paid more than the other; everyone of them made the same statement Mr. Doherty made this morning. So we wanted a uniform scale of prices. The committee told the firm in each place that they were wanting an answer by Monday, and every firm would grant the demand, then the workers in that mill would return to work wherever the demands were granted, wherever the minimum price list would be accepted. There were a few mills that accepted on the following Monday. In fact one was Cohen, who was the first one to break it. Within about five weeks—yes; four weeks—I think practically all broad-silk manufacturers acceded to our demands. The only trouble that arose was about the signing or the recognition of the union. They said they would not sign the price list, because it had the seal of the organization, and that they would sign nothing with the seal of the organization thereon. The rank and file of the members insisted upon them; I advised them against it. I have both the price list here with the seal of the organization, and one without, and we agreed that they would not have to sign anything with the organization whatsoever. All we wanted them to do was to agree to pay this list. We thought their word was as good as their written word; that didn't make any difference, seal or no seal. We made the point that we are not asking a recognition of the union by the bosses, as the American Federation of Labor. Some instances they have the check-off system. We want the workers recognized—the union—and if the workers do not, it is no union at all. It is simply a thing to be held together by the boss.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. You make contracts with the boss, don't you?

Mr. KATZ. No, sir.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Isn't that a contract?

Mr. KATZ. No, sir. This is not a contract. This is a minimum price list which is expected to be exhibited or posted up in a conspicuous place in the shop. This is not a contract binding for any length of time. This is an understanding simply that these wages are to be paid. A contract is a document that you go into with witnesses, seals, etc.

Now, Mr. Chairman, after these price lists were accepted by the manager or bosses the music began. It seems that though we had the best of them, because at that time they were rather busy, and they waited for an opportune moment to break their promise to pay this price, and they were assisted by a good many factors; in fact, by everybody except ourselves. There was the American Federation of Labor, who did its best to stab us in the back. There was Mr. Lessig's organization that did the same. They brought Haywood into the city, where there was no necessity for it. They claimed in New York before your commission that they butted into no strike, but they butted in here. I have the document here to show that. I have also the document to

show the answer we published. He said to Haywood, "If you come here from Lawrence to collect funds, we are willing to help you, but keep your hands off. We don't want none of your tactics; we don't want anything to do with you."

The bosses saw that: it was encouraging to them. Arrests were made that were not justified at all, because our organization that stands for peaceful acts, that repudiates every act of violence, I, as the spokesman of that organization at the mass meeting that we have held here in this city, told the people that we repudiated the acts of violence, that brutality will accomplish nothing; that if the people can not be gained through solidarity, that such methods as have taken place through the American Federation of Labor out West, by McNamara and Parks, would not bring any results to the working classes. In spite of all that, the police begun to act, after the bosses had begun to break their words, after a series of strikes had started, they began to arrest our pickets; and we selected a committee to see the city mayor. Mr. McBride said he would speak to the chief and see that no pickets are molested when the pickets are within their rights and limits. Thereupon we called upon the mayor again, and a conference was arranged between two members of the I. W. W., myself, and the chief of police and the city council.

Chairman WALSH. Mr. Katz, when you have reached a convenient place I would like you to stop, perhaps with your next answer, a logical spot, because we have to adjourn at 4 o'clock this afternoon. When you get to a convenient and logical place we will stop.

Mr. KATZ. I would then add this, Mr. Chairman, that this conference was held. At that conference it was agreed how many pickets were allowed—two or four—and we lived strictly up to that understanding. The next day those pickets were driven away. I went to complain to the chief of police about it, and the chief of police said that could not be. He called in the sergeant, who is dead now, and the sergeant said it was so. Then the chief of police told me I should go up there and see for myself how the pickets have been. When I did come up there, no more than got there, when the police officials, who were in the bosses' office, telephoned immediately for the patrol wagon. I was brought down to the building next door and railroaded to six months in jail without any trial, practically speaking.

I want to end there, and if you will give me the opportunity I will speak to-morrow.

These are the price lists that we presented to the bosses.

(Which were accordingly marked "Katz Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2.")

Katz Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2, circular price lists, were submitted in printed form.)

These six documents are Strike Bulletins published by the striking weavers of the Henry Doherty Silk Co.

(Which were marked "Katz Exhibits 3 to 8," inclusive.)

Katz Exhibits Nos. 3 to 8 were copies of the Strike Bulletin (published at Paterson, N. J., by striking weavers of Henry Doherty Silk Co.), dated January 13, 1911; January 27, 1911; November 25, 1911; December 2, 1911; December 9, 1911; and December 16, 1911.)

Chairman WALSH. The commission will stand adjourned until 10.30 o'clock a. m. sharp.

(Thereupon, at 4 o'clock p. m., an adjournment was taken until June 16, 1914, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.)

PATERSON, N. J., June 16, 1914—10.30 a. m.

Present: Chairman Walsh, Commissioners O'Connell, Lennon, and Commons; also W. O. Thompson, counsel.

The stenographer notes the receipt of two copies of the Constitution and By-Laws of the Silk Loom Fixers and Twisters' Benevolent and Protective Association, which are marked "Morgan Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2," respectively.

(Morgan Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2 were submitted in printed form.)

TESTIMONY OF MR. RUDOLPH KATZ—Continued.

Mr. THOMPSON. You may proceed, Mr. Katz, where you left off last night and finish your statement.

Mr. KATZ. All right. I want to start by making good the promise I made yesterday in reference to the number of membership books of those who were

at work in the Doherty mill and who were organized previously to the first strike, but because dissatisfied with the four-loom system though advised by the officials of the American Federation of Labor to accept the four-loom system as progress. They repudiated that organization and adopted a resolution, which also I have a copy of and will give the secretary, and also a number of the due books.

(Received and marked "Katz Exhibits Nos. 9 to 17," inclusive.

Katz Exhibits Nos. 9 to 17, copies of membership books, were submitted in printed form.)

Mr. KATZ (continuing). I left off yesterday with my arrest, and I set up the claim that that was prearranged by the city officials here to get me out of the way, and I was kept in jail until the strikers returned to work; then I was released.

Chairman WALSH. What length of time?

Mr. KATZ. Three months or nearly three months; maybe two days missing. My attorneys told me at that time that they would wait for Mr. Hughes to return, who was then both judge and a Member of the House of Representatives and who, having the reputation of being a labor Congressman, would be at least fair, I was told, but he did not return, and finally some one else was appointed in his place—Judge Martin. The matter came before him for review, and he decided that I must stay in jail. I insisted that my matter should come up before Judge Minturn, who seems to be at least an honest man, and finally the matter did come up before him—that is, when the strike was practically over—and I was released as soon as my matter was brought before him. The question was asked by Mr. Thompson of one of the witnesses if there was any feeling against the police that the violence was justified. I think that was asked of Mr. Lessig, and he did not answer that question at all. There certainly was a good cause for strong feeling to exist, and I will cite an instance:

When we conducted the strike of 1912 a number of pickets were arrested—not because they were violent. It was at Arohnson & Blun's—Messrs. Arohnson & Blun. So I may point out that the question of foreigners has been brought in; and I want to state in that connection before I go any further than the number of foreigners among the manufacturers, the percentage is much larger than among the workingmen. I believe that the number of foreigners among the manufacturers is about 99 per cent; among the workers it may be much less than that.

So Messrs. Arohnson & Blun, both Americans, were in the court room and were permitted to have a conference with Judge Carroll privately—not a public hearing—when those who were arrested for doing picket duty were brought up, and, without being given anything like a hearing—it was more a farce—they were sentenced to \$10 fine or 20 days in jail. Quite a number of men assembled in front of the police station here, and, since we did not want to give at no time the police officials an opportunity to club our men, I asked one of my assistants, Mr. Frank Young, of Detroit, to tell the crowd to go to headquarters and not to stay in front of the police station, which he did. He said, "Fellow workers, go to 184 Main Street." No more than he uttered these words and he was grabbed by a policeman and hustled into the court room, when court practically had been adjourned, and sentenced to three months, and he had to stay his full time. Peculiar to me that our lawyers didn't know of any way of getting him out, but he stayed there with me.

In order to show you still further the acts of the police here, Paterson has the reputation of being an anarchistic city, they tell me. Well, it begins with our city officials, from Mayor McBride down. We were to hold a mass meeting at one time, on the 1st of May, at Coles Hill, opposite the post office. We notified the chief. The chief told me I must come before the mayor. I did. The mayor was present, the chief of police, and the city counsel. They had me in a corner shaking their fists in my face. Mr. McBride is a much bigger man than I am, and there were three of them, and telling me all sorts of things; telling me that some time ago there were men who marched up Coles Hill who had red handkerchiefs on their backs. And I told him, "What has that to do with the rights of free assemblage?" "Well," the mayor said, "do you mean to tell me men will have the right to march there with red handkerchiefs in the face of law and order, and all that thing?" And I said, "Well, they did nothing against the law. You must proceed against them lawfully when they violate any law." "Law or no law, I will not allow that," said the mayor. Well, I knew we were in the right, but in order to avoid any bloodshed I advised our men not to meet there, although the meeting had been already arranged. I came to Coles Hill and told them to go to our meeting hall.

Some time after, during the strike, we were going to have a meeting in Turn Hall, and again the chief instructed the owner of that hall not to let us have the hall. I went to see the chief about it, and I says, "How is it that you would not let us have the hall?" "Well," he said, "there may be trouble," and all sorts of excuses. Finally I said, "If you don't allow that man to open that hall we will hold the meeting in front of the city hall steps, come what may." The chief said, "Why don't you go to Coles Hill?" I said, "All right; we will go to Coles Hill; that is just as good." So, with him, he sends us from Coles Hill into the city hall, and when we went to hold a meeting in front of city hall he sends us to Coles Hill.

When the first strike was won, that I mentioned here yesterday, when practically all the silk manufacturers in the broad-silk line in the city, with the exception of Mr. Henry Doherty and his son, granted the price lists that we asked—the minimum price list—we thought the time had come, and arranged a mass meeting with a parade, and we applied to the chief of police. "Well," he said, "I will have to lay that before the police commissioners." So I came before the police commissioners. No; it was not allowed. We were not allowed to parade. It happens in this city that Barnum & Bailey's circus comes every year once; they have a parade. The elephants and the rest of the menagerie, including the mules of Barnum's circus, can parade the streets of Paterson, but the workers who produce all the wealth are not permitted to do so. There are reasons why there is always a strong feeling among those who are active in the labor movement against the city officials. How can they explain that the city officials will allow the mules to parade the streets of Paterson and the workers not, unless it was due to some affinity between those two species? The feeling was very strong.

I have up to now, Mr. Chairman, just skimmed the surface. At the time that the strike started here—

Chairman WALSH. If you can make your statement of facts, I don't want to criticize you at all; but we have endeavored to hold these meetings without permitting characterizations of any kind, so that at least we shall produce no feeling. Your illustration is a very good one, and I am not criticizing any of your alleged facts or anything; but to compare mules and officials, you understand, makes for more feeling and more hatred; and we are simply trying to get along without any characterizations of any kind. If one of those officials should come in and attempt to characterize your position, I would be compelled to say the same thing.

Make your statement of facts, please.

Mr. KATZ. I have simply skimmed the surface; there is so much to say.

At the time this strike started—and we were partly successful—the workers in the silk industry in Hudson County, numbering about 10,000, applied to us. A mass meeting was called and the same demands presented to all of the mills in Hudson County, and the demands were granted within three days. We had a good deal of opposition on the one hand from the A. F. of L., and on the other from the Chicago faction, who felt that the matter was slipping out of their hands; but in spite of that we succeeded in having the united front and winning the fight.

In Plainfield, Astoria, Long Island, in several mills in New York City, in Summit, and all over north New Jersey the same demands were made, and they were granted for the time being. Of course, after a while the bosses took them back again. Not only here, but—this is very important—when the Doherty strikers were out, and when Mr. Doherty was so obstinate and said he couldn't grant the demands, and that he would not, I said this to the committee, they should go back to Mr. Doherty and tell him that, in view of the fact that Mr. Doherty claims that he is paying more than any other firm in the city, that we pledge ourselves, if he abolishes the four-loom system, that if any manufacturer pays less than he does that within three months from date we would see to it that the wages would be raised to his standard, provided that he pays more—but he did not—than the Pennsylvania people, or in any other place in the city, and within six months to raise the prices also in the State of Pennsylvania, which is the bone of contention where these broad-silk mills are, where this cheap work is said to be done.

While we make a success here I must go to Easton, Pa.; and we had a similar strike there. They worked there 59 hours per week; here we worked only 54, 55; there they worked 59—they worked on Saturday afternoon. We made a demand that the workers have a raise from 7 to 15 per cent and a reduction in the hours of labor. That was granted within one day, and the men went back to work.

In spite of all opposition that we had to contend with from the Socialist Party, from the American Federation of Labor, from the Chicago organization, etc., then came the biggest strike of all, which was the strike in Passaic.

I have some documents here that I will leave with the commission, Mr. Chairman, showing the wages there and some photographs of the existing conditions. There is a mill in Passaic there—the Botany mill——

Chairman WALSH. Will you please just briefly describe those documents so that the stenographer can take them?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir. It is a poster. I will have it out in a minute.

Chairman WALSH. If they are too voluminous, you can give the identification mark that is on the package; but I would rather have them specified.

Mr. KATZ. Wages paid and the hours of work.

(Document was marked "Katz Exhibit No. 18, of June 16, 1914.")

Katz Exhibit No. 18, poster, was submitted in printed form.)

Mr. KATZ. The Botany mill, in Passaic—there is no place in the United States of America or the Chinese Empire where the wages are lower in comparison with the amount of work produced.

Chairman WALSH. Are the wages shown on that document?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir; and the hours of labor. And it has been impossible up to that time to ever arouse the people—mostly women—to action, to have them make a demand for higher wages. The Botany mills are the wealthiest concern in these parts.

Finally they did come out—I can not say how many, but we were practically overwhelmed with applications for membership, and the strike was conducted in an exemplary way; there was no interference, and the police there did not bother so much until Haywood appeared on the scene.

Chairman WALSH. Until who appeared?

Mr. KATZ. Until Haywood appeared and butted in on us.

Commissioner COMMONS. What year was this, please?

Mr. KATZ. 1912.

Chairman WALSH. Generally speaking, was there violence in that strike?

Mr. KATZ. Not in our strike; no, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Any persons hurt on either side?

Mr. KATZ. There was not a black eye made. The only fight in Paterson was where two policemen got into an argument.

Chairman WALSH. I was referring really to this other place.

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir. After Haywood appeared on the scene—and here I also have a document in that connection; if you will permit me, Mr. Chairman, I will make a statement that may not seem in place, yet it is very important.

At that time it was closely before the election of the Senator from this State, Mr. Smith, of Newark; he saw an opportunity to score one against a Wilson candidate, and he was trying to engineer matters in such a way that Gov. Wilson, the present President, should be compelled to call out the militia, and the Newark Star, its reporter, came into the town of Passaic, and although we had the matter in full control, they gave the other side such prominence that it looked as though we were divided, where practically we were not divided at all. Here is a picture taken out of the Newark Star, reprinted in our paper, where a group of those leaders are standing, and alongside of Haywood stands one who was admittedly a member of a detective agency, of the O'Brien Detective Agency, of Newark, a fellow by the name of Frank Domo. There were deputies brought in and some heads were broken in Garfield.

(A document was received and marked "Exhibit Katz No. 19, June 16, 1914.")

Katz Exhibit No. 19 is a copy of the Daily People, dated New York, April 9, 1912.)

Mr. KATZ. The people had no experience with organizations. When they saw the newspapers and all those who were opposed to us coming out, making the statement that there were two factions, and that they were the original I. W. W. and that they were the right I. W. W., and all that sort of thing, naturally the workers were discouraged; they were told to go back to work and they would call another strike where different methods were used, and the strike was lost there.

I have another document that I want to submit in this connection. There is the paper called the Passaic Issue—this is published April, 1912. This was at the time we were out on strike. Here is an article, "History of the strike," where they stated that 40,000 textile workers in Passaic, West Hoboken, etc., are out on strike, and admitted that they were led by our organization, because this was printed before Haywood appeared, but they have it headed all over

the paper, "Haywood puts Passaic on the map." When we approached them on that score they said they thought he was the stronger man, and all that sort of thing, although they had promised to help us, and, in fact, had an appeal in this paper for financial assistance for the strike.

Am I permitted to read that? It is short.

Chairman WALSH. If it is very short; but our rule is that documentary evidence should simply be identified.

Mr. KATZ. All right. They never turned a cent over to us, and when they approached the editor—there is a copy of the paper. He said they collected nothing. Shows it was not put in in good faith, and that they worked hand in hand with our enemies.

(Document marked "Katz Exhibit No. 20," dated June 16, 1914.

Katz Exhibit No. 20 is a copy of The Issue, dated Passaic, N. J., April, 1912.)

There is the resolution that I promised yesterday, or I think this morning. There is the resolution that was adopted at a meeting of the weavers of the Henry Doherty Silk Co. held at Institute Hall, 90 Market Street, November 6, 1911. They repudiated the American Federation of Labor and went out on a strike about the four loom.

(The paper referred to was marked "Exhibit No. 22, Witness Katz, June 16, 1914.")

Chairman WALSH. Have you a copy of the demand you made on the first Doherty strike?

Mr. KATZ. Well, the price list which I have submitted was practically the thing.

Now, I presume you would want to know—if you wish, I could also submit some evidence—these are letters written and signed by Woodrow Wilson, then governor of the State, in reference to the imprisonment of our men, and that he would investigate the matter.

(The papers here introduced were marked "Exhibit No. 23, Witness Katz, June 16," and are as follows:)

KATZ EXHIBIT NO. 23.

STATE OF NEW JERSEY,

Executive Department, June 9, 1912.

MY DEAR SIR: Allow me to acknowledge receipt of your letter of June 5 with its very important inclosure, namely, the resolutions adopted on Monday, June 3, at a mass meeting held at Turn Hall under the auspices of Local Union 25, Industrial Workers of the World, and to say that I shall take pleasure in investigating the circumstances set forth in the communication.

Very truly, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. ROBERT McLURE,
Paterson, N. J.

TRENTON, N. J., *July 16, 1912.*

MY DEAR SIR: Allow me to acknowledge receipt of your letter of yesterday and to say that it will give me pleasure to see the committee of your party who wish to consult me about the action of the authorities of the city of Paterson, and I would be glad for them to call on me at my office here in Trenton on Tuesday next, the 23d, early in the afternoon.

Cordially and sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. PAUL AUGUSTIN, *Secretary,*
New York City.

Mr. KATZ. Now, here is also a document, Mr. Chairman, in reference to the four-loom system that has been spoken of and a statement has been made by the manufacturers in regard to Pennsylvania prices paid, that we attempted to rectify that. We had a strike in the State of Pennsylvania at Lancaster and there are the official demands which I presume will be of interest to you.

(The paper here produced by the witness was marked "Exhibit 24, Witness Katz, June 16, 1914.")

Katz Exhibit No. 24 is a printed circular dated Lancaster, Pa., November 5, 1907, entitled "A Plain Statement of Facts and Conditions," relative to the strike of the silk workers in Stehli & Co.'s silk mill.

They have the four-loom system there; and while I am speaking about that I would like to say that the statement made by Mr. Doherty when he was asked here yesterday whether it was easy to operate four looms or not—now, I am not a weaver; I am a cigar maker; but I have come in contact with all these men, and I interview them—all of them—especially over in Lancaster, because the four-loom system was in effect over there. I was told by the girls who operated the four looms that their health was impaired because of the operation of the four looms. That they had spent a good deal of money for drugs, medicine, and doctors in order to keep up; and that any person who operates the four looms for any length of time, that his health would be ruined. There is also a document which I have in my possession which I am going to submit. I may not present it as it should be in a chronological order, but this will do, I guess—and that is in reference to the position of the city officials of Paterson.

(The document here produced was marked "Exhibit No. 25, Witness Katz, June 16, 1914.")

Katz Exhibit No. 25, circular entitled "A Warning," issued by order of the Paterson Industrial Council and Silk Workers' Industrial Union, Local No. 152, I. W. W., was submitted in printed form.)

Something has been said relative to the two organizations. When the two organizations parted in convention in Chicago in 1907 we, in this city, stood with the organization that was originally formed, at our headquarters at 184 Main Street, had there about 500 chairs, several desks, and other things. One night—on the 22d of December, 1908—the furniture and everything in that hall was removed. I came there the next morning and there was nothing left in the hall but the whitewash on the walls. I inquired and found, by men who were witnesses, who the men were that took this stuff. They were the fellows belonging to the other organization, who had no connection with us at all, who were expelled sometime previous; and it was a theft pure and simple. I went to the district attorney, and he told me that it was a civil case. We then went into the civil courts, and I found that we got the same deal there. The judge, Judge Lewis, in the municipal court, decided in our favor, but he took about 12 months to decide, so that the furniture that had been stored in a storage house—the Fidelity storage house—the rent for the furniture amounted to really what the whole thing was worth. And there is a document which was published by the organization at that time signed by myself and Mr. William Glanz, who is now in the Socialist Party, relative to that matter.

(The paper here introduced was marked "Exhibit No. 26, Witness Katz, June 16, 1914.")

(The document referred to was submitted in printed form.)

I have documents here also, our constitution, including the preliminary organization, and there is our original constitution of the I. W. W. adopted in Chicago in 1905.

(The pamphlet here introduced was marked "Exhibit No. 27, Witness Katz, June 16, 1914.")

Katz Exhibit No. 27, "Constitution and By-Laws of the Industrial Workers of the World," adopted at Chicago, 1905, was submitted in printed form.)

You will find a preamble and declaration of principles which are identically the same, and now this document is the manifesto which called the organization into being and which also stands by the same principles.

(The paper last offered in evidence was marked "Exhibit No. 28, Witness Katz, June 16, 1914.")

Katz Exhibit No. 28, circular "Manifesto—to the Workers of the World," issued by conference of industrial unionists at Chicago, January 2, '3, and 4, 1905, was submitted in printed form.)

I come now to the lost strike, which took place here in 1913, but before I do that I want to place in your hands also, a financial statement of all the receipts and expenditures of the strike conducted by us in 1912, if you care to have that.

(The paper here introduced was marked "Exhibit No. 29, Witness Katz, June 16, 1914.")

Chairman WALSH. Now, have you a copy of the demand made in writing by the shop committee in these various shops in the strike of 1913?

Mr. KATZ. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Have you any publication there which purports to contain those demands?

Mr. KATZ. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. They are not in the manifesto?

Mr. KATZ. No, sir; the manifesto is the one that was used in calling the I. W. W. into being. I want to state that with that strike I had no connection whatsoever. Now, I have here a document which is a statement by our organization to the public at large when the second strike started. Now, if you want me to I will read it; if not I will submit it with the rest of your documents.

Chairman WALSH. Just submit it.

(The paper was marked "Exhibit No. 30, Witness Katz, June 16, 1914.")

The document referred to was submitted in printed form.)

Mr. KATZ. That shows our position, and that we did not antagonize the workers out on strike, and instructed all those who still remained members in our organization to remain out and to be the last ones to go to work. We wanted to demonstrate that above all we were concerned about the welfare of the working class regardless of any split that may exist in our ranks. And we collected a sum of money and paid to our strikers, as much as we could, \$2 or \$3 a week. We didn't have the money to pay more, but those who were the faithful ones that remained with our organization. We did not take the position as the other side did; that is, to butt in or criticize or in any way interfere. When we were conducting our strike they said our methods were not any good, that stronger methods must be used. Whereas we maintain that the best methods are to appeal to the workers' solidarity; that nothing could be gained by direct action or sabotage or violence or anything of that sort.

So this is all that I want to say, unless you have some questions to ask me.

Commissioner LENNON. I have a question or two.

Chairman WALSH. Commissioner Lennon would like to ask you some questions, Mr. Katz.

Commissioner LENNON. You spoke at one point about the operation of the four looms and its detrimental effects upon the workers. In the philosophy of your organization do you oppose the introduction into industry of improved machinery?

Mr. KATZ. No, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. Just explain your position.

Mr. KATZ. In contradistinction to the American Federation of Labor, Mr. Lennon, to which you belong, we do not oppose the introduction of improved machinery. I am a cigar maker. In the constitution of the Cigar Makers' International Union there is a clause that cigars manufactured in a place where machinery is employed can not bear the union label. That, of course, is a reactionary position. But, as you heard testified here yesterday, the improvement upon these looms exists only in the mind of Mr. Doherty. There has been practically no improvement made upon the loom. You must take each case for itself. If a machine is invented that actually makes it possible for an individual to operate two machines where he formerly operated only one, why, we could not step in the path of progress; but where there has been practically no improvement at all, or only such slight improvement as is the case in the instance before us, why, it is not a question to say that on general principles we would be opposed to the improved machinery. On general principles we are in favor of improved machinery; but there is no improved machinery here, and, moreover, four looms, improved or not improved, is inhuman.

Commissioner LENNON. I want to say, for your information, though not pertinent perhaps to the record, that I do not belong to any school that is opposed to the introduction of improved machinery.

Mr. KATZ. Well, the American Federation of Labor does.

Commissioner LENNON. In your testimony you spoke of the interference of the city officials and the police with the strike—more with the strikers than, you said, directly with the strike, but with the strikers.

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Commissioner LENNON. What would you propose as a remedy for that situation?

Mr. KATZ. What would I propose?

Commissioner LENNON. Yes.

Mr. KATZ. My remedy for that would be very radical. My remedy would be to suspend the political state of capital and establish a socialistic republic—the only remedy.

Commissioner LENNON. Then, you believe in the Socialist philosophy?

Mr. KATZ. Oh, yes; but not that of the Socialist Party.

Commissioner LENNON. Will you tell us in what way the American Federation of Labor interfered with the strike in this city or any of the strikes in this city?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir. In the strike in Henry Doherty, when the men and women went on strike first; that is, in November 10, 1911, the loom fixers and twisters' union, alone, a member of the American Federation of Labor did not go out. I mean not when our people came out, but they went out later, because the feeling in the city was so strong that they actually were compelled to come out because of the feeling with the other silk workers, and there was really a danger that if they would not come out that the silk workers in other mills would refuse to work with them. And here I may state that if I made one mistake in that strike it was that after the American Federation of Labor took a hostile attitude—I mean the loom fixers toward the four-loom strikers—we should have advised our men not to work with any members of the American Federation of Labor; I mean the loom fixers' union in any of the mills. They remained on strike for a while. That was because they were compelled to. That did not last long. They came to most every meeting of the strikers. Mr. Morgan, whom I saw here yesterday, was the most prominent one. And they said to the strikers that they should go back to work; that Mr. Doherty don't want them to work four looms. If every man should work four looms, it was left with him, with every individual. In other words, they discouraged the strikers.

Commissioner LENNON. Then you mean by interference that some of the affiliated unions of the A. F. of L. did not cooperate with you as you thought they should in the contest?

Mr. KATZ. Not only that, Mr. Lennon, they did not only not cooperate with us, but they cooperated with the bosses and Mr. Doherty.

Commissioner LENNON. And you hold the American Federation of Labor responsible for such action?

Mr. KATZ. I do.

Commissioner LENNON. Do you belong to the Cigar Makers' International Union?

Mr. KATZ. No, sir. I belong to the I. W. W.

Commissioner LENNON. Have you ever belonged to the cigar makers' union?

Mr. KATZ. I did for 12 years.

Commissioner LENNON. Yes; I know. You don't remember me, but I have known you. That is all.

Chairman WALSH. Have you any questions, Prof. Commons?

Commissioner COMMONS. I think you said that your principles agreed with the Chicago branch in all matters except political action?

Mr. KATZ. Well, no; you misunderstood me. I said that that was the principal point; all the rest flows from that. A body like ours, that stands for revolution—we are not reformers—if we don't want to have our movement be a conspiracy must recognize the necessity of political action. We know that in this country we have a certain amount of political freedom. Our opponents from the Chicago I. W. W. say that the ballot is a gift of the capitalist class. We say that the ballot is a conquest of civilization and we are going to use it. Now, a body that repudiates the ballot naturally has to take something else; and from that develops their difference, such as sabotage and direct action.

Now, the American Federation of Labor does not preach sabotage, but it practices sabotage; and the Chicago I. W. W. preaches sabotage, but does not practice it, as they themselves have testified. But we are opposed to taking that position, because we think it is a remnant of barbarism. We know. This is the argument that we meet with: Well, don't the capitalists steal? Yes. Don't the capitalists cheat? Yes. Don't the capitalists commit murder? Yes. But that is no reason that we are going to stoop down to the position that the capitalist class takes. We know that the hands of the capitalists are red with the workers' blood; but we will not take that position. We want to take the position of civilized human beings, and we want to do all we can to solve this question peacefully.

There is a paper published in this city, and yellow journalism has made as much progress in Paterson as Mr. Doherty's four looms. I made certain statements here yesterday and they are twisted in this paper. They say we are going to take things by force, but the position that we take is, that if we have the majority and the capitalists, officials, who count the ballot will refuse to count us in—well, then there will be a scrap. But we are going to test the peaceful method first. In former years when two men met each other they

did not argue, they hit each other's noses. Civilized people don't do that. And from that flows this scripture of sabotage and direct action, so-called. There is no direct action about it; it is the most indirect action imaginable.

Commissioner COMMONS Then your position is political rather than anarchistic?

Mr. KATZ. Why, most decidedly.

Commissioner COMMONS. Well, then, how do you differ from the political Socialists?

Mr. KATZ. Why, in this wise: I have made the statement here that the American Federation of Labor and the Socialist Party are the obverse and the inverse of the same matters; but the Chicago I. W. W. is the American Federation of Labor painted red. They are both "pure and simple"—this phrase, Mr. Commons, it originated with Mr. Gompers, at a convention where I was present. Mr. Gompers declared, "We are trade-unionists pure and simple; that is, we have nothing to do with political movements."

On the other hand, these political Socialists again declare that they are for the political movement "pure and simple," as your own Mr. Berger, of your own State—I believe you come from Wisconsin—stands for. So that while one stands on the left leg, the other stands on the right leg; but they both stand on one leg, and in that way resemble each other very much; whereas our organization recognizes the necessity of political action for the purpose of enabling this movement not to be reduced to a conspiracy, so that we can preach the revolution in the open, on the street corner, without having to deny anything. I come here and I have nothing to deny, nothing to hedge about. We don't stand on a banana peel. We know where we stand, and on what we stand. We stand upon our own ground, and we can face any court of inquiry.

Our meetings are open meetings; anyone can come in. If they send any detectives to our meeting, they will find they have nothing to do there. So that while it may seem, for instance, that the American Federation of Labor is opposing the Socialist Party, that was only a comedy that you had in New York between Mr. Hillquit and Mr. Gompers. Why, they are Siamese twins. They are one and the same thing. The fact is that we are the only organization, small as we are numerically, that takes this stand: That we must have the political movement for the purpose of destroying the political power of the capitalist class. But getting the political power, we can not build anything political; whatever we are to build, we must build on the industrial field.

And to build, the I. W. W., or Industrial Workers of the World, as we understand the situation, the policy is to lay in this capitalist society the foundation for the future republic of labor, and to organize the workers in various industries, and control and to drill them for the purpose of producing wealth, so that, in contradistinction to the Chicago I. W. W., who preach the general strike, we are not in favor of the general strike, because the general strike is not a revolutionary measure.

Where people go out on strike they turn the keys of the factory over to men like Mr. Doherty. What we advocate is a general lockout. When we have the workers organized politically and economically, we will not have a general strike; we will have a general lockout, and the bosses will be locked out, and we will stay in the mills and keep the mills.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you say that Mr. Haywood came here in 1912 at the Passaic strike?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. What is the justification or the ground for your statement that violence began after his coming?

Mr. KATZ. As matter of fact.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did he have anything to do with it, directing it?

Mr. KATZ. Well, when a man uses that language that these people used, it naturally gives these people a handle. If the police of Paterson who were really responsible for the big strike here, no one else, had acted sensibly and given the people the rights that they were entitled to, not acted in the manner as they did, things would have turned out differently; perhaps better for the workers.

Commissioner COMMONS. I believe you stated that you were arrested. Was that before Mr. Haywood was here; was it before he came, or was it after he came?

Mr. KATZ. Mr. Haywood came here on March 7. I have the bills here, also. I can show some of them.

(Received and marked "Katz Exhibit No. 30, dated June 16, 1914.")

Katz Exhibit No. 30, circular entitled "Statement by Local 25, Industrial Workers of the World, in Regard to the Strike Now in the City of Paterson—An Appeal for Aid," was submitted in printed form.)

Commissioner COMMONS. 1912?

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Commissioner COMMONS. And when were you arrested?

Mr. KATZ. There is something that you put me in mind of. I have an interesting document. It is the document that we published at the time, stating clearly to the public in Paterson our position, saying that if Haywood comes here to aid the Lawrence strikers, we are willing to give them whatever our larders afford, but if he comes here with any anarchistic or direct-action methods, we will have none of them. Here is the document. That is what Haywood gave out, and here is what we gave:

(Received and marked "Katz Exhibits Nos. 31 and 32," dated June 16, 1914.

Katz Exhibit No. 31 is a printed circular announcing mass meeting of silk workers, to be addressed by William D. Haywood, issued by order of Local 152, I. W. W. Katz Exhibit No. 32 is a newspaper clipping, dated New York, February 28, 1912, addressed to the working class of Paterson.)

Commissioner COMMONS. When were you arrested?

Mr. KATZ. The day after Decoration Day.

Commissioner COMMONS. He came in March and you were arrested the following May?

Mr. KATZ. Of course, my arrest had nothing to do with him; I was referring to the matter in Passaic. My arrest was simply a scheme concocted between the police, the mayor, Recorder Carroll, and the manufacturers' association. Of course, I can not prove that, but when we see the tail of a rat sticking out at one end and the snout at the other, we know it is not a chicken in there—it is a rat.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did you make any addresses to the strikers at that time?

Mr. KATZ. No, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. You were directing the strike, were you not?

Mr. KATZ. I was. You mean at the time I was arrested?

Commissioner COMMONS. Yes.

Mr. KATZ. No. The matter came about in this way: As I stated yesterday, some of our pickets were arrested, and since there was no evidence whatsoever I went with a committee to the chief of police, who sent me to the mayor, then the mayor arranged a conference between the chief of police, the city attorney, and he himself was to be there, but he was absent. There were several reporters there from the local papers. And we agreed then to how many pickets we were entitled to at each mill; that is, the mayor said that we had the right to walk in front of the mills, but not more than two at a time, so as not to create any obstruction of the traffic. Now, then, we sent four men to this big mill, the Rhinehardt mill on Clay Street, and they came back with the news that they were threatened with arrest if they did not leave. I went immediately to the chief and told him that, and he told me, "You go there yourself and find out if these men act the way they do; if they really do not obstruct the sidewalk."

I went up there the next morning to look over the field, to look over the picket lines. No more than I arrived on the scene, I was not there three minutes, but just walked up in front of the mill once, why, I heard the patrol wagon coming, so that they must have telephoned to the police before I got on to Clay Street.

Commissioner COMMONS. Had you spoken to your pickets prior to that time?

Mr. KATZ. No; there was only one man I shook hands with. I thought I remembered him to be a member of the union at one time. He was a Swede. And I shook hands with him and I said—Francis was his name—and I found out afterwards that he was at work in the mill, but I had no idea that he was, and had he been working in the mill I would have spoken to him anyway, but I did not know it. When I came into court there was Recorder Carroll. I was put in jail first; that is, not in the jail, but in the lockup, in the police station. This was 7 o'clock in the morning, and I insisted that I should telephone to my attorneys, Messrs. Ward & McGinnis. I was refused. At 10 o'clock I was brought into court, and my attorneys were not there, but one of their friends was, not an attorney—Mr. Smith was there. I insisted that my own attorneys be there, and finally Mr. McGinnis came. I insisted that my witnesses be given a chance. There were a lot of people in the neighborhood. It is in a place where people go to work in the mills. I insisted they be given a chance to bring them to tes-

tify as to what I did. The recorder did not allow it. It was not a trial. It was a farce. And the recorder sentenced me to six months in jail.

And there was another lawyer present who had sometimes acted as acting recorder. He sat behind the recorder. I made the statement to the judge that I went up there by the advice of the chief of police, and I heard this gentleman remark—his name is Benjamin Stein—I want to be perfectly aboveboard with everyone—he said, “Why, suppose the police chief would have told him to jump off the dock, would he do that?” That is the Paterson justice.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did you do anything to encourage the pickets when you went up there that morning?

Mr. KATZ. I did not see the pickets at all; they were afraid to come near, it seems, to return. I walked up by myself, all alone.

Commissioner COMMONS. When you were arrested, you were all alone?

Mr. KATZ. When I was arrested, I shook hands with Francis.

Commissioner COMMONS. That is the only man you saw?

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Commissioner COMMONS. You were not encouraging any of the pickets at the time?

Mr. KATZ. No; none whatsoever. I would have; if I had seen them I should have done that, but I had no opportunity; I did not see them.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. What is the membership of your faction of the I. W. W.?

Mr. KATZ. At the last convention the general secretary reported 11,000.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. How long has it been operating as a separate faction?

Mr. KATZ. Since the fourth convention of the I. W. W., in 1908; took place on the 17th of September, 1908.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. That is six years ago?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. The idea as represented by your faction of the I. W. W. is the idea as held out for some years by De Leon in connection with the organization that was replaced by the—

Mr. KATZ (interrupting). I must answer that De Leon—that would not be the proper way to answer that question. It was not De Leon—

Commissioner O'CONNELL (interrupting). Of the Labor Alliance, so-called, at that time, of which he was the father and advocate?

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. And the paper was published in the interests of the people at that time?

Mr. KATZ. Yes. The situation is this: I submitted here a manifesto which called this organization into being.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. I am not questioning about that.

Mr. KATZ. Our so-called faction is that faction.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. When that manifesto was drawn up, was not Mr. De Leon, Mr. Debs, and Mr. Haywood, and others at Chicago, party to drawing that up?

Mr. KATZ. Not Mr. De Leon personally, but De Leon was in accord with it. Commissioner O'CONNELL. They were all there present, and didn't they draw up that arrangement together?

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. These men that now you say are not what they appeared to be in representing the different parties?

Mr. KATZ. Exactly.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Does your organization publish an annual statement of its income and expenses?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Can you furnish this committee with a copy of your annual report?

Mr. KATZ. Not the receipts of the strike.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. That is the local strike?

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. I am talking about your international union?

Mr. KATZ. Yes; we publish it in the Industrial Union News, published at Detroit.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Those are published monthly?

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Showing the monthly receipts of your international organization?

Mr. KATZ. No; the receipts are published every three months, but published in the paper which is a monthly paper.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Will you see that the last quarterly report is furnished to this commission?

Mr. KATZ. Surely.

Chairman WALSH. Mr. Katz, what is the wage of the average weaver in the silk industry in Paterson of reasonable skill and ability, comparatively?

Mr. KATZ. You mean in the broad silk industry or the ribbon?

Chairman WALSH. The broad silk industry.

Mr. KATZ. Not more than \$8 under the most favorable conditions, taking in the time they work and the time they don't work, of course—

Chairman WALSH. For a year, I mean.

Mr. KATZ. About \$800.

Chairman WALSH. About \$800.

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Is the Doherty mill, about which testimony has been given here, above, below, or on the average with other mills with respect to wages?

Mr. KATZ. The nominal wage may be above; the relative wage is smaller.

Chairman WALSH. When you say the relative wage, do you mean the wage for all the year around?

Mr. KATZ. I mean the wage in comparison to the amount of silk turned out.

Chairman WALSH. Then, as a matter of fact, leaving the amount of production out of the question, do I understand you to say that the wages in the Doherty mill are far above the average?

Mr. KATZ. Not far above the average.

Chairman WALSH. Well, are they above the average?

Mr. KATZ. Well, if a man or a woman works at the four loom they naturally knock out a few more cents.

Chairman WALSH. I am trying to leave the philosophy out. I am trying to get down, if I can, to the actual amount collected by the workers. Is it more in the Doherty mill than it is in the other mills?

Mr. KATZ. Well, I don't believe that it is much more. It may be a trifle more nominally, but, as I said, they produce twice as much.

Chairman WALSH. Then, in establishing a ground or justification or basis for the wage under the present system of industry, you say that is not fair. I understand that.

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. But I am trying to get at the concrete amounts. Is it a fact that the all-the-year-around wage for a reasonably skillful worker in the Doherty mill, with the equipment they have there in turning out the amount they do turn out, is something over \$15 a week?

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. That is true?

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Has any effort, or are you aware of any effort having been made by any employer to submit to publicity their capitalization of the plant, the cost of their product, including everything, with a suggestion that they should take a percentage and divide the balance among the workers under an agreement made with the workers?

Mr. KATZ. Well, there were rumors as to that afloat.

Chairman WALSH. I am asking do you know of any proposition of that sort?

Mr. KATZ. No; I do not.

Chairman WALSH. None had ever been submitted to you of that sort?

Mr. KATZ. Not to me; no, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Had there been submitted to you—I ask this in a hypothetical form—

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Had there been submitted to you such a proposition with the added offer that the employer, it being a large mill, should accept 5 per cent as the basis of the profits based upon actual cost and real value of the property invested, or the property used and the investment, would that have been acceptable?

Mr. KATZ. No; that would have been rejected.

Chairman WALSH. It would have been rejected?

Mr. KATZ. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Now, am I correct in my information that the census of 1910 shows a population of 125,000 in the city of Paterson?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Approximately?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir.

Commissioner WALSH. How many adult males are there engaged in the silk industry, would you say, in Paterson, or were there in 1910, we will say?

Mr. KATZ. I would say between twenty and twenty-three or twenty-four thousand.

Chairman WALSH. And how many of those adult males are citizens in the full sense of the term, would you say? What proportion of them?

Mr. KATZ. That would be purely guesswork on my part, but I would judge, that is, my observation, certainly about two-thirds.

Chairman WALSH. Two-thirds?

Mr. KATZ. Or nearly so.

Chairman WALSH. Were there any of the men employed in the mills on the grand juries that met during the progress of this trouble?

Mr. KATZ. I could not say positively, but so far as the names of the grand jurors that were selected, and under my observation, there was not a single one.

Chairman WALSH. Well, were you observing it closely, the investigation being made into these industrial struggles?

Mr. KATZ. I was interested very much at certain times, and I could not find anyone there that would be a real wageworker working in the mills.

Chairman WALSH. When the appeal was taken from the lower court in your case, under the laws of New Jersey, you were then entitled to the right of a trial by jury, were you not?

Mr. KATZ. I was denied that. This is Jersey.

Chairman WALSH. I do not know what the laws are.

Mr. KATZ. I was told by my attorney that this was simply a question of fact; it was not a question of law.

Chairman WALSH. Well, under the laws of New Jersey, you never reached the time when you had a right to trial by jury?

Mr. KATZ. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Your case was appealed from the recorder's court to what court?

Mr. KATZ. To the court of common pleas, the county court.

Chairman WALSH. And did it end there?

Mr. KATZ. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. It was appealed, then, to what place?

Mr. KATZ. To the chief justice—not chief justice—Judge Minturn. But I know he is one of the highest courts in the State.

Chairman WALSH. In the State?

Mr. KATZ. In the State.

Chairman WALSH. Or in the county?

Mr. KATZ. In the State.

Chairman WALSH. And a written opinion was rendered in your case, was it?

Mr. KATZ. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. No written opinion?

Mr. KATZ. No, sir; it was just simply pigeonholed or something.

Chairman WALSH. I was going to ask you—was there any addition made to the regular police force of Paterson during the time of these industrial troubles?

Mr. KATZ. Not when our strike was on.

Chairman WALSH. Was there during the strike of 1913?

Mr. KATZ. Yes; I think there was.

Chairman WALSH. From where were the recruits drawn, if you know?

Mr. KATZ. I don't know.

Chairman WALSH. You say you think there were. You have no first-hand information, I take it?

Mr. KATZ. No.

Chairman WALSH. Did the mills have any private guards or persons in their employ during the time of the trouble?

Mr. KATZ. They did; yes.

Chairman WALSH. And do you know the number in your strike, what you call your strike, the first one?

Mr. KATZ. Well, in our strike they were not in Paterson; there were in Passaic, the O'Brien—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Confine it to Paterson. Were there such persons in the second strike?

Mr. KATZ. Well, there were. I could see a lot of people in the street, and I can generally tell one of the O'Brien detectives when I see him, and I saw a number of people walking the streets that looked to me like those fellows who take a job with a detective agency, and it does not require much to tell them.

Chairman WALSH. Have you any observation on the subject as to whether or not detectives were among the workers or employed in the mills at any time?

Mr. KATZ. It would be only my opinion, of course.

Chairman WALSH. You have no definite knowledge that you can give the commission on the subject?

Mr. KATZ. No, sir. Only on certain occasions I have made this positive observation—I can mention the name of the fellow. He is now a member of the city police force, I believe. If you care to hear it, his name is De Lucia. I believe he is either a detective or some other officer.

When I first came to Paterson in 1906 and became the local organizer—we only had one organization then—we were organizing the dye workers. In Weidman's dye shop, whenever we held a meeting it was held there, and the next day everyone who had attended the meeting was discharged. There was a fellow coming there who was always well dressed, and who always wanted to treat me, and I became suspicious. I spoke to our Italian fellow workers about him, and finally I asked him what he had to do with it. I thought he was a dye worker. He said no, he did not; he used to be a dye worker. He was so sore at Weidman and called him all sorts of names, and that was why he was against Weidman. Then he came to other meetings, until I became sure he was sent by the bosses. When he came to the next meeting at Turn Hall I happened to be in the chair and told him to leave. It did not take very long until I was told he had some kind of a job on the police force.

Chairman WALSH. Am I to understand from the answers that you made to Commissioner Commons's questions that you are opposed to violence toward a person and the destruction of property as a means of obtaining what you call industrial liberty?

Mr. KATZ. Absolutely.

Chairman WALSH. And in the attempted gaining of your ends in an industrial contest you would consider it both illegal and immoral to blow up a building?

Mr. KATZ. Exactly.

Chairman WALSH. Or to commit violence against a fellow man?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. That is as broad as it can be made?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. You heard the statement on the stand yesterday?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And that statement made by that gentleman may be taken by us to be the recognized view of those associated with him, so far as you have observed?

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. That is all.

Mr. KATZ. I want to say that these matters are matters practically of public record. I would not want to come into court to testify against anyone, but those are statements made by themselves.

Chairman WALSH. I would not refer to them except that the testimony was given on the stand yesterday, and I do not want to leave any doubt about our position.

Mr. KATZ. Yes, sir. Am I excused?

Chairman WALSH. That is all. You are excused. Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF MR. MOSES H. STRAUS.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will you please state your name, your address, and your business?

Mr. STRAUS. Moses H. Straus; 435 Ellison Street is my residence; and my business is Frank & Dugan mills.

Mr. THOMPSON. What position do you occupy with that firm?

Mr. STRAUS. I am manager of Frank & Dugan.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been manager?

Mr. STRAUS. Well, it is the last four or five years—since Mr. Frank has not been active.

Mr. THOMPSON. What business are they engaged in?

Mr. STRAUS. They are manufacturing silk ribbons.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are they one of the largest concerns of the kind in Paterson?

Mr. STRAUS. One of the largest; they are considered so.

Mr. THOMPSON. They have been engaged here for a number of years in that business?

Mr. STRAUS. In Paterson a little over 20 years; in that business 26 years.

Mr. THOMPSON. During the strike of last year did the workers of your plant stop?

Mr. STRAUS. We have two mills here—the Cook mill and the Dale mill. In the Cook mill, which is nothing but the German looms, and employs male weavers, I think the date was March 5, at noontime—in the morning I think there was 84 weavers out; at noontime 28 of them did not return at 1 o'clock; approximately 55 or 56 came back and did not know that the others had stayed out. The next morning the balance of the 56 stayed out, after being asked by the others or by weavers from the other mills to stay out. That covers the Cook mill.

The Dale mill: On Wednesday, March 5, at noontime, the mill was well picketed by weavers from other shops. In the shops of the Dale mill there are about 200 girls on the loom. They asked them to stay out on a general strike. The girls came in, every one of them, at 1 o'clock, and the next morning every one of them showed up, even after these—at 6 and 7 o'clock the next morning every one of them came in. Some came to me and says, "What is this going on?" I said, "Girls, they are trying to get you out." They says they are not going to get out. "We are going to stay in."

The next day at noon, Thursday, they still tried to get them out, and they still came in. The next afternoon I went to the girls and spoke to them in groups of 30 or 35, and told them what was going on, and told them I was very much pleased that none of them had heeded the request. Some of the girls said, "We are going to stick to you and work if they knock our heads off." I said, "Girls, I don't want you to go through any dangers; those girls in this shop who are sympathizing with the situation I will be glad for each and every one of them to go home and stay until it is over." I said, "I am going to have no feeling against any one of you," and out of 200 girls 5 girls said they were sympathizers and were going to stay at home. "I hope you will have no feeling against us." I said, "Girls, I have none, if you have any people in the strike"; and one said, "Yes; my brother is out on strike." I said, "Go home and come back when it is over."

The next morning every other girl showed up; but in the afternoon I told them, I said, "Girls, when I see there is any danger I will send you home; leave that to me." I says, "Your life is just as valuable to somebody at home as my own is." The next morning there was a rumor that Mr. Hayward was going to arrive in town. The depot is right opposite the mill. It was rumored there would be 4,000 or 5,000 people to meet him. I called up New York and talked to Mr. Frank, and said, "I am going to send the girls home; I am not going to endanger their lives." The afternoon of the day before there has been some stones thrown through the windows. I sent notice around through the mill for them to stay at home. They said they wanted to work; that we had treated them right; but I prevailed upon them to go home; and most of them stayed away from the organization; would have nothing to do with it and would not go near it. They could never get more than 35 or 40 girls to meet with the I. W. W. at any one time. They wanted to know when it was going to open up again, because they were anxious to go back to work.

Mr. THOMPSON. When did your girls go back to work after that?

Mr. STRAUS. On May 23 I met two of our girls in front of the City Hall. They said, "Mr. Straus, why don't you open up the mill? We are sick and tired of this, and we can not live on this hot air." I said, "If you want to come back to work—if there is only one or two girls, that would not be enough." I says to her—I don't want to mention her name—I said to her, "You go and see some of the other girls. This is Friday afternoon. The mill will be open for you Monday morning." I went around, and several other people in the mill went around, and we gathered together 43 girls who made up their minds to come in to work. Monday morning arrived and the mill was heavily picketed—possible 500 or 600 people around the mill. We kept it very quiet; none of the other manufacturers knew we were going to open up this morning. We did not work Saturday afternoon or Sunday, and forty-odd came in that morning, and the mill was heavily picketed, but they came into work and started the looms up.

Mr. THOMPSON. That was about the time of the break up of the strike?

Mr. STRAUS. No, sir; this was on the 26th of May, long before.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long after that did the strike end?

Mr. STRAUS. About July it started to peter out. Other concerns who were hiring about the same class of help as we were, I prevailed upon them, in order to take some of the attention from our place, to start up—who were also employing female labor.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you have any trouble after opening up again; and if so, what was it?

Mr. STRAUS. Our girls were bothered a great deal. Some of the girls who lived in the Riverside section had to change their residence and live with other girls who lived in a different neighborhood, because they could not live there. We even had men posted there at night to stop stone throwing. One girl, whose father was working in a dyehouse, had the windows broken out and his house was badly demolished. The girls were more brave than the men.

Mr. THOMPSON. I take it from what you have said that no demands were made by your employees on you either before the strike or afterwards.

Mr. STRAUS. None was made before the strike. Our girls went out on Friday, May 7, and the 14th was our pay day. When the committee came in and got their pay they handed me a piece of paper and I saw stamped on it the stamp of the I. W. W. I handed it back and said, "I'll receive no paper with the stamp of the I. W. W. on it." She handed it back to me, and I says, "Bertha, you better take it," and she shoved it to me and I tore it up and said, "I will never have anything to do with it." I don't know whether it was the same one that was handed to me; I don't know. As soon as I saw the stamp of the I. W. W. I would not receive it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was there any change in the hours, working conditions, or wages of your employees after they came back from what they were before?

Mr. STRAUS. Only during the time of the turmoil we let the girls go home at different hours; but after July 7 we went on the 10-hour day and have been working ever since.

Mr. THOMPSON. Under the same working conditions?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And wages?

Mr. STRAUS. And wages. We gave them a slight increase after they came back.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was that increase?

Mr. STRAUS. We raised our weavers \$1, and the different departments all had advances.

Mr. THOMPSON. Any horizontal advances?

Mr. STRAUS. No, sir; it was not. Well, in the weavers, yes; they did get a dollar advance, but there was no promise made when they came back.

Mr. THOMPSON. And in the other departments no horizontal advance?

Mr. STRAUS. No; we raised them according to their ability in a good many cases.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you any organizations in your plant?

Mr. STRAUS. Not in the female plant—not in the plant where we have women employed; but in our large mill, where we have men employed, there is some sort of labor organization. I don't know—they are very much divided.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is your attitude toward them?

Mr. STRAUS. The question is quite a broad one, Mr. Thompson.

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean that you may state, if you want to, what is your attitude toward the organization of your workmen?

Mr. STRAUS. I don't know whether it is or not, but if it is I. W. W. we don't care; they call it an association. What it is I don't know.

Chairman WALSH. How is that? I didn't understand you.

Mr. STRAUS. I say if it is not I. W. W.

Chairman WALSH. I thought you said if it was I. W. W. you didn't care?

Mr. STRAUS. I say if it is not affiliated with the I. W. W. I don't know what they are. I wouldn't recognize it if it was I. W. W.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is the reason for that?

Mr. STRAUS. Well, the I. W. W. I don't consider an American organization. They are un-American in their preamble and everything else. They say they are very much un-American.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you care to state more fully your reasons?

Mr. STRAUS. Their preamble says they have nothing in common with the capitalists, and I suppose that means the people that own the mills. And they make no agreement. There is nothing behind it. If they were to make any

sort of an agreement, which they do not do, there is nothing back of it. You couldn't come back at them.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you distinguish between these two branches of the I. W. W.?

Mr. STRAUS. Why they both look alike to me.

Mr. THOMPSON. So far as the question of violence during the strike is concerned, you have heard what Mr. Katz has said about the strike of 1912, and you know, of course, what occurred during the strike of 1913. Was there anything different in those strikes?

Mr. STRAUS. Well, as a matter of fact, the strike in 1912 was simply a broad-silk strike and the ribbons were not brought in. I was out of town at the time, out West, and when I got back the strike was about over.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, was there any talk in the town generally?

Mr. STRAUS. No, sir; I don't think there was as much at that time as in 1913.

Mr. THOMPSON. You never heard those two strikes compared as to the manner of carrying them out?

Mr. STRAUS. Oh, you couldn't compare the broad-silk strike with this latter strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean as to method?

Mr. STRAUS. I don't know much about the Katz strike. I know what the other was.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you any organization of ribbon manufacturers here?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. That includes the manufacturers of this city and vicinity?

Mr. STRAUS. No, sir; not all of them. There are some in the city of Paterson who are not members.

Mr. THOMPSON. It is a local organization?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. About how many members have you?

Mr. STRAUS. Thirty-three or thirty-four, I think.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you a constitution or by-laws?

Mr. STRAUS. No, sir; that is, not that I know of.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, what, in your view, is the purpose and object of the organization?

Mr. STRAUS. Well, it is to try to get some stable arrangement amongst the manufacturers as to selling goods and different things.

Mr. THOMPSON. Selling goods and the relationship with your employees?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir; as much as we possibly can.

Mr. THOMPSON. Has the association taken any definite stand in regard to any phase of the labor problem?

Mr. STRAUS. We have not; no, sir; because we did not think it was the right time to do it; that is, the last year or so.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you any understanding amongst yourselves as to your attitude or disposition to it?

Mr. STRAUS. Oh, each one has a different view as to that situation. I will have one view and somebody else comes in with another view. We have never come together as to any single point that we could agree upon.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is there any general consensus of opinion among these manufacturers as to any phase of the labor problem?

Mr. STRAUS. Why they all feel that something should be done, but nobody has a solution that we can agree upon as yet.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are not against organization?

Mr. STRAUS. We are against such as there is in town to-day.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would that include all the unions—the A. F. of L. and the two branches of the I. W. W.?

Mr. STRAUS. I think so.

Mr. THOMPSON. You think so?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And you know of the A. F. of L. organizations?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And this attitude includes that organization as well?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, is there any reason for that that you care to state?

Mr. STRAUS. Well, just at the present time I would rather not state it, Mr. Thompson, unless you insist upon it.

Mr. THOMPSON. What, in your opinion, is the cause of the industrial unrest in Paterson?

Mr. STRAUS. Why, a good deal is agitated, I think. There was no unrest here amongst the ribbon weavers. They did not know what they went out for.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is to say, in your opinion, there are no conditions among the workers either as to the question of hours or the question of wages or the question of working conditions, which would be apt to cause unrest?

Mr. STRAUS. Possibly in some mills there are.

Mr. THOMPSON. What are they?

Mr. STRAUS. Well, possibly there may be a question of wages in some places. I think there is a good deal of trouble comes from the fact that the silk business is passing through a change; that it is gradually becoming a business for females; that in the next 15 or 20 years the males employed in the silk industry will be nil. The change is coming very fast. For instance, as far as ribbons are concerned, the high-speed looms are mostly being run by females. The German looms are gradually changing from male to female and, as I say, in 15 or 20 years, or possibly less time, the mills will mostly be run by the female labor.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, in your opinion, Mr. Straus, if agitators were absent you believe that things, so far as the industrial matters are concerned, with reference to the relations between employer and employee, would be pretty quiet in Paterson?

Mr. STRAUS. I think so.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you any suggestions to make as to how conditions may be improved?

Mr. STRAUS. Well, I only hear that in some of the places they are dissatisfied with the wages, not so much in the ribbons as in the broad silks—that is, in some places.

Mr. THOMPSON. Generally speaking, leaving out of the question the present organizations, have you any views in regard to whether it is wise or best for the employees to be organized, or not?

Mr. STRAUS. Well, I have been trying to work out some plan of organization, but I haven't got it as yet. There are a lot of other people who have tried before me, and they have not found it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then you are rather inclined to the opinion that possibly organizations may be necessary or wise?

Mr. STRAUS. Why, I don't see—I don't think it would be a cure-all.

Mr. THOMPSON. I understand; but even your own mind is turning somewhat in the direction of some form of organization?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes; I think it would help the situation in some cases.

Chairman WALSH. Commissioner Commons wishes to ask some questions.

Commissioner COMMONS. Is the ribbon industry materially different in the kind of labor from the broad silk? That is, for example, loom fixers, twisters, and warpers are all employed in the broad silk industry?

Mr. STRAUS. Why, a warper can work in the broad silk just the same as in ribbon, excepting the beaming department is a little different, but they can readily learn.

Commissioner COMMONS. How about the loom fixers?

Mr. STRAUS. A different branch altogether. The broad silk loom fixer is organized under the Federation of Labor, but the ribbons are not, so far as we are concerned.

Commissioner COMMONS. You have never had up the organization of the loom fixers, have you, then?

Mr. STRAUS. No, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Never tried to organize, have they?

Mr. STRAUS. No, sir; not as I know of.

Commissioner COMMONS. Is it fully as skilled an operation as it is in the broad silk?

Mr. STRAUS. I think so; I think more so.

Commissioner COMMONS. What wages do loom fixers get with you?

Mr. STRAUS. From \$20 to \$35 a week; from \$21 to \$35.

Commissioner COMMONS. Are they paid by the week?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. What wages do the warpers get?

Mr. STRAUS. Well, it all depends on what category; we have some learners getting \$7 or \$8, and the experienced ones getting \$13 to \$15.

Commissioner COMMONS. The warping operation then is different from what it is in the broad silk?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Could you employ only women as warpers?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir; in our place.

Commissioner COMMONS. Is that as skilled an operation as it would be in the broad silk, the warping?

Mr. STRAUS. Well, I hardly think so.

Commissioner COMMONS. In what respect would it not be?

Mr. STRAUS. Well, in the first place the warps are much lighter than they are in the broad silk; much lighter in the ribbons than in the broad silk.

Commissioner COMMONS. That is the only difference you see. Have women displaced men as warpers?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Within how long a period?

Mr. STRAUS. Well, it has been coming along gradually.

Commissioner COMMONS. What were the men paid?

Mr. STRAUS. I never employed any; I don't know—excepting here lately I had four, and paid them \$20 and \$22.

Commissioner COMMONS. Where the women are similarly skilled, they will get \$15?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes.

Commissioner COMMONS. That is, your women begin at \$8 or \$9 and get up as high as \$15?

Mr. STRAUS. That is, as far as the learners are concerned. When we take an experienced warper in we pay \$14 or \$15. When we take a girl in, she starts as draw-side girl at \$3.50 or \$4 a week, and, then, in a few years she may be—will get up to where she will earn \$7, \$8, \$9, or \$12. It all depends on the ability. She comes in as a girl 14 years old, and we raise all our own warpers.

Commissioner COMMONS. That is all week work?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. And not piecework?

Mr. STRAUS. Not piecework.

Commissioner COMMONS. The weaver is all piecework?

Mr. STRAUS. No, sir; daywork.

Commissioner COMMONS. Daywork also?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. And you begin with the weavers, then, at what rate?

Mr. STRAUS. All depends on the girl's ability. Some start with \$7, \$8, \$9, and gradually come up to \$15. We have girls that started with us at \$6 a week that are making \$15 to-day.

Commissioner COMMONS. The highest you pay is \$15?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. And you said you had about 200 weavers?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. About what number would be getting \$15?

Mr. STRAUS. I can not tell exactly, but I think that over two-thirds of them are getting from \$13 to \$15.

Commissioner COMMONS. The larger number are getting which of those figures?

Mr. STRAUS. The larger number, \$14 to \$15. Over half are getting \$14 to \$15.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you have any way of measuring the length of time that they stay with you—the weavers in your establishment?

Mr. STRAUS. We have had some with us a good many years. We have had some weavers that have been with us over 15 years.

Commissioner COMMONS. About how long does it take a girl, starting in at \$6, to get up to \$15?

Mr. STRAUS. Possibly two years. It all depends on her ability. We never lose a weaver, if we can keep her, for the sake of a dollar.

Commissioner COMMONS. Well, if a person did not advance as rapidly as you thought they ought to, you would let them go?

Mr. STRAUS. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. And such a one, you would expect them to get up in about two years on that basis. What ages do you begin with the girl?

Mr. STRAUS. Weavers, we try to get them 16 and over 16. I think we have one girl in the mill who is a weaver who is less than 16, but will be 16 in a very short time.

Commissioner COMMONS. What occupations do you employ less than 16—14 to 16?

Mr. STRAUS. The pickers and edge girls. We have 22 pickers in our mill—that is, in the larger mill—and there are three girls there under 16. We have about 8 girls in about 350 who are under 16.

Commissioner COMMONS. What are the wages of the 16?

Mr. STRAUS. All depends on the department they are in; run from \$3.50 up to \$6.50.

Commissioner COMMONS. That is all.

Chairman WALSH. That is all; thank you, Mr. Straus.

(Witness excused.)

TESTIMONY OF MR. RODNEY MILLER.

Mr. THOMPSON. Give us your name.

Mr. MILLER. Rodney Miller.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is your address and business?

Mr. MILLER. Organizing engineer; 922 Broadway, New York.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Miller, were you ever employed by the National Silk Dyeing Co.?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. That company has a branch in this city here?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; they have a large plant at Riverside.

Mr. THOMPSON. During what time were you employed by the company?

Mr. MILLER. From February to August, 1913—during the strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. You have stated, Mr. Miller, that you are an organization engineer?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What do you mean by that? State it in detail.

Mr. MILLER. Well, an organization engineer deals with the human element and mechanical element; and the title arose with engineering development from the mechanical to include both the mechanical and the human element in organization work.

Mr. THOMPSON. In what respect do you deal with the human element in the plant?

Mr. MILLER. The human element in the plant? We study the human element and analyze it, and analyze it much in the same way as we analyze machinery, with the idea of producing harmonious relations throughout the management.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you follow it long the same line as efficiency engineers do, or is it purely a matter of relationship?

Mr. MILLER. It is more a matter of relationship. We do not follow the lines of efficiency engineers; no.

Mr. THOMPSON. And generally do you approach the subject of relationship as an engineer? And how do you classify, and what is your method of procedure that you generally adopt?

Mr. MILLER. We go into the classifying of the relationship of individuals in the plant. We classify and analyze the individuals in the plant right straight from the top to the bottom and attempt to correlate them so they will work harmoniously and produce the best or highest and most efficient results.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, in doing that do you take into consideration the people as groups or as individuals?

Mr. MILLER. Essentially as individuals. Our doctrine is rather the individuality of the workers. One of the principal doctrines that we are developing now is in testing and developing the mentality of the worker and establishing the value of that in contradistinction to the crushing of the brain of the worker under the present system.

Mr. THOMPSON. As far as you would test the mentality of the worker along the line, it would be along the line of efficiency and developing brain power as applied to his work?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, taking up the question purely of the relationships purely between employee and employer and dealing with that, how do you approach that subject?

Mr. MILLER. Basically our idea is that there is no antagonism between the employer and employee; but we believe, as we develop the worker and create a better understanding between the employer and the employee, that both sides see the point more directly where their interests are the same. We believe that most industrial troubles—our investigations of troubles that occur throughout this country seem to bring us more clearly to the fact that there

has been a misunderstanding between the two factions rather than from any absolute difference that may exist.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, taking the question again, how do you approach it now with relation to the relationship of the employer and employee, including that of wages, of working conditions, and of hours? They are supposed to be the three main groups. Now, do you approach it from those matters or from the standpoint of personal feelings? How do you handle the situation in regard to the three main issues?

Mr. MILLER. Well, in regard to the three main issues we tend to develop the individual ability of the individual worker. That is our tendency. And the reward of that individual worker should be in proportion to his individuality.

Mr. THOMPSON. Of course, the reward that the worker shall get for his additional ability must come from a point of bargaining between employer and employee.

Mr. MILLER. Between employer and employee; yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. But in approaching that subject you approach it from the standpoint of the individual and the employer?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Rather than from a group of employees?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, in the question of dealings between the two parties the subject of collective bargaining as such is not used by you?

Mr. MILLER. No. No; we do not use collective bargaining. We are not opposed to collective bargaining, because—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). But you do not advocate it?

Mr. MILLER. We are not opposed to collective bargaining, but we believe we can go over that. We have no objection to minimum wage, the result of collective bargaining, but if there is a minimum wage existing our idea is to go over the top of that and bring certain men of certain special qualities up above that, if they show the disposition.

Mr. THOMPSON. If there were established a minimum wage as such, it would be done by the action of the employer and the employee through collective bargaining.

Mr. MILLER. Well, our entire dealings, you understand, are with the employee.

Mr. THOMPSON. As an individual, Mr. Miller?

Mr. MILLER. As an individual; yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And all relationships which exist between the employer and the employee are resolved into the individual proposition?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been engaged in that business?

Mr. MILLER. Why, in the organization business, about 15 years; I was a constructing engineer before that, and a railroad engineer.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you been in the business for yourself alone, or associated with other people?

Mr. MILLER. Why, principally for myself. I was originally organizing engineer for the Trust Co. of America, the American Ice Co., and the International Smokeless Powder Co., and more recently have been particularly interested in the labor controversies as the diseased condition of industrial relations, and our attempt is to analyze it from that point, under the same idea that—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Have you been associated with any efficiency engineers, or others?

Mr. MILLER. Indirectly, yes; but not directly. I have been associated with Mr. Gantt, of New York.

Mr. THOMPSON. What were your relations with the silk manufacturers of Paterson during the strike?

Mr. MILLER. I was in Paterson more as an observer than anything else, to study conditions and to study the causes and in probably—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Did you advise with the manufacturers?

Mr. MILLER. Advised with them; yes, sir—with the national company, not with the manufacturers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, in your opinion what were the main causes and events which led to the strike, and what part did you personally take in it?

Mr. MILLER. Why, the causes which led to this strike, I think—you might put it in a number of different ways. In this city the basic industrial conditions are pretty healthy. Among the old-line silk manufacturers, compared with what they are in New England and some of the textile industries, they are very superior. Now, in all communities where they are absorbing an extensive foreign

element it requires a special amount of study to assimilate that element, and in Paterson they did not do that. The result was that there was a constant series of misunderstandings in some of the plants. I gathered this from interviews with the workers I had. I have had several hundred of them during the strike, and I talked with them and not from the manufacturers, because it is from the workers' side that I generally look for information in a case of that kind. It seemed that the tendency is the result of the inflow of nationalities. For instance, there is a tendency to classify them by nationalities, as good Italians and bad Italians and worthless Italians and high-class Italians are all classified in the same bunch.

The result is that when anything happens they are all classified down rather than up. That is the point. The question of assimilation here has not been given the study that it required. The average manufacturer will employ the highest class of brains in the mechanical department and the highest class of analytical brains in the selling department and the production department; but when they start in on the government of the human element they will put in any old person who happens to be handy, and then will be surprised when the blowup comes, and wonder what the trouble was about, and will be blaming it on somebody else.

Our whole contention with the manufacturers, and our whole endeavor, is to bring the same class of pure analytic mind into the government of the human element that they have employed and that we have employed in this development of the mechanical and financial end of the industry. That is our individual fight in the matter.

Mr. THOMPSON. And that, in your opinion, was neglected in this city?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, yes; that is neglected in every city. I say that is neglected in every city. You can see what the result of it is in the Tennessee Coal & Iron, and the present chamber of commerce in Detroit, and that sort of thing. They are picking it up and it is being gradually introduced. In this city it was neglected.

Mr. THOMPSON. And what you want to state is that, so far as the strike at Paterson is concerned, it was caused by that lack of study?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; that lack of study. There has been a vast inflow of foreign population in here that has not been understood by the manufacturer and which has not been properly analyzed by the manufacturers, and the consequence is that in this city, as in dozens of other cities in the country, it has given rise to misunderstandings and labor eruptions that were certainly unnecessary.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you make any study of the action of the city authorities during the strike? And also of the leaders of the strike?

Mr. MILLER. Why, not very extensively—no—but I made some study of the authorities.

Mr. THOMPSON. What did the result of that study show?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I will say that that question is rather—that is a question that is rather difficult to answer in this way. I can not say that I blame the city authorities one way or the other, and I will say why. Now, for instance, I was asked some few years ago—I will explain that in this way: I was asked two years ago by Stone & Webster Corporation to go to Florida. They were having some trouble and a strike down there, and they wanted me to go down and see what the trouble was—what caused it. That was a very high-class corporation, and they were surprised that they had trouble; and when I got down there the police and the authorities were essentially on the side of the strikers. Well, the result was that at the last minute the police and the mayor were the most absolute in asking the State for soldiers, because the strikers completely got away from the situation. Now, looking at that side and at the different sides there, I don't want to emphasize one way or the other; but in a battle of that kind, personally, I don't—I think it is one of fact; it is a question of who is right and who is wrong.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are you of the opinion as to whether you could give the same class of study to a thing of that kind, as between the relations of employer and employee, that are given to the other departments of the industrial activity?

Mr. MILLER. You could, unquestionably. But I have not devoted the same study to that.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then you have nothing to state with reference either to the leaders of the strike or as to the action of the authorities?

Mr. MILLER. Well, as regards to the I. W. W., I will say that I do not regard them seriously one way or the other. I think the I. W. W. is simply the result

of an industrial condition, and you remove that industrial condition and the I. W. W. don't exist.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is the industrial condition at Paterson which caused the I. W. W. to come here and create such a trouble?

Mr. MILLER. This constant misunderstanding between certain mill owners and the foreign population. I believe there were certain—I don't know from first hand, because I was not in those factories at the time—there wasn't any factory that I was connected with—it was very detrimental—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). In other words, that the lack of this study, as you have already stated, caused this condition, which was taken advantage of by the I. W. W.?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir. The I. W. W. is very prominent where industrial conditions are bad.

Mr. THOMPSON. And rather a symptom of bad condition?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; we regard it as a symptom of a disease.

Mr. THOMPSON. In your opinion what could the manufacturers have done that they failed to do which would have obviated that strike?

Mr. MILLER. I should say that the manufacturers have got to bring into their organization a very much different type of mind and a very much different type of study; to analyze the conditions of the importation or the inflow of the foreign element.

Wherever a foreign element commences to come in in very large numbers, the only way I believe we can avoid industrial troubles is to make a close analysis of that element, so that it is possible to distinguish, for instance, between the high-class Italian and the Italian that is a brigand; so that it is possible to distinguish between a good worker or a man that will make a good citizen and a man that is criminally inclined.

Chairman WALSH. How is that? You say the trouble is to make the distinction between what you call high-class Italians and an Italian who is criminally inclined?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; well, I simply used that as an illustration.

Chairman WALSH. Yes; but I want to get at the actual way you work it. I don't want to interrupt you, but—

Mr. THOMPSON. Is that your complete statement of the situation at that point?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Anything further you want to state?

Mr. MILLER. Why, in regard to the inflow of the Jewish element, of a certain branch of the Jewish element that is apparently coming in here from New York now. There is a tendency among a certain branch of the Jewish element in manufacturing to exploit laborers unnecessarily. We know that that is not extravagance; it is totally unnecessary.

Chairman WALSH. You say there is a tendency on the part of Jewish manufacturers?

Mr. MILLER. Not all manufacturers.

Chairman WALSH. Of certain Jewish manufacturers?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. To do what?

Mr. MILLER. To exploit labor unnecessarily and extravagantly.

Mr. THOMPSON. What effect do you think that will have on labor?

Mr. MILLER. It produces constant friction; it produces small strikes and all that sort of thing; and the fact that it has no standing in economy or profit makes it entirely unnecessary.

Mr. THOMPSON. That would lead to the creation of such conditions as you have stated, upon which the I. W. W. could come in?

Mr. MILLER. It will never lead, I don't think, to the creation of such an upheaval, but as we see it in New York now it leads to constant small friction, sometimes growing quite large.

Mr. THOMPSON. What New York situation are you speaking of?

Mr. MILLER. For instance, the clothing trade in New York.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you made a study of that?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, yes. If you went into the clothing trade thoroughly, you would see that the system that is followed over there in Brooklyn by a great many of the manufacturers is extravagant; if you compare that to the custom of Hart, Schaffner & Marx, in Chicago, you will see that the human waste is extensive there and absolutely unnecessary. It has no standing in economics.

Mr. THOMPSON. Men's clothing or clothing in general?

Mr. MILLER. Men's clothing; to the contract system, and of the outlet system there, that is one of the worst ends of industrial conditions in this country, outside of the longshoremen.

Mr. THOMPSON. When did you make that study?

Mr. MILLER. Just previous to coming over here. That was in the latter part of 1912.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALSH. Prof. Commons, have you any questions to ask?

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you feel it is possible with what you call the foreign element to make a scientific study and work out a harmonious arrangement that you have in mind?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir. Experiments I have carried out with the Italians. I made some quite extensive experiments years ago on railroad construction work, in which I took Italians from a very brutal contracting system and took them by themselves up the line and endeavored to develop their living conditions and their mentality, and such as that, and I found that, as a result of those investigations and several others, that they improve wonderfully under a certain system of treatment and become valuable citizens.

Commissioner COMMONS. How large a body of Italians do you have in mind?

Mr. MILLER. First, 10; and then that was finally developed to 150.

Commissioner COMMONS. They had been employed by contractors?

Mr. MILLER. They were employed by contractors; yes, sir; under a genuine exploiting case, a case of pick-handle operation.

Commissioner COMMONS. And you were employed by the railroad company?

Mr. MILLER. I was employed as engineer by the railroad company, and I wanted to carry out this experiment.

Commissioner COMMONS. What were the essential changes you made?

Mr. MILLER. I put them under normal living conditions. I provided sanitary bunk houses for them to sleep in. I fed them on certain rations that I thought was especially adapted to the class of work they were doing, and I interested them mentally; I explained and interested them mentally in their particular work. My tendency was to find how they developed mentally. Our idea of that is that when you put a man under what we call the exploiting system, for instance, on railroad work, the law of self-preservation sets in, and he puts in really more time watching his boss and saving his strength than he does in doing work. His whole mental caliber is devoted more to fooling his foreman than to doing his best work. We removed that attitude of mind and got his mind concentrated on the idea of doing his work with nothing else to think about.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did you change the method of payment?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir; I did not change the method of payment at all. I paid them the same.

Commissioner COMMONS. Paid them by the day, the same thing?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir. There was no premium put on it at all. That I particularly avoided, anything of that kind. I simply wanted to see what education would do, what intelligent treatment would do, what the effect would be.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did you treat them all individually?

Mr. MILLER. How?

Commissioner COMMONS. Did you treat them all individually?

Mr. MILLER. I treated them as individuals.

Commissioner COMMONS. You did not treat them through their leaders?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir; I treated them all individually. I would go off and leave them for six or seven hours without anybody over them at all, without anybody to look after them.

Commissioner COMMONS. You think that is a general principle that can be adopted in factories?

Mr. MILLER. To a very great extent. The greatest waste in this country to-day is the mental destruction of the worker.

Chairman WALSH. What?

Mr. MILLER. The mental destruction of the worker.

Commissioner COMMONS. You feel that those Italians that you dealt with there represented an average class?

Mr. MILLER. I took them simply as an average 10 men. The first 10 men I took, I took them right out of the cut.

Commissioner COMMONS. They are similar to those who are now coming in?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; very much the same.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you feel that this influx is too great to be handled under the present methods?

Mr. MILLER. I do.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you feel that if your wise methods were adopted the present influx could be handled?

Mr. MILLER. I doubt from the wise methods to have sufficient extent to handle the influx?

Commissioner COMMONS. You think it is too great?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you think under the present system of management that the numbers should be restricted?

Mr. MILLER. Most decidedly, until we catch up. They are coming in too fast to get a possible efficient human development.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you think that is true in Paterson?

Mr. MILLER. I can not say as to that. I did not go into that particular subject.

Commissioner COMMONS. But generally, your observation?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; generally it is. It gives too much of an inclination to exploitation. Although the foolishness and waste of exploitation and destruction of employees is becoming known, up to a couple of years ago it was scarcely acknowledged at all among the big manufacturers.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you find it difficult to get manufacturers to accept your idea?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. What is the main difficulty?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I assume it is heredity.

Commissioner COMMONS. Heredity?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir. I mean the tendency is not to treat the human element scientifically. These tremendous units in manufacture have sprung up without handling or taking into consideration. The government of 10,000 men is—in a plant—is a tremendously important operation, and it is not considered so by the manufacturer. They do not give the proper analysis, the proper attention.

Commissioner COMMONS. Am I correct in saying that you do not think it necessary to introduce piecework or premium methods of securing the cooperation of this element, the Italians and the foreign element? You say you pay them by the day the same as before. Do you always follow that practice?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir; not necessarily.

Commissioner COMMONS. Sometimes you introduce—

Mr. MILLER. Sometimes the premium, the test of any system, seems to have operated successfully under a very humane system of management. The point is, under a condition of that kind, unless you have a very humane system of management, I don't believe in it. I do not believe any of us understand the human element to a sufficient extent to say how much work a man can do in any—

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you find that any of the broad-silk weavers or owners here introduce any system of time studies?

Mr. MILLER. Not that I know of.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did you look into the issue any on the two looms, and three and four loom question?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir; I did not go into that.

Commissioner COMMONS. That seemed to be the essential thing here?

Mr. MILLER. That was the essential thing; yes, sir; to start on, but the trouble was, when I came to Paterson I came here to discover barely the personal element rather than the personal feeling and personal animosities.

Commissioner COMMONS. You did not look into the merits of that question?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. You looked into simply the individual question?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Supposing you had looked into the merits of that question and found that the employers here could not run on a two-loom system in competition with the employers in Pennsylvania, could your method of individual treatment have solved the question?

Mr. MILLER. I think so.

Commissioner COMMONS. How would you do it?

Mr. MILLER. I think so. I think that in the majority of cases the system of instructing rather than bossing the worker develops his knowledge. In other words, in a case of that kind I depend rather on the development of the mentality of the worker.

Commissioner COMMONS. But how could you help the employer out in competition with Pennsylvania unless you would also go down to Pennsylvania and get them to adopt your system?

Mr. MILLER. I believe the employer then does more work. I believe the employer, if his mentality is developed, his harmonized action becomes greater. Commissioner COMMONS. The employee you mean?

Mr. MILLER. The employee, I mean.

Chairman WALSH. How is that?

Mr. MILLER. As you develop the mentality of the employee, as he understands his position better, as he understands his job better, his action becomes more harmonious, and if he does more work without serious retardation or serious fatigue—

Commissioner COMMONS. In this case that would mean that he is more capable of running four looms than he is of running two looms?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir. I don't want to get into the controversy between two looms and four looms, because I did not go into that question, but, as a usual thing, you can develop your workers in the majority of cases in which I have ever carried out the experiments, you can develop your workers to do a great deal more work normally, naturally, without fatigue, without reaction.

Commissioner COMMONS. If you had taken hold of this situation, or had authority, you would have made a study to see whether or not they could operate four looms?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; I would make every possible kind of a study. I would try them on four looms and two looms, and then note the results, and find out what the outcome would be.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you think such a study was not made here?

Mr. MILLER. Well, that I don't know. That is, you are referring to the time studies, and so on and so forth. I have never heard of such a study being made.

Commissioner COMMONS. I am referring to your first proposition, that the employers here had not made a sufficient scientific study of their employers?

Mr. MILLER. Of the individuality of their employees; not of the work that they were turning out.

Commissioner COMMONS. The individuality, as I understand it—the whole problem of individuality was to get them up to the four-loom basis.

Mr. MILLER. As I understood it here, they simply put them on the four-loom basis because they were operating four looms in other places.

Commissioner COMMONS. That was the reason?

Mr. MILLER. That was the reason.

Commissioner COMMONS. I was trying to get at whether, by your method, you would also put them on the four-loom basis?

Mr. MILLER. I should not have put them on the four-loom basis until I had made a very thorough examination and very complete test as to whether it was practical to run four looms or not.

Commissioner COMMONS. I believe that is all I have.

Chairman WALSH. At this point we will adjourn until 2 o'clock sharp. You will kindly resume the stand at 2 o'clock, Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. Very well.

(Whereupon, at 12:30 o'clock p. m., a recess was taken until 2 o'clock p. m.)

AFTERNOON SESSION—2 P. M.

TESTIMONY OF MR. RODNEY MILLER—Continued.

Chairman WALSH. Where are your headquarters, Mr. Miller?

Mr. MILLER. 922 Broadway, New York.

Chairman WALSH. New York City?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. You are an organization engineer?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And that organization, in that title, as I understand it, refers to the organization between employers and employees?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And naturally is confined to large industries?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. How many men have you in your organization?

Mr. MILLER. In New York?

Chairman WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Well, that varies. Sometimes only 5 or 6; other times 15 or 20. Chairman WALSH. How many have you now?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I have five out now.

Chairman WALSH. At what period of your business life did you have 15 or 20?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, I have had, when I was with the old Trust Co. of America, I had a couple of hundred.

Chairman WALSH. A couple of hundred?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Do you make a distinction between the time you were with the old Trust Co. of America and when you were in your present independent professional organization?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Well, I was asking you about the latter. You said sometimes 5 and 6 and sometimes 15 or 20.

Mr. MILLER. Well, that you understand, those employees would depend on the work which we happen to be doing.

Chairman WALSH. Well, now, then, since you have an independent professional organization, what is the highest number you had in your employ?

Mr. MILLER. About 20.

Chairman WALSH. About 20?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And what industry were you working in at the time?

Mr. MILLER. Why, we were working in the clothing; we were working on the dock workers; and we were working on the American Ice.

Chairman WALSH. The dock workers of New York City?

Mr. MILLER. Boston.

Chairman WALSH. Boston?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. How long have you been engaged in this independently?

Mr. MILLER. Why, off and on for about seven or eight years.

Chairman WALSH. You say off and on. How long have you been engaged in it continuously?

Mr. MILLER. What I mean by that is I would go to work for a corporation direct.

Chairman WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Then it is a matter of—you could not say at that time that I was independent any more than any other engineer was.

Chairman WALSH. Did you maintain an office for the last seven years?

Mr. MILLER. I have maintained an office for about seven years.

Chairman WALSH. For about seven years?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And what proportion of that time would you say that you have been away on some particular job from which you draw the distinction in your last answer?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I should say three-quarters of the time.

Chairman WALSH. Three-quarters of the time?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Then, when you were away on some of these jobs did you have some person in your office in New York?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And you are pushing the lines of your profession so that if you take on any more occupation you add more force?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. In an attempt to handle it?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. So that in reality you have been engaged in this steadily, then, for seven years?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Sometimes being away from your office and sometimes not?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. That would express it, would it?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Now, tell me in what industry, leaving out Paterson, you did the largest amount of work in the past seven years?

Mr. MILLER. In the past seven years? Well, it is a question whether it was in the clothing or whether it was in the shore or whether it was in the street railway.

Chairman WALSH. You mentioned in your direct examination that you had been employed by Stone & Webster?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Was that when you were in the street railway industry?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Stone & Webster are a firm in Boston are they?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And what are they particularly? What are they called? Mr. MILLER. Well, Stone & Webster are constructors and operators of street railways. I believe they have 36 systems throughout the United States.

Chairman WALSH. They act in a manner as trustees for propositions?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; for street railway properties.

Chairman WALSH. Do they have to do with the employment of the organization?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; operation and management.

Chairman WALSH. What?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; also managers.

Chairman WALSH. Please give me the names of the largest cities in which Stone & Webster operate?

Mr. MILLER. Well, they are almost all southern cities.

Chairman WALSH. For instance?

Mr. MILLER. For instance, Jacksonville, Fla., Atlanta—I have forgotten most of the cities.

Chairman WALSH. Memphis?

Mr. MILLER. Memphis; they are in Memphis.

Chairman WALSH. But not in New Orleans?

Mr. MILLER. Not in New Orleans; no.

Chairman WALSH. In what other city in the South or West do they operate?

Mr. MILLER. Well, they are in Tennessee, in one of the big cities there.

Chairman WALSH. Chattanooga?

Mr. MILLER. I think in Chattanooga; yes.

Chairman WALSH. Do you recall any others?

Mr. MILLER. No; I don't recall any others.

Chairman WALSH. Are they in any eastern cities?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Chairman WALSH. Are they in any mid-western city that you know of, any city in the Mississippi Valley?

Mr. MILLER. I believe they are in Seattle, I think.

Chairman WALSH. Now, as I understand it, these railway companies all have a local organization in their towns?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And a staff of officers?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. But Stone & Webster are in reality the operators of them; they underwrite bonds and sell bonds?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; act as brokers.

Chairman WALSH. And assume as trustees the management of these properties?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. I am going to try to pick them out as a typical case to see if I can get an illustration of about how your general work comes into an industry?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. For what length of time were you with Stone & Webster?

Mr. MILLER. I was only with Stone & Webster about two months. I was to stay with Stone & Webster for some time, but I left them on account of malaria fever that I contracted in Florida.

Chairman WALSH. Very well. I took them because you said there were three industries in which you were divided as to which you did the largest amount of work; one was clothing, the dock workers, and street railways?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. How long were you in the clothing work?

Mr. MILLER. In the clothier work about three months.

Chairman WALSH. Whereabouts?

Mr. MILLER. Around Brooklyn.

Chairman WALSH. Not in the Borough of Manhattan at all?

Mr. MILLER. Well, you understand that most of the big clothing houses have their headquarters in the Borough of Manhattan.

Chairman WALSH. But your work, so far as the industry, the workers, and employers is concerned, was confined to Brooklyn?

Mr. MILLER. Principally to Brooklyn; yes.

Chairman WALSH. You say principally Brooklyn. Was there any of it in the Borough of Manhattan?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Chairman WALSH. Now, then, the dock workers, as I understand you, was in Boston?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. How long did you remain in that industry?

Mr. MILLER. In that industry I was about three months.

Chairman WALSH. Three months?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. By whom were you employed when you were working on the dock workers?

Mr. MILLER. I was in the employ of Wall Street interests.

Chairman WALSH. Well, what interests?

Mr. MILLER. Interests—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). If you have no objection to telling.

Mr. MILLER. Well, some of them I have.

Chairman WALSH. Very good. Any that you have objection to stating, why, don't state them.

Mr. MILLER. Wherever I can I will make a clean statement.

Chairman WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Well, some are old clients of the Trust Co. of America that employed me direct to look into these matters as rather a side issue. That is where they are stockholders in it. That was the case, for instance, when I was sent up to Boston during the Boston railway strike. I was sent up by some stockholders of the Boston Elevated Railroad and in their interest, and the fact that my decision up there was against the policy of the organization—why, I should not care to divulge the particular people that sent me up there. In other words, I favored in that particular case the union, where the management did not.

Chairman WALSH. Well, my question was just to state as briefly as possible the names of those clients you had in the dock workers, if you do not object to giving them. If you object to giving them, I will not pursue it. Just indicate the names of those clients that you had a retainer from in the dock workers in Boston, if you do not decline or object to giving them.

Mr. MILLER. The dock workers in Boston came indirectly through the stockholders of the International Mercantile Marine.

Chairman WALSH. The International Mercantile Marine?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, but not through Mr. Franklin; not through the management.

Chairman WALSH. Well, if you will indicate to me now who your employer was—any employer you had in the dock workers that you care to—why, I will be very glad to have it. I will ask you this question. Perhaps I ought to pursue that: Was there a difficulty pending between the client which you had and the employees in the shipping industry in Boston at that time?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, yes.

Chairman WALSH. How long did that last?

Mr. MILLER. That lasted about six weeks.

Chairman WALSH. About six weeks?

Mr. MILLER. About six weeks.

Chairman WALSH. And how long were you there?

Mr. MILLER. I was there about three months.

Chairman WALSH. About three months?

Mr. MILLER. That is, there on that work about three months.

Chairman WALSH. When did you go there with reference to the cessation of work and the calling of the strike—the beginning of this trouble?

Mr. MILLER. I went there after the strike was called.

Chairman WALSH. After it was called?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And then I take it that you remained there something like as great a length of time after it was over as you were there before?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; practically.

Chairman WALSH. And how large a staff did you have in the dock workers?

Mr. MILLER. In the dock workers there were only three of us up there.

Chairman WALSH. Only three?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. In the clothing industry, do you mind saying who your clients were?

Mr. MILLER. S. W. Peck.

Chairman WALSH. M. W. Peck?

Mr. MILLER. S. W. Peck.

Chairman WALSH. S. W. Peck?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. When was the time you worked in the clothing industry?

Mr. MILLER. Well, that was in the latter part of 1912 and first part of 1913.

Chairman WALSH. And he was your sole client in the clothing industry at that time?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And was there a labor difficulty pending at that time?

Mr. MILLER. There was a labor difficulty pending at that time.

Chairman WALSH. In the city of Brooklyn?

Mr. MILLER. In the city of Brooklyn.

Chairman WALSH. How long were you on that work, on the clothing work?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I was on the clothing work I should say for, as nearly as I can recall now, at different periods, for three months. You know it extended over after, and certain issues came up.

Chairman WALSH. Was that a strike or a lockout or both? Just broadly state it?

Mr. MILLER. Well, that was practically a lockout.

Chairman WALSH. Practically a lockout?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Certain men struck and the employers locked out the rest?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Was there any organization of employers in Brooklyn at the time?

Mr. MILLER. Of employees?

Chairman WALSH. Of employers? Was there an employers' association in the clothing trade in Brooklyn at the time?

Mr. MILLER. Well, there was an employers' association in New York which covered Brooklyn.

Chairman WALSH. It covered this territory?

Mr. MILLER. The clothing manufacturers association did.

Chairman WALSH. Was there a strike in other manufactories aside from the Peck factory?

Chairman WALSH. But you only represented that one?

Mr. MILLER. That is all.

Chairman WALSH. How much of a staff did you have in your work in the clothing trade?

Mr. MILLER. There were about five of us there.

Chairman WALSH. About five of you?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Now, did you go to Brooklyn on this work for S. W. Peck before or after the strike was called or the lockout begun?

Mr. MILLER. I think it was just about—perhaps about as the strike had started.

Chairman WALSH. Just as it started?

Mr. MILLER. Perhaps it was a little before. I have forgotten.

Chairman WALSH. If it was before, what length of time would you say?

Mr. MILLER. A very short time before.

Chairman WALSH. Was it a matter of days or hours or weeks?

Mr. MILLER. It was a matter of a few days probably.

Chairman WALSH. You were called in, as I take it, on account of the fact that the relations were not pleasant between the employers and employees?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And when you were there a few days a lockout had been instituted or a strike took place?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And how long did it last, the whole strike?

Mr. MILLER. Why it lasted I believe to the 10th of March.

Chairman WALSH. The 10th of March?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. That is before it was entirely settled, until the 10th of March.

Chairman WALSH. I will ask you this: In your employment in these concerns are you paid a lump sum? Do you contract for a lump sum or so much salary and so much for staff?

Mr. MILLER. So much salary and so much for staff.

Chairman WALSH. So much for staff?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And it depends then, of course, on the length of time of your service?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Now, when you were working for Stone & Webster, in what cities did you work?

Mr. MILLER. Only in Jacksonville.

Chairman WALSH. Only in Jacksonville?

Mr. MILLER. That is all. I was to go to other cities, but on account of the fever I contracted in Jacksonville I did not go.

Chairman WALSH. How long were you there?

Mr. MILLER. About two months.

Chairman WALSH. And did I make a mistake? I thought you stated that it was two weeks for Stone & Webster?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, no.

Chairman WALSH. It was two months?

Mr. MILLER. It was between six weeks and two months. I think it was two months. It was not less than six weeks.

Chairman WALSH. Not less than six weeks, and you think two months?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And all of your work was in Jacksonville?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Was there a labor difficulty pending in Jacksonville at the time?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. They—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). What is that?

Mr. MILLER. Stone & Webster was—what they wanted to was what brought on that difficulty.

Chairman WALSH. The difficulty was in progress when you reached Jacksonville?

Mr. MILLER. It was in the embryo when I got there.

Chairman WALSH. What is that?

Mr. MILLER. They had not gone out when I got there.

Chairman WALSH. Was there an association of street employees in Jacksonville?

Mr. MILLER. There was. The organization was made up at the time that the employees went out.

Chairman WALSH. That the employees went out?

Mr. MILLER. They applied to the American Federation of Labor there to be taken in at the time or just prior to the time the strike was called.

Chairman WALSH. And when did you get there with reference to the time the strike was called?

Mr. MILLER. I got there at about the same time that the strike was called.

Chairman WALSH. Well, was it—was that a matter of days?

Mr. MILLER. That was a matter of days; yes.

Chairman WALSH. Could you tell whether it was a few days before or a few days afterwards?

Mr. MILLER. It was two or three days before.

Chairman WALSH. How long had there been a labor organization of any kind in Jacksonville when you got there?

Mr. MILLER. I don't think there had been any.

Chairman WALSH. Well, was the effort being made to organize the men at that time?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. By the Amalgamated Association?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And who was in there as leader for the amalgamating association?

Mr. MILLER. That slips my mind now.

Chairman WALSH. Was Mr. Mahon there?

Mr. MILLER. No; he was not.

Chairman WALSH. Was Mr. Pratt in the organization at that time?

Mr. MILLER. No; he was not in the organization.

Chairman WALSH. Mr. Terry?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; I think it was Mr. Terry if I remember rightly.

Chairman WALSH. And you remained there for some time?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Was the strike over when you left?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. You say that the work you did in the clothing industry was when?

Mr. MILLER. The latter part of 1912 and the first part of 1913.

Chairman WALSH. Now, you say that the clothing, the work you did in the clothing industry was when?

Mr. MILLER. Why, it was the latter part of 1912 and the first part of 1913.

Chairman WALSH. And in the dock workers?

Mr. MILLER. And now, I have forgotten that dock workers' date.

Chairman WALSH. Well, approximate it as near as you can.

Mr. MILLER. I think that was in 1911.

Chairman WALSH. It was prior to your service for Mr. Peck?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. You are quite sure of that?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; I am quite sure of that.

Chairman WALSH. When was your service at Jacksonville?

Mr. MILLER. That was the latter part of 1911.

Chairman WALSH. Now, will you kindly tell me, if there be such in your memory, in existence, some industry in which you were employed when there was not any trouble pending, and in which no trouble came?

Mr. MILLER. Why, I was in the United States Carbonate Co.

Chairman WALSH. What?

Mr. MILLER. Carbonate.

Chairman WALSH. How long were you with them?

Mr. MILLER. A year and a half.

Chairman WALSH. Was that in the last seven years?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. When was it?

Mr. MILLER. That was about six years ago.

Chairman WALSH. Where is their place?

Mr. MILLER. Down on the Passaic River, just above Newark.

Chairman WALSH. How long were you with them?

Mr. MILLER. A year and a half.

Chairman WALSH. When I asked you for the longest places, Mr. Miller, you mentioned those other three. Was the character of your employment any different with the United States Carbonate Co. than it was with those others?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I was associate receiver of the United States Carbonate Co.

Chairman WALSH. You were receiver?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir; associate; John R. Harper was receiver of the United States Carbonate Co.

Chairman WALSH. What—your appointment with that company was a court appointment?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. What court?

Mr. MILLER. The Chancery Court of New Jersey.

Chairman WALSH. You were an official of the Chancery Court of New Jersey?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And operating the plant?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Would you care to put that in as one of the places? I am leading up to find out just how your system applies to the industrial system as a whole, and how it could be worked in. What I want to know is, if you do not make a distinction between the work you did for the carbonate company and the work you did for the clothing companies, street railway, and dock-workers' industries.

Mr. MILLER. The difference is this—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). I don't care for the difference. Is there a difference?

Mr. MILLER. There is a difference.

Chairman WALSH. You were appointed by the court, and you were paid a fee which was charged up in the case?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Did you remain on the job during all the time? Was it a matter of continuous employment?

Mr. MILLER. Very much so; yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Where did you have an office during the time you were with them?

Mr. MILLER. I had the same office—922 Broadway.

Chairman WALSH. How many employees in the United States Carbonate Co.?

Mr. MILLER. It varies; it was simply a matter of maintenance while the case was in the court, and the process of finding out some way to reorganize the property. Very few.

Chairman WALSH. Approximately how many employees in the United States Carbonate Co.?

Mr. MILLER. I should say it averaged perhaps 20.

Chairman WALSH. Twenty?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. What was the total number when the company was operating outside of the jurisdiction of the court?

Mr. MILLER. Probably 150.

Chairman WALSH. One hundred and fifty?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. During the time you were there, the general character of those 20 employees, were they mechanics or clerks, or what?

Mr. MILLER. Mechanics, principally.

Chairman WALSH. Mechanics, principally?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; and watchmen.

Chairman WALSH. How many mechanics and how many watchmen?

Mr. MILLER. Well, four—five watchmen, and there were about three or four painters. It is necessary to keep machinery painted when idle.

Chairman WALSH. It was just such an equipment as was necessary to keep the plant from running down while in the hands of the court?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir. Occasionally, we made certain tests of the machinery to see whether it was practical.

Chairman WALSH. They were not operating the plant?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir; it was in a state of reorganization. All I did was to find out if reorganization was practical.

Chairman WALSH. And they were not producing any produce for a year and a half?

Mr. MILLER. Not for market; simply for test.

Chairman WALSH. Whatever action you took—general action—was under the orders of the court?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Federal court?

Mr. MILLER. Chancery court.

Chairman WALSH. I shall eliminate that from the list for the purpose of the questions I am going to ask, so that you can drop that from your mind.

I wish you would take the street car situation, which was the first one, and tell us, if you will, exactly what you did.

Mr. MILLER. Which was that?

Chairman WALSH. One minute, please. I believe that you stated that the philosophy of your business scheme, or professional scheme, was to establish better relations between the employers and the employees, and to develop the mental attitude of the workers and employees so that they would have a better understanding, that the employers could get along better with the men, not attempt to exploit them, and that the men could do better and more efficient work with less fatigue. That about states your statement?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. I wish you would, as briefly as possible, tell us exactly what you did in Jacksonville.

Mr. MILLER. In Jacksonville, I wandered around the city, I made inquiries through men who had worked for the car company. I made inquiries of mer-

chants around the city as to the car company, as to the general opinion of the management of the car company, and such inquiries as would lead to establish, in my mind, what the discontent of those workers were. The idea was to establish, from disinterested people, who might have valuable knowledge, why those workers went out.

Chairman WALSH. What else?

Mr. MILLER. What the cause of this sudden——

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). And, in general terms, among whom did you inquire?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I inquired among anybody that I thought would have any interest. I would inquire of a merchant.

Chairman WALSH. Was your purpose announced publicly?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir; it was not public, nor was it secret. It was neither one thing nor the other.

Chairman WALSH. You were attempting to ascertain, as I understand you, and localizing it, the cause of the strike?

Mr. MILLER. I wanted to find out personally the cause of the strike.

Chairman WALSH. You wanted to ascertain personally the cause of the strike?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And to do that you went to the employers, of course?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And to the men who had been in the industry and were on strike?

Mr. MILLER. Not particularly to the men that were on strike. The men who had left the company.

Chairman WALSH. The men who had left the company?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Did you go to them in a body?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, no.

Chairman WALSH. You went to them individually?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Were they holding meetings?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir; I didn't go to the meetings.

Chairman WALSH. Were they holding them?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Did you go to any of the meetings?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Did you talk to Mr. Terry, or whoever was in charge?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir; I did not talk to Mr. Terry.

Chairman WALSH. Did you talk to the public, the business men, etc.?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. You told them what your purpose was, did you not?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir; I did not tell them particularly what my purpose was one way or the other.

Chairman WALSH. How many men, approximately, were in the organization that were out?

Mr. MILLER. I think about 400, if I remember rightly, approximately that.

Chairman WALSH. Mr. Miller, anything else that you may have done there?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I will state that the trend of my report was this——

Chairman WALSH. No; but what did you do? You say you inquired in those various places to ascertain the cause of the strike?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And the opinions of the individuals?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. As to the cause of the strike?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. What else, if anything, did you do before making any report?

Mr. MILLER. I pursued that course pretty much throughout the time I was down there.

Chairman WALSH. What else did you do besides inquire from those various quarters as to the cause of the strike, if anything?

Mr. MILLER. I didn't do anything.

Chairman WALSH. You didn't do anything?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Did you make any effort—or what effort did you make, if any—toward establishing this proposition that you say you think underlies this situation?

Mr. MILLER. I didn't make any effort.

Chairman WALSH. You didn't make any effort there?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir. My mission down there was to find why this trouble was produced.

Chairman WALSH. Yes; and that is all?

Mr. MILLER. That is all.

Chairman WALSH. You thought you ascertained that?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; I thought I found out, and reported to that effect.

Chairman WALSH. Did you make suggestions as to allaying any feeling that there was?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; I made suggestions and they were accepted, and I was to continue those suggestions throughout other parts of the system.

Chairman WALSH. In what way, if in any way, did you attempt to put into operation the plan that you suggested to our commission here?

Mr. MILLER. I made no attempt to put in the plan excepting in my recommendations to the company.

Chairman WALSH. Well, did you say anything to the workers about it?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Did you say anything to the men who were leading the organization?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Was the strike there for wages, conditions, hours?

Mr. MILLER. Ostensibly it was for wages. As a matter of fact, I think also it was rather conditions.

Chairman WALSH. It was rather conditions?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. The men that were on strike, what did they claim?

Mr. MILLER. The wages were very low there.

Chairman WALSH. What did the men on strike say they were staying out for?

Mr. MILLER. For money.

Chairman WALSH. For more wages?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; and they were entitled to it.

Chairman WALSH. They were entitled to it?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. You didn't say anything to them about your plans?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Individually or collectively?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. You entered the clothing business in 1912 and 1913?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. I wish you would begin and briefly state to the commission what you did during the three months that you were in Brooklyn. What were your general duties?

Mr. MILLER. My general duties—I wandered around. I would go into a clothing factory, say, and I would watch the workers, if there were any. In the clothing factories some of the workers stayed in. I watched the workers; I watched the management; I studied the system. For instance, I heard in one shop down the line—I will compare two shops.

In one shop the fighting around that particular shop was very severe. Every striker was out. Well, now, I became interested in finding out why the animosity against that particular shop was so great.

Chairman WALSH. And did you ascertain the facts?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. To your satisfaction?

Mr. MILLER. I ascertained the facts.

Chairman WALSH. What else did you do?

Mr. MILLER. As to why that animosity was—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Existed?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir. In other words, the fault was with the particular type of management which there was in that shop, which was an exploiting system, which provoked the workers and annoyed them unnecessarily. And the consequence was, when they went out they attacked the shop and attempted to

destroy it, which afterwards, after my investigation, I did not blame them much for doing it.

Chairman WALSH. So that one of the things you did was to inquire into the acute disturbance in the particular place?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir. I wanted to find out what the personality was.

Chairman WALSH. How long did it take you to make that particular inquiry?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, I was off and on there, I guess, for a couple weeks.

Then, in another shop, the workers had stayed in, they would not go out. This was also for the same concern.

Chairman WALSH. Yes?

Mr. MILLER. I went up there and made an investigation as to why those people stayed in, why they did not go out.

Chairman WALSH. Did you talk to the employers in both instances?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Did you talk with the employees in both instances?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; everybody concerned in those two instances that I could find to talk to.

Chairman WALSH. What else did you do aside from inquiring into the cause of violence at this one place, and the phenomena, as you might call it, of the men staying in the shop when they did not in the other places? What else did you do?

Mr. MILLER. I went into the contractors' shop. I talked to the contractors, and people who worked in contracting shops, and people in tuberculosis shops, that sort of things.

Chairman WALSH. Anything else?

Mr. MILLER. That was principally what I did.

Chairman WALSH. What else did you do while you were in Brooklyn?

Mr. MILLER. That was practically all.

Chairman WALSH. Did you suggest a plan to the employers for bringing about more amicable relations, and all the industrial unrest of Brooklyn on the occasion of this visit?

Mr. MILLER. I did, but I don't think it was ever accepted.

Chairman WALSH. Briefly, what was the plan?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I simply suggested, I pointed out to the management, the system of management that had not been successful. But I will say as to the economic conditions as a whole, in the clothing industry, at that time I did not have clearly the same ideas that I have now, or that I have in the course of preparation at the present time.

Chairman WALSH. That you have now, and what else? I didn't catch that?

Mr. MILLER. That I have in course of preparation at the present time.

Chairman WALSH. That you have in course of preparation at the present time?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir. It is a very complicated industry, the clothing industry is, and while my conclusions are very clear on it, we have to get evidence, additional evidence.

Chairman WALSH. Did you give any advice to the men who were on strike in Brooklyn?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Either individually or collectively?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir; not in that case.

Chairman WALSH. Not in that case?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Now, I wish you would briefly state what you did in Boston, if you did anything, different from what you did in Brooklyn and the other place?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir; Boston was very much the same, with the exception that I came to the conclusion in Boston that the strikers were right and the management was wrong, and I so advised the men in New York, that that was my idea; that I thought it would be better for the company and better for the men if the union was acknowledged, and I did advise some of the strikers in that case to that end.

Chairman WALSH. In those places did you look after such things as the sanitary arrangements and the hygienic welfare of the people in the industry? Or did that come under your system?

Mr. MILLER. That did not come under it.

Chairman WALSH. I understand you to say that you thought the cause of industrial unrest was the lack of study in Paterson?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. The lack of study of the foreigners engaged in the industry?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. Well, yes; the lack of study generally.

Chairman WALSH. And that the remedy was to restore or build up the mental attitude or the intelligence of the worker and the employer.

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. To the end that a better understanding might be had, and that the policy of crushing the brain of the worker, as by the present system, might be done away with?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. To put that into concrete, everyday terms, what observation have you had of the crushing of the brain of the workers under the present system?

Mr. MILLER. In dock workers that might be exaggerating it, or it might be resented.

Chairman WALSH. I don't wish to present it that way; but I am trying to get at whether or not you have a remedy now for the industrial unrest.

Mr. MILLER. My idea is, in the case of a foreman, for instance—our idea of training foremen and managers is to train instructives.

Chairman WALSH. To train instructives?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; our idea is not that the foreman or the superintendent is the brains of the plant. Every worker in the plant has a mind that is of special value. Our tendency is to, in the place of the ordinary foremen, put men in there and instruct and raise the quality and relations—raise the ideal and utilize the mentality of the employee.

Chairman WALSH. Let me localize further, if possible. Pick out a shop in the city of Paterson which you investigated and tell me the change that, in your opinion as an expert, you would make with reference to the employment of the foremen therein.

Mr. MILLER. I don't want to go into an individual shop in Paterson specially. I will show you an instance that came up last night.

Chairman WALSH. One minute, please. I will let you make an explanation, but I would like to keep to this for the present.

You would prefer not to mention any plant in Paterson in which you could put this plan in operation in Paterson on account of the personal element involved?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Would you, without mentioning any names, mention a condition in a shop in Paterson which has a tendency—I am simply using this as your phrase—to depress or crush the brain of the worker, and what you would do toward selecting a foreman, and what the present foreman does that has that tendency, and the advice that you would give to the foreman whom you would select?

Mr. MILLER. The tendency in some shops in Paterson is to treat the worker rather as an automaton.

Chairman WALSH. As an automaton?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. What do you mean by that? That in the case of a weaver, as I understand it, he has a machine to attend.

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Watch the material going through and stop the machine when the work is not being done properly, and perform some other little things of that kind. How does the foreman treat the men in doing that work?

Mr. MILLER. He treats them not as well as he does his machine. It is an automatic proposition to him. There is no individuality. The extent that a man who may be doing very good work, or may have a tendency to do very good work; there is not enough attention given to training a man up to his work.

Chairman WALSH. The man has a loom?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. That I see.

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. You have seen them, of course?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Well, take four looms—

Mr. MILLER (interrupting). If he makes one or two mistakes, he is thrown out. My idea in that case would be to take a man who was normal and train him up rather than throw him out. When you throw him out you make him an enemy.

Chairman WALSH. That is, if you treat him with any sort of justice?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. What I wish to say, we are on this particular industry now. Tell me how a man is treated, a weaver, say, who is operating four looms, which seems to be a matter of controversy here between the employers and the employees, how the man is treated there by the foreman, the man that you say does not do it right, and how you would propose that should be done to allay the ill feeling between the employer and the employee?

Mr. MILLER. Well, in the case where, for instance, the case of speeding up, we regard overspeeding as a very serious condition.

Chairman WALSH. You regard overspeeding as a serious condition?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. I am trying to get a local case to apply?

Mr. MILLER. For instance, here is a man, say, 25 years old, working four looms. I don't say that this is a particular case. This man can work those three or four looms, as the case may be, without injury to himself. Perhaps next to him is a man 50 years old who is not quick enough to operate those four looms. Do you see?

Chairman WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Then, our idea is, under the conditions, to overwork a worker, because it reflects back on the entire plant.

Chairman WALSH. But that is the general proposition that a man should not be overworked?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. But I am getting down to this now: Give me the case of a foreman. Your plan would be, then, if I get your simile right, that this old man of 50 should not be discharged because he could not do as much as the young man of 25?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. What should be done with him under your system?

Mr. MILLER. Well, that is a question of the general policy of your plant.

Chairman WALSH. Have you worked out in a concrete way your plan so that it could be applied to an industry in Paterson?

Mr. MILLER. Why, yes; it could be applied to an industry in Paterson.

Chairman WALSH. Will you state any other—all I have been able to gather, and it may be because I have asked questions along one line, has been that you thought the foremen should not treat the workmen with injustice or severity.

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Is that correct?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Anything else in your plan?

Mr. MILLER. The plan involves a general system on instruction.

Chairman WALSH. To whom?

Mr. MILLER. To the workers.

Chairman WALSH. Well, how would the workers—do I understand that you expect them not to be so speedy or to refuse to do this added work?

Mr. MILLER. No; that comes directly from the management.

Chairman WALSH. Well, what would you instruct the worker to do in the case where he was, say, 50 years of age and the foreman was threatening him with discharge on account of the fact that he did not operate four looms with as much speed as a man of 25?

Mr. MILLER. Well, the worker in that case—you have got to control the management, not the worker. You can't control the worker.

Chairman WALSH. There is nothing the worker could do in that case?

Mr. MILLER. No—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Now, you say you found the tendency here for the employers here in some instances to lump the Italian workers, the high-class ones, with the Italian criminally inclined?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And in your work as organization engineer have you observed or is it your opinion that there are persons who are criminally inclined as distinguished from normal persons?

Mr. MILLER. In rare cases; yes.

Chairman WALSH. In rare cases?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And do you make a study of causes?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. That is, as to environments?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And as to surroundings?

Mr. MILLER. And surroundings.

Chairman WALSH. And educational facilities?

Mr. MILLER. For instance, I have taken men into a plant who are supposed to be criminally inclined and found that when put under a humane system they became very good workers—very fine workers. The criminal inclination is a disease in many cases, capable of being overcome by proper environment.

Chairman WALSH. Well, I had not concluded my question. That would include, of course, the teaching of moral precepts?

Mr. MILLER. Well, moral precepts come from environment to a very great extent.

Chairman WALSH. And the expression of what we might call a religious life, which has grown out of ancestry and youthful teachings and things of that sort?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. They cut a figure, of course, with a man deemed to be criminally inclined?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And you think, then, a very small minority, from your investigation, of these Italians are criminally inclined and that the trouble came here from classifying those from what you call high-class Italians with the others. What is your definition, applied locally, of high-class Italians?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I don't know as I would call them high-class Italians; but I mean a good, clean-minded worker.

Chairman WALSH. A good man morally?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. That abides by the law?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And by the conventions as proclaimed by society as a whole?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And his financial condition, of course, would have nothing to do with that?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, no.

Chairman WALSH. His ability to work, of course, would have nothing to do with making him a good citizen?

Mr. MILLER. No; it is simply a state of mind.

Chairman WALSH. Just a state of mind?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Now, you found another class; now, what sort of a plan have you, if any, to do away with that cause of unrest in Paterson? What would you do to eliminate what you conceive to be the injustice of taking these few criminally inclined and in fact and by expression putting them with the high-class ones?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I think Paterson is not different in that respect from a great many industrial centers. As I stated, in the first place, the solution of that problem probably is the bringing to bear on the industrial conditions the same type of analysis, the same type of brain, that we bring to bear and have brought to bear in this country in the development of our mechanical and financial institutions. Now, for certain hereditary reasons—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Well, very briefly, where would you get your plan in the educational system of the country?

Mr. MILLER. I should go—for instance, there is an experiment now in the Detroit Chamber of Commerce. They are sending all over the country for experts to analyze all the different nationalities that are gathered into Detroit there and to work out the characteristics of each with the idea of amalgamating the institutions. As I said before, the Tennessee Coal & Iron experiment was tremendously successful down there—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). My question was, What would be your plan, now, specifically, bearing upon the one class that we have come to—that is, the amalgamation—in the minds of the employers of the high-class Italians and the criminally inclined?

Mr. MILLER. Well, that is simply a matter of study of the characteristics of the Italians until you can distinguish the individual. Now, we can distinguish

naturally an American, as to his quality, after a comparatively short talk with him.

Chairman WALSH. You can?

Mr. MILLER. That is, in a general sense.

Chairman WALSH. That is, whether or not he is criminally inclined and if so, whether it is a matter of environment or disease, or because of depravity?

Mr. MILLER. Yes—in a comparatively short time.

Chairman WALSH. Why is it more difficult to do it in the case of the Italian through an interpreter?

Mr. MILLER. Well, in the first place, we don't understand the customs generations back under which he has been developed. In a great many cases we don't understand his language, and he has certain characteristics, different as to each nationality, that we frequently do not understand.

Chairman WALSH. Very good. Now, directly, what would you tell the employer to do about that to remove that cause, under your plan?

Mr. MILLER. To put it briefly, I should tell the employee—

Chairman WALSH. The employer, you mean?

Mr. MILLER. The employer, rather, to put in a very much different class—a higher class, as it were—either of superintendents or of high-class men over the human element, however mixed.

Chairman WALSH. Is there any other suggestion you wish to make with respect to that industrial unrest in Paterson that you observed?

Mr. MILLER. That same proposition might be taken up by the chamber of commerce, or it might be taken up by the manufacturers.

Chairman WALSH. Is there any suggestion that you would have to make to the other workmen in the industry or to the high-class Italians themselves? Could they do anything toward ameliorating conditions?

Mr. MILLER. No; I think very little. That is the reason that I devoted so much attention to the employer.

Chairman WALSH. Yes. Well now, then, as I understand it from the evidence here, there were three organizations; the American Federation of Labor, represented at this hearing by a witness, Mr. Morgan, and two types of an industrial organization known as the Industrial Workers of the World. Now, would you give to those organizations—have you any plan that you would give to them as organizations to do away with that cause of industrial unrest, to wit, the amalgamation of the high-class Italians with the criminal classes?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Chairman WALSH. There is nothing you could say to the workers about that?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Now, you stated another cause. The other cause was that there were certain Jewish manufacturers who exploited labor unnecessarily?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. That is to their own economic advantage and to the hurt of the worker?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. How many of them were there?

Mr. MILLER. I haven't any idea; I haven't been over here for six months.

Chairman WALSH. You said certain Jewish manufacturers. Are there any other manufacturers that do that?

Mr. MILLER. Why, I rather think there are.

Chairman WALSH. But it just struck you that there were certain Jewish manufacturers that exhibited the characteristics of greediness?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And ignorance?

Mr. MILLER. Yes. In other words, the Jewish manufacturers, the principal class I have in mind, are not really manufacturers, but normally trade people; and when they go into manufacturing, at first, until they learn a whole lot, the tendency is to exploit their labor beyond the proper point.

Chairman WALSH. That is to take advantage of everything that there is surrounding them in the industry within the law to make money?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Do you notice any difference between a Jewish manufacturer and a Yankee or a Donegal peddler in that respect?

Mr. MILLER. I will say that I have seen some scientific exploitation in New England.

Chairman WALSH. They simply don't do it quite so well?

Mr. MILLER. No; they don't do it quite so well.

Chairman WALSH. It is shocking to the average mind?

Mr. MILLER. It certainly is. Now I will say in Lawrence there are people I represented telegraphed down and wanted to know if I hadn't joined the I. W. W.

Chairman WALSH. Do you know Mr. Robert Valentine, of Boston, who calls himself an industrial engineer?

Mr. MILLER. No; I do not.

Chairman WALSH. And who has apparently done a great deal of work at the Plympton Press and other places?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, yes; I remember.

Chairman WALSH. Do you believe that it is possible to democratize industry; that is, to establish organizations of employers and workers so that each will have a compelling voice under the present industrial system in the matter of hours, labor conditions, employment, and compensation? Is such a thing possible in your opinion as an expert?

Mr. MILLER. I should not say it was practicable at present with our knowledge of human relations in industry. The science of human relations in industry—we have built up such tremendous units so rapidly that we can not look for any ideal conditions, I do not think, for some time to come.

Chairman WALSH. I am not trying, and perhaps I misled you, but I am not trying to state what I deem to be an ideal condition; but, as I understand, Mr. Valentine, who is engaged in a somewhat similar work, his proposition is to democratize industry in the way I have stated—I have tried to state it as sharply as I could—to democratize industry by establishing organizations of employers and workers so that each will have a compelling voice under the present industrial system in the matter of hours, labor conditions, employment, and compensation. Can such a thing be done according to your opinion as an expert?

Mr. MILLER. No; I don't think so.

Chairman WALSH. Now, you say as you developed the mentality of an employee he becomes harmonious and less subject to fatigue. Did I get you right?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; the greater interest he takes in his work the more harmonious the action of his body.

Chairman WALSH. Does he do more or less work?

Mr. MILLER. He does more work and does it more easily.

Chairman WALSH. That is, he does more work and does not get as tired as he did before?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. He lifts the same load?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And makes the same motions?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And still don't get tired?

Mr. MILLER. Still don't get as tired.

Chairman WALSH. Because he is a more harmonious man?

Mr. MILLER. No; the body works more harmoniously. There is no retardation.

Chairman WALSH. Is that a development of efficient management?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Do you make a study of motions?

Mr. MILLER. I never have made a time study of motions in my life.

Chairman WALSH. Do you think that discontent on the part of the worker comes partly from bodily fatigue?

Mr. MILLER. Partly from bodily fatigue and partly from want of proper use of the brain or the proper interest of the brain.

Chairman WALSH. Now, if I understand you, and I want to see if I do understand you, if a man's brain is highly developed and if he has an intelligent mind he accomplishes the same amount of work with less effort and therefore does not become fatigued.

Mr. MILLER. He does not become fatigued to the extent—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). To the extent that he did before?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. So that is the point. So it is a matter of the general education of the worker?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And do you find now that the schools that are maintained by the public are not educating workers in a proper way for the life

which they are to lead to make them happiest by enabling them to do their work most easily?

Mr. MILLER. I don't think they are.

Chairman WALSH. Now, you told of an experiment you made with certain Italians. How many did you take?

Mr. MILLER. I started with 10 and ran up to 150.

Chairman WALSH. How long did you continue the operation?

Mr. MILLER. The operation was extended—well, the first operation was about two months. Then afterwards it was moved from a railroad to a construction of an irrigation works or waterwork, and it was continued over there about three months, if I remember rightly.

Chairman WALSH. Now, how many men did you have for the first experiment?

Mr. MILLER. The first operation 10 men only.

Chairman WALSH. And the next operation?

Mr. MILLER. In the waterworks part I worked up from 10 to 150.

Chairman WALSH. Did you keep the same 10 you had the first time?

Mr. MILLER. I kept the same 10 I had the first time.

Chairman WALSH. Now, take those 10 alone, you had them for six months?

Mr. MILLER. Yes—or about five months, I think it was.

Chairman WALSH. And you say you applied a certain experiment to them and found them to be much improved and better men at the end of the experiment than at first?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. What were the defects you found in them at first?

Mr. MILLER. In their original state, as I took them out of the gravel pit, in watching them very closely and analyzing their motions very closely I discovered they were making anywhere from 6 to 20 false motions to 1 really effective motion. That is, as nearly as I could analyze their occupation they were principally watching the foreman with his pick handle rather more interestedly than they were the proposition of getting that gravel into the car.

Chairman WALSH. Were they shovelers?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; they were shovelers.

Chairman WALSH. During all the time of the experiment?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; well, no; on the other work they became drivers, and for a time handled wheel scrapers.

Chairman WALSH. But they were ordinary laborers to begin with and when they got through they were ordinary laborers?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; the idea was to take the lowest form possible of labor work.

Chairman WALSH. What other defect did you notice when you started your experiment besides taking so many motions to accomplish the work?

Mr. MILLER. Well, I didn't think they were fed properly. They didn't look—they were overcrowded in the bunk houses and didn't get or rarely got a chance to take their clothes off; used to tumble into bed with their clothes on principally; and sometimes they would tumble into their beds wet, and that sort of thing. There were no accommodations for drying their clothes or taking such sanitary steps as might be necessary.

Chairman WALSH. Anything else?

Mr. MILLER. And they were generally afraid—had no confidence in the system under which they were working. Their whole idea was to get their \$2.50 a day and not get hit with the pick handle and to get away with it.

Chairman WALSH. What were they eating at the time you began the experiment?

Mr. MILLER. Well, they were eating meat and beans of a quality mostly uncooked.

Chairman WALSH. Was it provided by the commissary?

Mr. MILLER. Provided by the regular railroad commissary.

Chairman WALSH. And not properly cooked?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Chairman WALSH. Now, after you took them in charge did you change their diet?

Mr. MILLER. I did change their diet.

Chairman WALSH. What did you give them?

Mr. MILLER. Gave them meat and potatoes and peas and beans—properly cooked—well cooked—as well as I ate myself.

Chairman WALSH. And gave them decent living conditions?

Mr. MILLER. I gave them decent living conditions that I thought were normal.

Chairman WALSH. Did you study their personal habits as to whether they used liquor to excess?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And did they, to begin with?

Mr. MILLER. No; they did not use liquor—that particular crowd did not—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Did they have families?

Mr. MILLER. Not with them.

Chairman WALSH. Did you inquire into their home surroundings?

Mr. MILLER. Not very extensively. Most of their families lived in Italy.

Chairman WALSH. Did you pick them out with respect to age?

Mr. MILLER. No; I did not; simply picked out 10 men.

Chairman WALSH. Young and old?

Mr. MILLER. Young and old, just as they stood.

Chairman WALSH. And did you inquire into what they desired to do afterwards, as to whether any of them wanted to go into other and higher employment?

Mr. MILLER. Oh, yes; yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. So the 10 you picked out were reasonably ambitious?

Mr. MILLER. No; I did not inquire into their ideas and surroundings until after I picked them out.

Chairman WALSH. But there were 10 you kept all the way through?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Now, I believe you stated they were men of good personal habits to begin with?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. You don't know what their home surroundings were?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. But they made too many motions in their work?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And were not fed properly?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Chairman WALSH. And did not have sanitary surroundings as to health?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Chairman WALSH. Now, you gave them these?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And at the end of the six months what did you find out about that?

Mr. MILLER. Why, I found out that they were improved physically; that is, if you notice—if you have ever been in industrial towns—you go into a town where there is a great deal of exploitation and you will see a great deal of difference in the carriage of the men.

Chairman WALSH. In other words, that they walk straight up?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; walk straight up, with their heads in the air.

Chairman WALSH. These men were improved physically?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; improved physically, and they were improved mentally. They showed a clearer conception and higher intelligence of their surroundings, and improved in every way possible and in their expression and in their confidence in the general surroundings. I never saw—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). You mean by expression their bodily expression?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; both their bodily expression—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). And their mental attitude toward their surroundings?

Mr. MILLER. And their mental attitude toward their surroundings.

Chairman WALSH. Now, you say you did not inquire when you went into this as to their desires and ambitions?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Chairman WALSH. What they hoped to be or do?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Chairman WALSH. Or what their family relations were?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Chairman WALSH. Or what they hoped they should be?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Chairman WALSH. When you took them out did you inquire as to any part they took in community life, or did they have any?

Mr. MILLER. They had no community life.

Chairman WALSH. After they got through were they in a place where they could give expression of community life, as, for instance, pride in the State or county—

Mr. MILLER. No; they were still on the frontier on this waterworks.

Chairman WALSH. Or to any desire to improve their conditions by law or to study the laws of the country or anything of that sort?

Mr. MILLER. Simply that they were taking an interest when they got through in the farms and the surrounding farming conditions and that sort of thing, and made a great many inquiries of me. I used to talk to them a good deal.

Chairman WALSH. Got acquainted with them?

Mr. MILLER. I got very closely acquainted with them, because I was interested in the experiment and wanted to see what the result would be; and generally the tendency was to find out if I could advise them in any way by which they could acquire land and about going into farming. That seemed to be their particular tendency.

Chairman WALSH. And when during that six months did you get that first expression that they desired or might desire to become farmers?

Mr. MILLER. Well, about—I should say this was perhaps a month after we got into Utah.

Chairman WALSH. This was in Utah—now, then, at the end of your experiment they showed a desire to find out about conditions that surrounded them?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And they looked better physically?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Now, what else?

Mr. MILLER. They were more intelligent. I will say that I ran that up to the 150 men and had no foremen.

Chairman WALSH. Well, these 10 men, what were they getting when they started?

Mr. MILLER. \$2.50 a day.

Chairman WALSH. What did they get when they finished?

Mr. MILLER. \$2.50 a day.

Chairman WALSH. After you eliminated these motions did they shovel more gravel and do more work?

Mr. MILLER. Yes; they did fully twice as much.

Chairman WALSH. Now, what became of them—of the whole 150?

Mr. MILLER. Well, that I don't know.

Chairman WALSH. Did they go into other industries?

Mr. MILLER. They went into other industries.

Chairman WALSH. What about the first 10?

Mr. MILLER. Some of the first 10, I understood afterwards, stayed in Utah and went to farming; but what the others did I never—

Chairman WALSH. You don't know?

Mr. MILLER. No.

Chairman WALSH. And did you do this for some company or just do it yourself?

Mr. MILLER. This experiment?

Chairman WALSH. Yes, sir.

Mr. MILLER. That was purely a personal experiment, while I was chief engineer of these works. I was carrying on this experiment.

Chairman WALSH. You have stated, have you, Mr. Miller, all of the causes, now, of the industrial unrest that you have observed during your visits to these various places? You have given us, so far as you can give in language in this length of time, any plans that you might have for allaying some of this industrial unrest?

Mr. MILLER. As far as I can think of at the present time.

Commissioner WALSH. If there is anything else you desire to state voluntarily or any explanation that you wish to give of your testimony, you may do so?

Mr. MILLER. There is nothing else that I think of.

Chairman WALSH. Just a moment. Did you ever employ other persons or have anything to do with employing other persons while the strikes were in progress at any of the places where you have worked?

Mr. MILLER. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Did you advise employers where and how they could employ men and the circumstances under which they could get them to go into the work and feel satisfied therewith?

Mr. MILLER. That problem has been discussed.

Chairman WALSH. Well, did you give advice on that?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; we have discussed that problem.

Chairman WALSH. Well, did you give advice on it?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. As an expert?

Mr. MILLER. Yes, sir; as to the quality of men desired.

(Witness excused.)

TESTIMONY OF MR. ALEXANDER SCOTT.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is your name?

Mr. SCOTT. Alexander Scott.

Mr. THOMPSON. Please give us your address.

Mr. SCOTT. 541 Forty-seventh Street, Brooklyn.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you formerly editor of the Paterson Daily Issue?

Mr. SCOTT. Paterson Weekly Issue.

Mr. THOMPSON. When were you editor of that paper?

Mr. SCOTT. From February 1, 1913, until August 10, or until the first or second week in August.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is, during the time of the strike here?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. What work did you do prior to that time?

Mr. SCOTT. I worked as a free-lance newspaper man.

Mr. THOMPSON. In the East here?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; around New York City.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you been a newspaper man for some time?

Mr. SCOTT. About four years.

Mr. THOMPSON. And is that now your business?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What sort of a paper is the Paterson Weekly Issue?

Mr. SCOTT. It was the official organ of the Socialist Party of this county—Passaic County—owned by the party, and I was the official editor, paid by the Socialist Party of Passaic County.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long had it been in existence?

Mr. SCOTT. I started the paper known as the Weekly Issue. It previously had been published as the Issue of Passaic, a monthly paper, and it had been suspended.

Mr. THOMPSON. For how long?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, I don't know; suspended some five or six months; and then they resurrected the paper as a weekly and brought me from New York to take charge of it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is it now in existence?

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did it die with you—

Mr. SCOTT (interrupting). No; after I left; I think it suspended about two months ago.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was it a paper that was brought into existence at the time of the strike?

Mr. SCOTT. No. In fact we didn't know anything about a strike when the paper was started. The strike broke out just about the time the paper started.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then between the starting of the paper and the starting of the strike there was no connection excepting the one of time?

Mr. SCOTT. No; no connection at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were the aims and objects of that paper of course the aims and objects of the Socialist Party?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; the propaganda of socialism and the giving of Socialist news.

Mr. THOMPSON. And during the progress of the strike your paper published locals relating thereto?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, yes; we did that with the strike more than anything else, because that was more news than anything else we could think of at the time.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, during the course of that strike and the articles you printed, did anything happen to you?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, yes; a great deal happened to me.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you arrested?

Mr. SCOTT. I was arrested three distinct and separate times.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the first time you were arrested and what was the reason for the arrest?

Mr. SCOTT. I was arrested, charged with inciting hostility to the government of the city of Paterson. That indictment was based upon pictures, headlines, and an editorial that I wrote criticizing the chief of police and his officers and the entire city government for their action in the strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was this editorial and the article and the pictures set out in the indictment or connected with it?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were they specified?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you those articles here?

Mr. SCOTT. I have.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would you be willing to file them with the commission?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Please do so.

Mr. SCOTT. I have a complete file of the Issue here as a matter of fact.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, just those articles now for which you were first indicted.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you tried on that indictment?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What court did that indictment come from?

Mr. SCOTT. In the court of quarter sessions.

Mr. THOMPSON. Who is the judge of that?

Mr. SCOTT. Abraham Klenert.

Mr. THOMPSON. And who was the attorney who prosecuted the case?

Mr. SCOTT. Michael Dunn.

Mr. THOMPSON. And who was your attorney?

Mr. SCOTT. Henry Carles, of Newark, and Henry Marelli, of Paterson.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was it a jury trial?

Mr. SCOTT. Jury trial; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the result of that trial?

Mr. SCOTT. I was found guilty as charged.

Mr. THOMPSON. And what was the sentence, if any?

Mr. SCOTT. From 1 to 15 years hard labor.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you put in prison under that charge?

Mr. SCOTT. I went to jail for a short time pending appeal.

Mr. THOMPSON. When you were arrested under the indictment, were you put in jail?

Mr. SCOTT. I was arrested in a hall here where a meeting had been held, taken to the police station and locked up there, and held incommunicado until morning.

Mr. THOMPSON. What time were you arrested in the day?

Mr. SCOTT. At night about 10 o'clock.

Mr. THOMPSON. What you mean is that you were not permitted to communicate with anybody until morning?

Mr. SCOTT. No. Nobody was allowed to see me.

Mr. THOMPSON. And when were you permitted to see anyone?

Mr. SCOTT. In the morning when I got up and pleaded and furnished bail.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you appeal that case?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; it was appealed.

Mr. THOMPSON. To what court was it taken?

Mr. SCOTT. Supreme Court of New Jersey.

Mr. THOMPSON. And has that court decided on the case yet?

Mr. SCOTT. The court decided in my favor.

Mr. THOMPSON. When next were you arrested and what was the charge?

Mr. SCOTT. I don't remember the exact date, but I can soon give it to you. It was about a month afterwards. I was arrested—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). I forget—did I get the date of your first arrest?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; February 28 was the first one.

Mr. THOMPSON. And this next was along about the latter part of March?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. On what charge then were you arrested?

Mr. SCOTT. Criminal libel.

Mr. THOMPSON. Criminal libel.

Mr. SCOTT. Based upon an editorial in which I accused the four police officers who confiscated 5,000 copies of my paper without a search warrant of

being thieves and intimating that a certain individual had something to do with the transaction. This certain individual—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Did you name him then in the paper by name?

Mr. SCOTT. In the editorial I mentioned a name. I would not care to just say that now. I would rather read the editorial, because I am under indictment on that same charge now.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then you may just file that editorial with the commission, if you like.

Mr. SCOTT. All right.

Mr. THOMPSON. And that case has not been tried in the lower court yet?

Mr. SCOTT. No; it has not been tried.

Mr. THOMPSON. You will file that editorial?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; I will. I haven't it here, but I will file it for you later.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you got a copy of the indictment?

Mr. SCOTT. Not here. I can very readily get you one and send it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, will you please get copies of all your indictments?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. When were you next arrested and what was the charge then?

Mr. SCOTT. I was arrested then in July, charged with criminal libel for having printed some affidavits setting forth that a police officer in Paterson named Love had brutally attacked several people. I published the affidavits of these people and also the affidavits of a veterinary surgeon in Paterson called Dr. Cooper. Dr. Cooper had preferred charges against Love to the police commissioners. The police commissioners had done nothing and Dr. Cooper had charges brought against this Policeman Love of atrocious assault. I published a news article covering that and referred in a subhead line to Policeman Love as a drunken Cossack type of policeman, and he brought a charge of criminal libel against me.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you a copy of that article with you?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; I have a copy of all those articles.

Mr. THOMPSON. So you will furnish us also with a copy of them?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You were indicted on that charge?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes—no I was not indicted. I was arrested and had to furnish bail. So far as I know I have not been indicted on that charge, but I had to give bail.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the charge upon which you were arrested and caused to give bail?

Mr. SCOTT. Three of them.

Mr. THOMPSON. But this last case?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, the last case was only about three weeks ago.

Mr. THOMPSON. But there was no indictment there?

Mr. SCOTT. That was another indictment based upon the same editorial and same article which the supreme court had decided to throw out in the other case, of hostility to the government.

Mr. THOMPSON. Just to go back to this third case. As I understand, you say you were arrested for charging a certain police officer with certain things?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. But were not indicted in that case?

Mr. SCOTT. Not as far as I know.

Mr. THOMPSON. What were you arrested for? What did the warrant charge you with?

Mr. SCOTT. The warrant charged me with criminal libel.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you tried on that case?

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was the case dismissed?

Mr. SCOTT. Not that I now of.

Mr. THOMPSON. And that case is still pending in court?

Mr. SCOTT. Still pending, and we don't know anything about it.

Mr. THOMPSON. What court was that in?

Mr. SCOTT. Well, it went to a justice of the peace court, as a matter of fact.

Mr. THOMPSON. Who was the justice?

Mr. SCOTT. I really forgot his name; at the corner of Market Street and Main.

Mr. THOMPSON. Can you get that name and furnish it to the commissioner?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir; I have all these things.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are out on bail now in that case?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. What other charges were you arrested on, if any; I believe you stated in the beginning, three?

Mr. SCOTT. That is all, three; and a fourth one.

Mr. THOMPSON. A fourth one?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir; last month; brought by Chief Bimson, charging criminal libel, based on some articles that the charge of hostility to government had been based on.

Mr. THOMPSON. In the first arrest?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. It does not include the last two articles of criminal libel?

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you arrested in this last matter?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And under indictment?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you put in jail?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long did you stay?

Mr. SCOTT. I had to stay in jail four hours, until bail was secured, bail of \$500.

Mr. THOMPSON. And you are out on bail in that case now?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Where were you at the time you were arrested on the last charge?

Mr. SCOTT. I voluntarily came to Paterson. I was arrested in Paterson. I was notified by my attorney to come here, and I did it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is there anything further, Mr. Scott, that you wish to say in regard to your matters, or anything else?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes. I was going to first of all read this, but I don't think you want me to. I have here a diary of the strike. This is my own personal diary. I did not get it up for this commission. I got this diary, and it is based upon news items in my own paper, from February 1 until August 2, and the important items, in my opinion, the things that I wanted to get down here I put down here with notes as to where they can be found in my paper.

Chairman WALSH. Would you file that with the commission, that document you have?

Mr. SCOTT. I could file this, but I would rather have it read, if possible.

Chairman WALSH. How long is it?

Mr. SCOTT. It is not long; it will take about eight minutes to read it.

Chairman WALSH. Go ahead.

Mr. SCOTT. This is a personal diary, and I shall, if you wish me to, in any case, I shall read the article described here.

Chairman WALSH. Does that document you hold in your hand describe the articles in some way by which they can be identified?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; they can. But all of these papers, I am afraid, I can not file with the committee, because these are my personal property; it is my personal file, and it is the only file I have, and I desire to keep it. However, I shall give the committee all of the extra copies I have, and probably the committee can get a complete file from Socialist headquarters. I shall find out.

(Mr. Scott submitted copies of the Weekly Issue (Passaic, N. J.) of February 1, 22, 28, March 8, 22, April 5, 12, 19, 26, May 3, 17, 24, July 19, 26, and August 2 and 16, 1913.)

The strike started about February 1. Before the strike had spread at all, it broke out in the Doherty mill. The police officials of this city had declared officially in the newspapers that they intended to nip the strike in the bud. They boasted of that fact. The general strike was declared on Wednesday, February 19, at Turn Hall. On Tuesday, February 26, was the day that the vicious attack was made upon the strikers for which I was convicted. Six thousand strikers were out by that time, because of the fact that arrests had been made. Thus the workers' ranks were solidified and, meeting in Turn Hall that day in the afternoon, about 5,000 workers left after the meeting and were proceeding in a peaceful manner, two abreast, along the sidewalks of the city of Paterson, when they were attacked by the police in a brutal and cowardly manner. This is just the article in my paper. Without warning, Flynn, Treska, Quinlan, Kaplan were seized by the police when they marched from the hall and asked to either get out of town or be locked up. They refused to

leave town, maintaining that, as citizens of the United States, they had a right to go to any town they pleased and stay as long as they liked, providing they did not break any law. They were immediately locked up. All the halls were then ordered closed, and arrests were made on the slightest pretext. It was this, the trampling down of all constitutional rights, that caused me to publish that particular issue of my paper and denounce the police for doing so.

This is the heading that got me convicted: "Shall Police Chief Bimson override Constitution?" The Constitution was overridden, not only then, but later. And so I denounced that continually, and always shall denounce lawlessness. The Socialist Party had decided to come into this fight; the strikers could not hold meetings anywhere. They were forbidden. And the Socialist Party decided to hire the biggest hall in town, which they did for the Friday evening, and I made arrangements to get out a special edition of my paper—the weekly issue—for the same day.

On February 26 or 27—that was the day after, the following day—Wilson B. Killenbeck, State secretary of the Socialist Party, mounted the platform in strikers' headquarters where a considerable number of strikers were congregated and proceeded to read the New Jersey constitution relative to free speech, when he was ordered to desist by the police chief who, with a squad of his men, had entered the hall. Killenbeck was placed under arrest, and the chief mounted the platform and proceeded to read the riot act in all its ancient glory. He read every word of it, even to the last "God save the King." I remember that very distinctly.

We arrived at the police station. Chief Bimson asked Killenbeck what was the strange law that he had been reading, and Killenbeck replied, "Why, Chief, that is the constitution of New Jersey. Did you never hear of it before?" The chief evidently considered himself judge and jury, as well as policeman, so he discharged Killenbeck.

The Weekly Issue came off the press on February 28, in the morning. Dr. Korshet, in the doctor's automobile, took 5,000 copies of this paper to Paterson. We intended to distribute them free, if necessary. The price of the paper was 2 cents. We deposited these 5,000 copies in the headquarters of the Socialist Party, which was then on Main Street, about half past 10, and left. A few minutes after—say 15 or 20 minutes—four policemen entered headquarters and demanded the papers from two members of the Socialist Party who were then present. The two members protested and denied to give the papers, refused them. Whereat, one of the policemen—a police detective—in order to feel quite sure, sent one of his assistants over to the chief to find out if they really should take these papers, and his assistant came back in a few minutes and said: "Yes; take them; the chief says it is all right." So they took them forcibly and without a search warrant.

Later, I charged these four policemen with theft. They were not indicted, however; they had to furnish \$200 bail apiece for grand larceny; but they have never been indicted, so far as I know.

On the same day a bench warrant was issued for my arrest and detectives were sent to Passaic and Paterson and elsewhere to look for me. I passed them several times in Passaic, because they did not know me from Adam. I am not a native Patersonian. I am from New York. They had never seen me before, and they went to Passaic to look for me without knowing who I was or what I looked like, so they could not find me, and I had no intentions of letting them find me just then, for I wanted to go to the meeting at night, which I did.

I was the last speaker at the meeting. There were about, I should say, 8,000 people present. I was up on the platform as the last speaker, and I read this article for which the warrant had been issued, and when I got through I was put under arrest by these two detectives and was taken to the police station through the streets, with a jeering crowd of strikers of about 3,000 following me. They were jeering at the policemen; not me.

Needless to say, of course, when the crowd got down to the police station they were quickly dispersed by a bunch of Paterson's finest. I was locked up for the evening and all night. And I was, as I say, held incommunicado. State Secretary Killenbeck tried to get in to see me with a message, but they would not allow him in. Dr. Korshet tried to get in, but they would not allow him in. Yet a fellow in the next cell from me, charged with theft or burglary, or something like that, was allowed to have visitors come in to see him.

In the morning I had to furnish \$2,000 bail, which was an increase of \$1,000 over what had been decided the night before. Police Recorder Carroll decided that \$1,000 extra should be put on.

From this time on arrests were made by the wholesale. I think that Mr. Marelli can give you more particulars about the actual arrests than I can. I have not kept a record of them. In some instances as high as 45 and 50 and 100 have been arrested at once on the slightest pretext. And many people were threatened with arrest for merely having a copy of my paper in their possession. Some copies happened to get around—that is, some few copies that the police did not confiscate—and those that were fortunate enough to have a copy of that innocent little paper had to go into the cellar and such places as that to read it.

Four men were charged with inciting hostility to the government of the city of Paterson for merely having this paper in their possession. These men were charged on the same indictment as myself. They were later taken off. I think, if the information is required, it will be found on the record. Those men's names will be found on the record. I don't remember them, because they are foreign names, and anyway Mr. Marelli can furnish that information.

Another man was arrested and taken to the police station because he refused to throw his issue away. He had it in his pocket. Another news dealer up here a little bit up the street—I won't mention him, because he will get into trouble again—every time he showed an issue or left an issue with his other papers one or more of these policemen would come along and ask him what he was doing with "that God damned sheet in there. Take it out." He was continually intimidated, kicked, and so on and so forth. These are facts.

Just to show you how far they had gone in this particular, how great the despotism was in Paterson at that particular time, several people were arrested who did not live in Paterson at all. They were arrested on suspicion of being strikers. A prominent artist's wife was arrested in Paterson here. She had come in here on a visit, and in order not to have publicity she gave a fictitious name.

Another man I know—I met him just when he came out of jail—had to serve 30 days in the Paterson jail, charged with unlawful assemblage or inciting a riot, or something else. He didn't know exactly what. He was not a silk worker. He was not a Patersonian. He came over from New York. He was a tailor and had come from New York to Paterson to look up an old friend and happened to be standing on the edge of the sidewalk when he was run in.

And many other cases like that. Jack Reed, the writer, was sent to jail for being "sassy" to a policeman who came along and jabbed him in the ribs and told him to make himself scarce, and so on and so forth.

Scores of innocent young girls were thrown into jails, there to mingle with hardened criminals. I have photographs of some of the girls who were in jail—young girls ranging from the age of 15, 18, and 20 years.

By March 8 there were 20,000 strikers out, and these strikers, I maintain, were brought out more because of the hostile acts of the police and the government than anything else.

Arrests continued. The local papers misrepresented the strikers, all of them. They accused the strikers, or the strike leaders, of throwing stones into windows, attempting to blow up the city hall, and all that sort of thing; and I have a news item here taken from the Paterson morning paper, where it tries to show how vicious the strikers are, and how they took the part of the policemen of Paterson, who rushed up and down the hill on horses, meeting shower after shower of stones from the strikers, and imagine, this article goes on to say how these policemen had to fight against women with children clinging to their skirts and hanging round their necks, who rushed at them. Imagine a woman with a child at her breast and three or four around her skirts, rushing at a policeman. Poor, big Paterson policemen. Poor fellows.

Chairman WALSH. Be in order. Order in the room.

Mr. SCOTT. I can read you this article. I have it on file. That attack—that was another attack that was made that I just described, where the morning Paterson paper described it. That was near the end of the strike, and at that time the National Silk Dyeing Co.'s automobile was used by the city of Paterson, by a police patrol, showing how closely knitted the silk interests and the government of Paterson are. And, in fact, that is why I got into trouble more than anything else, because I constantly maintained that the silk industry of Paterson, the silk manufacturer, and the city government of Paterson were one and the same thing, and were very hostile to the strikers.

The town was swarming at this time with O'Brien and other detectives, gunmen who insulted women and attacked men and incited to violence, and it is a remarkable thing that the strikers actually did remain so passive. They had every incentive to become violent.

I remember coming along past the strikers' headquarters one day, headquarters which they had been forced to hire, because they could not hire a hall. They themselves got a lease of an old estate that had big grounds and a couple of little houses, and they used the houses in the daytime for their headquarters and the grounds at night for meetings. I remember passing there one day in the afternoon, and, I would say, about 200 or 300 strikers were congregated around their headquarters, in the yard which they rented and around the house in front of the house, and three, four, five, or maybe a few more were on the sidewalk, but certainly not impeding the traffic of any pedestrian, when two policemen came along and ordered them to move, "to get in there." They spoke to them as though they were dogs; and then these two policemen met a sergeant, I believe it was Sergeant Ryan, I am not sure, who came back with them, and he, too, joined and ordered the strikers to get off the sidewalk, which the strikers very readily did, because the policy of the strikers all during this strike was to fold their arms and keep their hands in their pockets, and, no matter how they were incited to violence, not to commit any violence. That was their policy. And so they got up very peacefully off the sidewalk and began to discuss this thing. When three or four hundred men talk together, even though they whisper, it makes a murmur, and the police sergeant heard this murmuring, and he immediately turned back again in a threatening manner, and he said, "If you don't like it, just start something."

That happened every day. They were always asking them to start something. There was enough strikers there to kill three times the number of policemen if they had been as violent as the Paterson papers said they were.

Here is a case of a woman who was beaten up by a policeman named Duffy. I have a photograph of this woman with a bandage around her neck. She was punched on the breast, knocked down, her head thrown against the wall, and she was laid up in bed.

Another woman that I know of, and a photograph of whom I have, a woman about eight months' pregnant, was pushed in the abdomen very roughly by a policeman, and knocked down. She was taken home and had a hemorrhage immediately afterwards. She had gone simply to plead with the policeman not to arrest her husband.

I have these cases and I shall certainly file those with the commission.

On March 30 there were 25,000 people on strike by this time and their meeting on the baseball grounds took place. That was broken up. I have a photograph of that. The Constitution was certainly trampled down. The workers had driven to Haledon and they went to Haledon, and it was at that time that Haywood and Lessig were arrested on a charge of unlawful assemblage, and railroaded by Police Recorder Carroll to six months in jail. That decision, most of you will remember, was overruled by Supreme Court Justice Minturn.

On April 19 a strike sympathizer by the name of Modestino, a man who used to invite one or two of the strikers in at a time to have a cup of coffee or a bite of lunch, was shot and killed; shot in the back and killed by an O'Brien detective in the presence of his wife. That O'Brien detective was arrested, and is now free.

Chairman WALSH. Was he tried by a jury and acquitted?

Mr. SCOTT. He was never indicted. O'Brien men held up in the week of April 19 and beat up and took circulars from three or four young men who had gone to Passaic announcing an athletic exhibition. They were mistaken for strikers announcing a meeting. The circulars were thrown in the river without being read. This happened three times in and around Passaic. Men were held up.

The Garfield citizens signed resolutions of protest against these gunmen who were swarming their town and threatening pedestrians and insulting women. They took these resolutions they had signed to the Garfield officials, who had at that time, two of them, extended their vacations—they had left town and they could not present the resolutions. My opinion is that they left town in order to avoid responsibility.

On April 26 Treska, Flynn, Quinlan, and Lessig were indicted on charges preferred at the first police outbreak. At that same time an American Federation of Labor meeting was held in the armory, in which the workers decided to continue their affiliation with the I. W. W. In that same week the Modestino funeral was held, and there was 15,000 in line.

On May 3 there was another holdup in Passaic. Three men, with circulars announcing Socialist meetings, were held up at the point of a gun and the circulars taken from them. One man, badly beaten up, was attended by Dr. Korshet. I was there when he came in with a broken head.

Chief Hendry, of Passaic, pretended ignorance, and failed to do anything. I saw him and had an interview with him. The number of the auto proved it to be that of O'Brien or men of the Jerry O'Brien, of the detective agency.

But Chief Hendry said he could not proceed against these people, could not do anything unless definite charges were made against the individuals in the automobile; and certainly the strikers had no means of finding out who the individuals were. I had a tiff with Chief Hendry on that account.

About this time, too, an interesting thing took place. The authorities of Paterson threatened to prevent the strikers from sending away their children to be taken care of in other cities. Mayor McBride said the city could very well take care of its own poor, and that they should come to him and not go out of the city and thereby disgrace Paterson; but when a committee called upon Mayor McBride with a batch of children, Mayor McBride had gone on his vacation or something else. He was not there that day.

For a while the halls were allowed to open, and then about the middle of May they were closed again, and wholesale arrests were made.

Recorder Carroll sentenced one girl to 60 days for smiling. She was smiling in anticipation of being released. Her lawyer had told her it would be all right—she would get off, don't worry—and so the poor girl smiled, and for smiling Police Recorder Carroll said: "I will make you smile on the other side of your face." [Witness snaps fingers.] "Sixty days."

Then another little girl in court, when she heard it, expressed her surprise and disgust by [witness makes noise with tongue similar to smacking of lips]—was given 30 days.

That gives you an idea of just how conditions really were here.

Mayor Breuckman, of Haledon, had invited the strikers to exercise the right of free speech in his borough, and ordered the Paterson detectives to leave his town, as they only incited to riot, and they left.

He said the reason there was no disorder in Haledon was because of the absence of the police. The borough of Haledon has one little bit of a policeman there, who weighs about 90 pounds, a little pink-cheeked fellow, and they never, at any of the big, tremendous meetings that they held in Haledon, there never was any disorder, it was always like a picnic, and it was a real joy to go there. Why, so careful were the strikers when they went there that they would not even trample on the little plot of grass that surrounded the house where the speakers spoke from. There were no policemen, consequently no disorder.

The local papers were venomous. They started to make appeals to violence, and you will have another editor here testifying. It was that editor and his paper who actually made an appeal to violence, practically murder, and also accused Haywood and all of the leaders of being crooks, big crooks, getting all sorts of money, slandering them in every particular way, and playing up all sorts of impossible stories of attempted bomb eruptions, and so on.

On June 6 I was sentenced to from 1 to 15 years.

I want to just read something here. Here is an article taken from the Paterson Call. This gives you an idea of how they attempted to mold public opinion:

"Sheriff Radcliff yesterday summoned another petit jury from which jury-men will be secured to try the remaining indictments against the I. W. W. agitators. The courts and prosecutor do not intend to take any chances in the remaining cases. The new jury is a crackerjack. Their conviction is bound to follow at the hands of any 12 men selected from this list, provided," they go on to say, of course, "the testimony warrants it."

That sort of thing appeared every day.

If I had desired to bring suits for libel, I had ample opportunity. One paper took great delight in referring to me as an anarchist, and referring to my paper as "the anarchistic sheet," or "the I. W. W. sheet"—anything but just the kind of sheet it was, and that was, a Socialist sheet. This paper continued at that until I began to refer to that paper as a terroristic sheet.

That is all I want to read from that particular paper.

Chairman WALSH. Please give us that paper, if you will, Mr. Scott, the main paper.

Mr. SCOTT. You may have that one; I have got that one.

About June 14 the Federal probe was being sought, and the things began to grow. I have made the assertion before that the strike was being purposely prolonged by the big silk manufacturers, for the double purpose of freezing out the small fry and starving the workers into submission. Several silk mills went into bankruptcy about this time. The total arrests, up to this time,

June 14, were about 2,000. The jail was overflowing, in some cases two or three in a cell. One cup for 50 or 60 men, sometimes more; one pillow for the same number of men. The cells about $4\frac{1}{2}$ by $6\frac{1}{2}$ by 7 feet, windowless. Prof. Livingston, of Columbia University, was in town this week, and with myself and another member of the party, we went around town and collected affidavits showing brutality and lawlessness, and so on, and so forth. These affidavits were presented to Congress, I understand, but Congress failed to act. On June 21, by that time arrests continued, and they were arresting them on even more ridiculous grounds. The story told of one man, the same paper that I referred to before, the morning paper, tells the story of one man being arrested because he had acted suspiciously. He was lying in a field, and when he saw a policeman approach he whistled. He was taken to jail.

These papers, although I was convicted for hostility to government because of the fact that I referred to the attack of the policemen upon strikers as though like a bunch of drunken Cossacks, the other people were never indicted for saying things just as bad about their own policemen. For instance, the Morning Call at one time describes an attack of policemen "like a thousand of brick," and at another time it tells a nice story of how some workmen were seen to be loitering about a shop; that is, they were walking up and down the street outside this particular mill. And this paper tells it very humorously: "Along comes Captain So-and-so, with a squad of men and a sergeant, and the sergeant looks at the captain and at the men and at the mill and said, 'Captain, isn't it about time you started something?'" I think the reporter is here who wrote that up. "'Ain't it about time we started something?' 'Yes; I guess it is. That is right. Charge.' And they charged like a bunch of"—let me get the words right. They said "like a bunch of"—I don't know—"like a regiment of Bulgars on the Turkish frontier." That can be found on file in the Morning Call at Paterson.

That showed the spirit of the papers; all of the papers, with the exception of the Issue—that little bit of a weekly paper here that caused so much trouble—was on the side of the manufacturers and absolutely against the workers. One paper pretended to be in favor of the workers and tried to take a middle course, and, like all papers that do that, fell flat.

One June 28, 60 strikers waived the right of trial by jury, showing how fair the juries are, preferring to depend upon the fairness of the judge. And they found that it worked well. It was much better to depend upon the judge in Paterson than to depend upon a jury. So that these 60 strikers, nearly all of them, were discharged, because the judge was ashamed to convict them on the evidence.

This time Boyd was arrested for advocating sabotage, and perfectly good bail was refused—that is, bail that would be considered good by any real-estate man in Passaic County, considered good legitimate bail—and it was refused time and time again, and Boyd had to furnish a certain kind of bail. He had to furnish Pennsylvania Railroad stock.

On July 5 I pleaded to the McCabe indictment and furnished \$1,000 bail. Then I stood in court. The Miss Flynn trial was going on at the time. Patrick Quinlan, who had gone there, like myself, to listen to the trial, was suddenly grabbed while in court, manacled, and immediately sentenced. I think about eight minutes' notice was given his lawyer. He was taken to the Paterson jail all of a sudden, and the excuse given was that he had been rather severe in a speech the night before; he had criticized the judge, and the judge got sore. Judges are not supposed to get sore, but they do.

On July 13 Vincenzo Madonna was shot and killed by strike breakers. This murderer was sent to jail. I met him in jail, and I met the other fellow in jail, too. This second murderer was not indicted, either, he was freed, as well as the other.

More false arrests were made. Some of them have to be discharged simply because the cases were altogether too ridiculous.

Dunn stated that he was reading the Weekly Issue to see if he could not get another indictment against me. He made the statement in the press.

In one of the dye shops here that harbored strike breakers disease was found to be rampant. It was kept rather quiet. The papers said nothing about it, but I got wind of it, and I published a little story about it, and then the other papers denied it and no record could be had. But certain it was that several people were taken out of the shop and to the hospital.

A riot was started in Haledon by policemen.

A Socialist alderman in Haledon was arrested for merely asking a silk boss to observe the borough ordinance relating to profanity.

Mayor Breuckman, on July 26, was indicted for unlawful assemblage and malfeasance in office and held in \$2,000 bail. He was asked to appear in court without being given the reasons why he was to appear in court, and if a friend had not come with him who was prepared to go bail, Mayor Breuckman of Haledon would have had to go to jail until bail was secured.

This shows just how vindictive they were. The only crime Mayor Breuckman committed was that of allowing free speech in his town and welcoming the strikers to his borough.

This same week I was arrested on a charge of libel brought by Policeman Love. I had to stay in jail 24 hours.

They had in that jail, I want to say—I would like it to go down, because it has been stated in the Globe and elsewhere, that it is an ancient jail and very insanitary. They have one bathtub there—a tub, not shower, for at least 40 people. The last time I was in jail, or at least this particular time last July, I was forced to take a bath in a black iron tub, unenameled, 10 minutes after a young fellow who was suffering from a virulent case of venereal disease. I saw the young fellow, and he told me himself, and I made an examination myself also. That I escaped contracting the disease is due to luck and nothing else.

While in jail, also, I discovered that the detective, the alleged murderer of Modestino, had the privilege of getting meals sent in to him, a privilege which all of the other people were denied.

Another case, two strikers were dragged from their bed at midnight, dragged from their bed beside their wives at the point of a gun, and locked up on ridiculous charges—arrested, not by police officers, but by private detectives who were sworn in by the sheriff as deputies, men whose records were not gone into; they did not know where the came from or what they did before they came, and they did not care. They swore them in as deputies, O'Brien men. Things like that were happening right along.

Then again Quinlan was arrested on August 2 for referring to Sergt. Charles Ryan as "Bummy Ryan." Charles Ryan is a policeman who is better known by his nickname than his real name. He is bound to admit that himself. But it was simply a means of getting Quinlan into trouble again and they did. Very few people in Paterson know that this policeman's name is Charles at all. He is known by his other name, "Bummy."

By August 2 the strike was broken, it was ended, and then they began to center their attacks upon the Socialists, and Bimson made a statement to the effect that the Socialist speakers on the street corners were far too hot and that they would have to be more respectful; that they would have to curb it. But I don't think the Socialists did. I believe they said all they wanted to just the same.

That is that diary. It is not complete.

Chairman WALSH. Are you going to file that little diary with us?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; but I am going to try to get a complete file of the paper with you so that you can look up these particular articles or verify them.

I think that is all I care to say.

(The diary was received and marked "Scott Exhibit 1," and the paper was marked "Scott Exhibit 2, June 16, 1914.")

Scott Exhibit 2 is a copy of the Weekly Issue, Passaic, N. J., February 28, 1913.)

Chairman WALSH. That is all, thank you.

Commissioner LENNON. I would like to ask a question or two?

Mr. SCOTT. All right.

Commissioner LENNON. I would like to ask you as to the composition of the grand jury that indicted you. Do you know anything about the drawing of that jury?

Mr. SCOTT. The grand jury?

Commissioner LENNON. Were they drawn specially for your case?

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir. They draw them as they do elsewhere. They have the quarterly panel, I understand, and if that runs out then they can draw for more for a particular case.

Commissioner LENNON. Was it a regular panel?

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir. The grand jury was the regular jury. It was the May term or the April term.

Commissioner LENNON. Were any of the employees of the silk mills on that grand jury?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, yes. I have the names of the grand jurymen here, I believe, and I believe I have also their employment.

Commissioner LENNON. Were there any people, men who were on strike on that grand jury?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, no. No strikers; no workingmen. I am pretty sure of that.

Commissioner LENNON. If the list of the grand jurors can be found in those papers—can they?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir; I have it.

The foreman of the grand jury is a superintendent of the Edison Electric Works.

William Armstrong comes from Little Falls. He is some sort of a retired business man.

John F. Ball, of Compton Lake. No occupation given.

Isaac Benjamin, dry goods merchant.

Emil Cohen, silk mill.

Michael Conlan, building contractor.

Philander Cooley, farmer; Bloomingdale.

Isaac Delasia, rubber worker.

Edward W. Garrison, county school superintendent.

Charles Anarkas, photographer.

August Koenig, Passaic. No occupation given.

Walter Little, silk manufacturer.

Samuel Meredith, retired.

Walter S. Mills, hardware merchant.

James K. O'Day, phonograph dealer.

Thomas L. Patton, physician.

George W. Pollett, postmaster.

Samuel Rachels, Passaic.

Albert W. Shaw, jr., Passaic. No occupation.

Herman Skill, Passaic. No occupation.

Harry A. Smith, show dealer.

Goddard Van Nimwegan, retired.

David Young, silk appraiser.

Commissioner LENNON. Did you ever receive any compensation for the 5,000 papers that you allege were taken from the Socialist headquarters?

Mr. SCOTT. None at all.

Commissioner LENNON. Did you ever ask for any compensation?

Mr. SCOTT. No, sir. I charged the four policemen who took them without a search warrant with grand larceny.

Commissioner LENNON. I understand.

Mr. SCOTT. They were never indicted, and since then I have taken no other action.

Commissioner LENNON. That is all I have.

Chairman WALSH. That is all. Thank you, Mr. Scott.

TESTIMONY OF MR. HENRY MARELLI.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will you give us your name, please?

Mr. MARELLI. Henry Marelli.

Mr. THOMPSON. Your address?

Mr. MARELLI. I live at 218 East Eighteenth Street, Paterson. I have an office in the Second National Bank Building.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are a lawyer by profession, I believe?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been practicing law?

Mr. MARELLI. Near 14 years.

Mr. THOMPSON. In Paterson here?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. All the time?

Mr. MARELLI. All the time.

Mr. THOMPSON. You were here during the strike?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Last year?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. At that time did you act as attorney for any of the people arrested?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir; I was counsel for the strikers, and associated with me were Mr. Gustave A. Hundsiger, and occasionally Mr. Jacob Kushner assisted us.

Chairman WALSH. What was the last name?

Mr. MARELLI. Kushner.

Mr. THOMPSON. When were you first employed as attorney in those cases, and who employed you?

Mr. MARELLI. I was first employed around the middle of March, 1913. The strike had been going on for a few weeks. I was employed by representatives of the strike committee. My first case was that—or the first case in which I became engaged was that of Carlo Treska.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was that the strike committee mentioned by Mr. Lessig yesterday?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. The executive strike committee?

Mr. MARELLI. The executive strike committee.

Mr. THOMPSON. Go ahead. I interrupted you.

Mr. MARELLI. Carlo Treska had been arrested and charged with being a disorderly person before the recorder of Paterson. He was tried on that charge and convicted and sentenced to six months in the county jail. It was after the conviction that I entered the case, entered the strike cases. We procured a writ of certiorari from the supreme court justice who presides in this district, whose name is James F. Minturn, to have the conviction of Treska reviewed. The conviction was reviewed at the following term of the supreme court, which was held in June.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the charge in that case, and what was the evidence before the court?

Mr. MARELLI. He was charged with being a disorderly person, and the evidence showed that he was simply marching along the sidewalk of a street, in the Riverside section of Paterson, followed by less than 100 persons, I believe. And he was charged with being a disorderly person, in that he obstructed people who were on the highway. That is to say, the evidence adduced showed that—tended to show—that people who were going in a direction opposite to his, had to walk by him and he, therefore, obstructed the highway.

Mr. THOMPSON. Who was the evidence given by in the lower court?

Mr. MARELLI. A police officer by the name of Corolla was the complaining witness, and I believe other policemen testified. His case, as I say, was argued at the June term of the supreme court, together with the cases of Haywood and Lessig, who were also convicted of being disorderly persons.

Mr. THOMPSON. State again, if you have not already stated, the sentence.

Mr. MARELLI. That Treska received?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MARELLI. Six months.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was done with his case in the supreme court?

Mr. MARELLI. His case was reversed. The conviction was set aside on the ground that the evidence did not disclose that he had been guilty of being a disorderly person.

Mr. THOMPSON. In the supreme court were those cases tried de novo, or tried on the record?

Mr. MARELLI. No; dismissed. The conviction was set aside on the ground that they were not guilty of being disorderly. I say they, because the supreme court, when it decided his case, also decided at the same time the cases against Haywood and Lessig. That there was no evidence at all to justify holding them on the charge of being disorderly persons, or of disorderly conduct.

Mr. THOMPSON. Those cases went up on the record for retrial in the upper court?

Mr. MARELLI. No, sir; not retrial. Simply went up on the record.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the next case that you were interested in?

Mr. MARELLI. There were many cases; we altogether were in 1,850 cases during the strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. I want to ask you to detail the 1,850 cases?

Mr. MARELLI. No; there were less than—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). In general, what was the nature?

Mr. MARELLI. Wait a moment, please.

Mr. THOMPSON. Go ahead.

Mr. MARELLI. There were less than 300 cases brought to the attention of the grand jury. Cases of unlawful assembly. There were quite a number who were convicted of disorderly conduct, where penalties of a fine were imposed, and where the persons convicted were sentenced to a number of days in the county jail.

Mr. THOMPSON. Those cases that came before Recorder Carroll that have been named?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were they upon original charge, or upon indictment, or upon warrant or indictment?

Mr. MARELLI. The cases before him?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; how did the cases come before him?

Mr. MARELLI. They were simply cases of strikers who were arrested for picketing.

Chairman WALSH. If some one files an information against them, is it the city attorney?

Mr. MARELLI. No information filed against them at all; simply strikers would be arrested for picketing and held in jail over night, and the next morning a charge would be preferred against them.

Chairman WALSH. By information?

Mr. MARELLI. No, sir; a charge would be made by a police officer.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. The policeman who made the arrest?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir; that is it.

Chairman WALSH. That was before Recorder Carroll?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And then an information was made out, was it not?

Mr. MARELLI. No, sir; simply a complaint.

Mr. THOMPSON. He sits as a police magistrate?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir. Sometimes he would hold the strikers on the charge of unlawful assembly. Their bail in that case would have to be given to hold the one accused for action by the grand jury. In other cases——

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Just a moment. Suppose I ask you a question or two and lay the groundwork.

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. In those 1,800 cases?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON (continuing). That you speak of?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON (continuing). Where arrests were made, not by indictment by the grand jury——

Mr. MARELLI (interrupting). Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON (continuing). But by police and others?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. They came before Recorder Carroll sitting as a police magistrate?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. As a court of first instance?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And he either fined them, dismissed them, discharged the case, or held them over to the grand jury, as he saw fit?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Just like the usual police magistrate sitting elsewhere?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now you may go on with your recital. You spoke about two other cases of arrest having been decided?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir. Shall I take that up?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. MARELLI. The cases of Haywood and Lessig. On the 30th of March, 1913, Haywood came to Paterson to address a meeting of strikers at a place called Lafayette Oval. He walked from the Erie station to the Lafayette Oval, and when he reached that place he was informed by some policemen that he would not be permitted to speak. I am telling you what occurred, what the evidence showed in court.

He said, "Very well," or words to that effect, "I won't speak." Then some one suggested that he go to Haledon, so he said, "All right, we will go to Haledon," and he started out toward Haledon. Lessig and Haywood walked together and a crowd of perhaps 800 or 1,000, as the evidence discloses, followed behind Haywood and Lessig. The crowd was not a disorderly one. They made no noise more than 800 or 1,000 people walking along talking together would make. And they proceeded along in that way until they were within a few feet of the line between Paterson and Haledon. They must have walked a distance of perhaps a mile and a half from Lafayette Oval. Then suddenly the police

patrol appeared, filled with policemen. The police alighted from the patrol wagon and walked toward Lessig and Haywood and placed them under arrest.

They were taken to the police station and I was sent for by them. I was permitted to see them, and I tried to find out from the sergeant at the desk what the charge against Haywood and Lessig was, but he couldn't tell me. He said, "I don't know; I suppose it is disorderly conduct. At any rate the hearing will be held to-morrow morning."

The next morning we were informed that there were two charges against each of those two men, one charge being for disorderly conduct and the other for unlawful assembly. The hearing was continued from the morning till the afternoon of the 31st of March; and at the hearing policemen were heard, and they stated, of course, what they had seen.

Sergt. Ryan was the one who was in charge of the policemen in the police patrol, and he was the first witness. He said that he arrested Haywood and Lessig because they were interfering with people on the public highway in that persons going in a direction opposite to which Haywood and Lessig were walking had to naturally walk a little to one side—deflect their course to the right or to the left, as the case might be.

I then asked him if it was not a fact that he had left the police station with the patrol for the purpose of arresting Haywood and Lessig, and he admitted that that was so. And yet the charge was based on something that he said he had seen at the time the arrest was made. These are all part of the records.

The recorder, after having heard the policeman, held that Haywood and Lessig were both guilty of being disorderly persons, and thereupon he sentenced them to six months in the county jail. And he also held that they were also guilty of unlawful assembly, and on that charge he held them under \$5,000 bail to answer to the indictment of the grand jury if one were found against them.

We immediately proceeded to apply to Justice Minturn—and I wish to say on the side here that Justice James F. Minturn was the one bright spot on the side of the State authorities during the strike. We applied to him for a writ of certiorari to review the six months' sentence and for a writ of habeas corpus to review the charge of unlawful assembly. Justice Minturn allowed us both writs.

On the writ of certiorari to review the disorderly conduct case he ordered that Lessig and Haywood be discharged on \$200 bail each pending the review by the supreme court under this writ of certiorari. This was on Monday that we spoke to the judge, and he said that he would be in Paterson the following Saturday for the hearing on the habeas corpus. He came to Paterson on the following Saturday, and, of course, we asked that the charge of unlawful assembly be dismissed; or rather, we asked that the defendants be dismissed on the ground that the charge was a defective one; but finally after argument the matter of the illegality of the charge, Justice Minturn said he would decide the case on its merits, and he said he would hear the testimony of the policeman concerning what happened on the way to Haledon.

So the policeman testified, and after—I don't know just when this came in—I believe it was after Sergt. Ryan had gone on with his testimony, and the justice seemed to indicate by his manner that there was no cause of action. The prosecutor who was representing the city sprung this on us that we had not anticipated. He said that Haywood was leading a parade, and that in the city of Paterson there was an ordinance which prohibited a parade without a permit first having been obtained, and that inasmuch as no permit for a parade had been obtained the crowd, and everyone in the crowd, was engaged in doing that which was unlawful, and therefore were guilty of unlawful assembly.

Then the justice proceeded to cross-examine the policeman, and he elicited from them the fact that the crowd was not marching two abreast or three abreast or four abreast in a real orderly fashion, each policeman testifying that the crowd was a disorderly one. They laid great stress on the word "disorderly"; that they were walking some on the sidewalk, some in the street, some two abreast, some four abreast; and then Justice Minturn said he understood a parade to be an orderly procession, and that inasmuch as the crowd was not an organized one that it was not a parade, and that therefore the persons in the crowd could not be said to be parading without first having obtained a permit.

During the taking of the testimony questions were asked by the justice of the policemen which they did not seem to be able to answer. For instance,

the justice asked each one of the policemen what was that crowd doing? Well, the policemen said they were disorderly.

"Well, what do you mean, they were disorderly?"

"Well, they were making a noise."

"What noises?"

"They were hollering."

"What did they holler?"

And finally, after repeating that a number of times, the policemen were compelled to say they were hollering "Yea, yea." That is what they were hollering. And Judge Minturn remarked that the Salvation Army made a noise, too; and he dismissed the charge and ordered that the defendants be discharged.

And he further held in so doing that it did not appear from the evidence that Haywood or Lessig had done anything whatsoever in violation of the law. On the contrary, he said they were endeavoring to obey the law in attempting to disburse the crowd. That ended the unlawful assembly matter.

In June the disorderly-conduct cases were argued before the supreme court—Haywood, Lessig, and also Tresca's case. Remember that the disorderly-conduct charge was based exactly on the same occurrence at Haledon on which the unlawful-assembly charge was based.

I have here the opinion of the court in that case, which I will file if the commission desires.

(The opinion was marked "Marelli Exhibit No. 1, June 16, 1914." See under "Exhibits.")

Copies of the record of the New Jersey Supreme Court in the cases of "The State, Carlo Tresca, prosecutor, v. Charles Carola and James F. Carroll, recorder of Paterson recorders' court, defendants, on certiorari (filed Mar. 15, 1913)," and "The State, William D. Haywood, prosecutor, v. Charles H. Ryan and James F. Carroll, recorder of Paterson recorders' court, defendants, on certiorari (filed Apr. 1, 1913)," were submitted in printed form.)

Mr. MARELLI. Every one of the disorderly-conduct cases that were appealed was reversed—every one of them.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many cases have you appealed?

Mr. MARELLI. We appealed those three; and then a man by the name of Louis Browksi was arrested, and on the charge of disorderly conduct. He was convicted and given 30 days. His wife was in a delicate condition; she was about to give birth to a child, and wanted her husband out of jail. She used every means possible to get him out, but she could not. Finally, after he had been in jail 10 days, I was ordered to get out a writ of certiorari, which I did.

I applied to Justice Minturn. He allowed the writ and ordered the defendant to be released on nominal bail—I think it was \$100—and after the writ had been issued, after Browksi was out on bail, the city attorney or the city counsel, I don't remember which one of the two it was, told me that this case would be abandoned, so far as the city was concerned, because the city was satisfied the conviction was not justified and was illegal. So that if the man had not been able to obtain this writ he would have been compelled to remain 30 days in jail; and as a matter of fact he did remain in jail 10 days without any grounds or cause whatsoever. That is one case.

Then, two men by the name of Julius Kopf and Frank Bruno were sent to jail for being disorderly persons. We obtained writs of certiorari in their behalf, and after release on bail the cases were abandoned by the city.

Hannah Silverman was arrested for being a disorderly person; sent to jail for a number of days. A writ of certiorari was obtained. After the writ was obtained we were informed that the case was abandoned.

There is another case that is still pending. We have not determined that case. She was sent to jail for something she did in court. She laughed or criticized the judge. I don't know the merits of that proposition. That matter is not yet determined. It is still pending. She was sent, however, up for disorderly conduct. The judge held that to be disorderly conduct. It seems to me it ought to have been contempt of court, but still she was sent up for disorderly conduct.

Chairman WALSH. Was she discharged?

Mr. MARELLI. Oh, yes; under bail ordered by Justice Minturn.

Chairman WALSH. Was that tried afterwards?

Mr. MARELLI. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. I would like to ask you right here if you can tell us approximately how many final convictions there were in the 1,800 cases that you refer to—approximately how many cases in which fines were assessed?

Mr. MARELLI. There may have been altogether, I should say, about 300. There were less than 100 convicted under indictment. The others were convicted of disorderly conduct.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Were they largely fines, and paid?

Mr. MARELLI. No, sir; most were prison sentences.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. Prison sentences?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Commissioner O'CONNELL. How many were there, approximately, that served prison sentences?

Mr. MARELLI. Oh, quite a number; I should say 100 served prison sentences, but here arrests were made ostensibly for either unlawful assembly or disorderly conduct, but actually they were made because the strikers were picketing, and picketing is no crime. It may mean the invasion of a property right or not, but there is no statute which prohibits picketing.

Some days, for instance, April 14, 25 were arrested for picketing.

April 15, 142 were arrested for picketing; March 21—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). What was generally the evidence in court? Take the case of the 142 people. What was said in court when their cases were called for trial? Were they tried in a bunch or separately?

Mr. MARELLI. In a bunch.

Mr. THOMPSON. A large group?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir. Sometimes two or three were tried together.

Mr. THOMPSON. Take the case of the 142, how did their cases come up in court, who were the witnesses, what was the evidence, and what action did the recorder take?

Mr. MARELLI. The cases of the 142, on April 15, was that against the strikers who were alleged to be picketing around the Hall mill, what is known as the Hall mill in Paterson. It was, so far as I recall, testified that they intimidated or frightened persons who wanted to go to work in the silk mills that were located in this particular Hall factory, Hall mill. The Hall mill was the large mill. There are a number of manufacturing concerns in the mill, I believe.

Mr. THOMPSON. Who, generally, are the witnesses, if you know, in those particular cases?

Mr. MARELLI. Police officers.

Mr. THOMPSON. And no other people?

Mr. MARELLI. No, sir; nobody.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many other people gave evidence that day?

Mr. MARELLI. Well, perhaps two or three.

Mr. THOMPSON. What other evidence was heard? And on whose part?

Mr. MARELLI. Once in a while there was evidence on the part of individuals—on the part of women or men.

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean, after that time, was there any other evidence heard on behalf of the prosecution?

Mr. MARELLI. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What evidence was heard on behalf of the defense at that time?

Mr. MARELLI. No evidence at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, how was the case handled in that respect? Were you the attorney there?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir; they were held on the charge of unlawful assembly; held under \$500 bail; sent to jail for a few days; and then released without bail in the custody of counsel, and that was the end of the cases.

Mr. THOMPSON. They were not fined then?

Mr. MARELLI. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. But how generally were these 1,800 cases heard in court, what generally was the evidence for the prosecution?

Mr. MARELLI. The evidence of the prosecution was generally that they gathered in the streets, that they interfered with traffic, or interfered with persons rather on the sidewalk; and in some cases it was testified that the strikers had shouted at persons who were coming out of the mills who were working in the places of the strikers; but that was very seldom because there were very few mills that were working during the strike. Very few of the mills were working that had persons employed. The general line of evidence was that there was a crowd there and that the police had asked them to disperse and that they would not disperse.

Mr. THOMPSON. And what was the evidence on behalf of the defense in those cases generally?

Mr. MARELLI. Didn't put in any evidence.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you asked to put in evidence?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes; but we would take the position that the evidence adduced by the State was insufficient for a verdict and asked that the case be dismissed, and generally they were dismissed. Nothing became of most of those cases.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the procedure? Take those cases, not where they fined or committed them to the grand jury or where they were discharged, but in the other cases, what was the general action?

Mr. MARELLI. In the cases where they were not held and were not fined?

Mr. THOMPSON. I say, where they were not discharged. You say some of the cases—well, now, let me examine you a little more in detail on that. You say about 300 cases were fined or held over to the grand jury out of the 1,800?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And what percentage of them were discharged forthwith?

Mr. MARELLI. Very few were discharged forthwith, except one day there were 222 that were discharged. That was on April 6. There were 222 that were discharged forthwith on account of lack of evidence, the recorder held.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was done with the other 1,300 cases?

Mr. MARELLI. The others—they were almost all of them—I think all of them were sent to jail for some time.

Mr. THOMPSON. They were held in jail or under bail or were discharged?

Mr. MARELLI. At the end of four or five days without bail.

Mr. THOMPSON. In those 1,300 cases the people were either placed under peace bond—is that right?

Mr. MARELLI. No; we haven't any such thing as a peace bond.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then they were all sent to jail?

Mr. MARELLI. Then they were all sent to jail.

Mr. THOMPSON. For different lengths or periods of time?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And, generally speaking, did they serve their time, or were they allowed to pay a fine as an alternative?

Mr. MARELLI. No; I don't think you quite grasp the situation here. Let me explain with reference to these 1,300. Now, we will take a group, we will say, of 25 that would be arrested. They are brought to the jail usually the day before they are arraigned before the recorder. They were compelled to remain in jail overnight. The next morning either a charge of disorderly conduct was made against them or a charge of unlawful assembly. If the charge was disorderly conduct they were tried forthwith and either sent to jail 10 days or fined \$10, or sent to jail a certain number of days and fined, and the case would be disposed of then and there. Perhaps, if they were sent to jail for 10 days or 2 days, they might possibly get out before the expiration of that time. That disposes of that 25. You understand that situation. Then perhaps the next day there might be a group of 25 come in and they would be held on a charge of unlawful assembly—

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, take any one time, how many people were in jail under these various charges, if you know?

Mr. MARELLI. Why, I think there was 200. One day I have a record here of having 222 who were released. They were released on the 8th, after being arrested on the 6th. No; arrested on the 6th and released on the 7th.

Mr. THOMPSON. There were these 222 in jail?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were there any other strikers or other people in jail—

Mr. MARELLI (interrupting). Yes; they were in jail at that time.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, state, if you know, how many at times were in jail.

Mr. MARELLI. Well, I am sure I don't remember; I couldn't say positively.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, from the beginning of the strike to the end, at least, so far as the 1,800 cases were concerned, there were about 222 discharged and 300 fined or sent to the grand jury, and the other 1,300 were sent or committed to jail?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you take care of the case of Mr. Scott, who testified here?

Mr. MARELLI. No; I did and I did not. I started out to try his case, but I was engaged in another case elsewhere, and after the jury was drawn I withdrew, although I helped to prepare the defense, whatever defense he had; he didn't have any defense—didn't put in any defense.

Mr. THOMPSON. About how many cases were sent to the grand jury, if you know?

Mr. MARELLI. Well, I guess 500 were sent to the grand jury.

Mr. THOMPSON. About how many indictments were returned by the grand jury and what was done in those cases?

Mr. MARELLI. Well, there were, perhaps—yes; less than a hundred indictments returned; but there were more than a hundred persons indicted, because sometimes a group would be indicted on the charge of unlawful assembly.

Mr. THOMPSON. About how many people were indicted by the grand jury?

Mr. MARELLI. Why, I should say about 200 or 250.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was done with those cases, if you know?

Mr. MARELLI. There were a few convictions; 32 were nolle-prossed a week ago, and 60 were acquitted. Mr. Scott referred to those who were acquitted. There were perhaps 80 convictions—actual convictions.

Mr. THOMPSON. By a petit jury?

Mr. MARELLI. No; we waived. This was convicted by the court. We waived trial by jury in all cases except the cases of the leaders and four or five other cases, I believe.

Mr. THOMPSON. Before what court were these 80 cases filed that were convicted?

Mr. MARELLI. Before the court of quarter sessions. Well, you mean tried. The court of quarter sessions was where they waived the jury. But when they waived the jury they came before the court of special sessions.

Mr. THOMPSON. Who was the judge before whom they were tried?

Mr. MARELLI. Judge Klenert.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were any actions taken by the jury in strike matters, or any other people indicted than those you have referred to?

Mr. MARELLI. Well, I don't know whether I included in my statement that Haywood was indicted and Quinlan and Treska and Flynn.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was it sought on behalf of anybody to indict other people than those you have named?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes; there was one murder committed during the strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. What murder was that?

Mr. MARELLI. The murder of Modestino Valentino. He was murdered by an O'Brien detective employed by the manufacturers. I was in the police court when the detective was arraigned, and there were three persons who positively identified this detective as the man they saw shoot in the direction of Valentino at the time that Valentino fell. I have the names of the witnesses and—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Did that matter come up before the grand jury?

Mr. MARELLI. The matter went before the grand jury. The recorder held the man without bail—held him on the charge of murder, although the prosecutor was there on the same day, and the recorder told me that the prosecutor had asked him to discharge the man. And Justice Minturn charged the first grand jury that was called after the murder of this man—the April term of the grand jury—charged that the case presented against the detective was a perfect prima facie case and that the grand jury ought to indict this detective for murder.

Mr. THOMPSON. This was the first grand jury?

Mr. MARELLI. The first grand jury.

Mr. THOMPSON. What did the grand jury do?

Mr. MARELLI. The grand jury did not indict him, and he continued to remain in jail; and the second grand jury was drawn and again the justice charged that this man ought to be indicted, and I believe that he authorized during the term Judge Klenert to charge the grand jury to do likewise, and I know that Judge Klenert did charge this grand jury to indict this man.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was done by the second grand jury?

Mr. MARELLI. Nothing. The next grand jury was again charged by Judge Minturn to return an indictment against this detective, and this time Judge Minturn spoke with considerable feeling.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you there at the time?

Mr. MARELLI. I heard him myself. I believe I took down just what he said [referring to a memorandum]. He said, "What invisible hand is there in this

community that is strong enough to prevent the indictment of this man? Are you willing to say that our laws are respecters of persons?" These are the words of Justice Minturn [reading]: "What power is there in this community that is greater than the power of the law?" This is what I could write down hastily—his exact words; and I can recall he spoke with feeling and was very emphatic about the matter. The last grand jury to whom he addressed these remarks took up the matter of this murder and returned a finding to the court that they had investigated the matter and that there was no evidence of a reliable nature. I am not stating the exact words, but I think in substance that there was no evidence of a reliable nature on which to justify an indictment for murder against this man, and he was discharged and is now free.

Mr. THOMPSON. In other words, he has never been indicted?

Mr. MARELLI. He has never been indicted. The grand jury that was in session during the strike was made up of manufacturers and business men who deal largely with manufacturers. There was not a single workingman or a representative of the working class on the grand jury. The grand jury is chosen, or was chosen at that time, by the sheriff of the county, solely. The sheriff chose 23, one of whom would be excused.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the method he used in choosing them under the law?

Mr. MARELLI. Why, there was no method—well, he simply—well, he did choose them under a law that had been passed, called the Fielder Act, which provided for the selecting of men from a panel of a certain number which he would choose; but he was the sole judge as to whom he was to have.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many would that panel be from which these 23 would be chosen?

Mr. MARELLI. Why I don't know. I think it was 150.

Mr. THOMPSON. You mean to say he could look over the list and choose out whom he wanted?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Knowing whom they were?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And all that?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. A panel of 150?

Mr. MARELLI. He would just choose them himself.

Mr. THOMPSON. The whole panel of 150?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. The same way?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. From out the citizenship?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is that the law to-day?

Mr. MARELLI. No, sir; there is a jury commission to-day composed of a sheriff and commissioner appointed by the governor, and a larger number of names is chosen out of the general panel for the year; and from that—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Who was the sheriff at that time?

Mr. MARELLI. Amos H. Radcliffe, who is sheriff at the present time.

Mr. THOMPSON. What, if any, attitude did he take in the matter of that strike, if he took any?

Mr. MARELLI. Oh, I don't know of any attitude he took; I don't know of any at all. All I know is that the jury that sat during the period of the strike was made up of manufacturers and business men, and not a single workingman or representative of the working class was on it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Which includes, of course, not a striker?

Mr. MARELLI. Not a striker; no.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is the present power of the commissioner and sheriff in regard to drawing the grand jury?

Mr. MARELLI. They have power—they make up a list of 500 names, I believe, for the petit jury and of 300 names, I think, for the grand jury.

Mr. THOMPSON. And that list is made by selecting the names themselves?

Mr. MARELLI. They select the names themselves.

Mr. THOMPSON. They are not taken blindly from the voting list or anything like that?

Mr. MARELLI. No; they select the list themselves, and the list must be—I may be inaccurate as to the number of names, but as to the method I think I am correct; but that list is submitted to the supreme court justice who must ap-

prove it, and then from that list of 300—the grand-jury list—the grand jury is drawn; and from the list of 500 the petit jury is drawn. That list stands for a year, I think.

MR. THOMPSON. From the list of 300 how is the grand jury drawn under the law?

MR. MARELLI. By the commissioners. The two commissioners choose from the 300. I believe the names are put in a box and the required number of names taken.

MR. THOMPSON. Without knowledge of who or what names are to be taken?

MR. MARELLI. Yes.

MR. THOMPSON. That is the provision of the law at the present time?

MR. MARELLI. Yes.

MR. THOMPSON. What other statement have you to make with reference to the strike, the conduct or the attitude of the officials or of the citizens or of the strikers themselves?

MR. MARELLI. The newspapers—I have had the files brought here—the newspapers were very bitter against the strikers and the strike leaders. The articles were really incendiary in their nature against the leaders, and if you wish I can read them.

Chairman WALSH. We will have to depend on merely general statements as to the general attitude.

MR. THOMPSON. You have the papers here that have the statements in?

MR. MARELLI. Yes, sir; the papers were very bitter.

MR. THOMPSON. Which papers?

MR. MARELLI. Particularly the Paterson Press and the Paterson Call. The Paterson News was rather bitter against the I. W. W., though not so much—didn't show such a spirit of animosity against the strikers in general. The Paterson Guardian, the other paper, was against both the strikers and the strike leaders, although not so bitter as the Press and the Call. And the Press—there are articles in the Paterson Press, published around the middle of March, which are practically an invitation to the public to treat Haywood, Flynn, and others in an illegal and unlawful manner.

MR. THOMPSON. If there is any language you would like to quote from in particular—

MR. MARELLI (interrupting). No; I haven't got—I don't remember the language; the only thing I could do would be to refer you to the files.

MR. THOMPSON. Well, have you any particular dates of any papers that you want to refer us to?

MR. MARELLI. March 8 in the Press—March 9, 10, and 11 of the Paterson Press.

MR. THOMPSON. Have you the pages there?

MR. MARELLI. No; not the pages.

MR. THOMPSON. Just give us what you have.

MR. MARELLI. That is what I have—the papers of March 8, 9, 10, and 11 of the Paterson Press. And there was an editorial in the Press of April 1, which says that those that are arrested will surely be convicted—the strikers arrested—the leaders arrested will surely be convicted. Quinlan, Patrick Quinlan, was the first of the leaders to be tried under the indictments that were returned by the strike grand jury against the leaders. He was tried some time in the early part of May. He was charged with having said in Turn Hall, in the course of a speech: "I move that we go to the mills. That we get them out of the mills, that we club them out, knock them out, anyway to get them out." Words like that. I can't remember the exact words. Perhaps the police can. There were eight or nine of them that testified at the trial, and they repeated word for word a sentence of about three or four lines and said that they could remember the exact words of that sentence after having heard it but once. He was tried, I say, around about the first part of May or around the early part of May, and the jury stood 7 to 5 for his acquittal. The verdict was returned on Saturday morning. I believe the jury were out all night Friday night, and then the newspapers—

MR. THOMPSON (interrupting). What was the verdict?

MR. MARELLI. Disagreement. Mr. Dunn, the prosecutor, announced that he would try the case, I think, the following Monday—try it right away. The newspapers then began to talk about this disagreement. There were editorials in those two newspapers in which, in polite language, the jurymen were insulted, their integrity was questioned, and one of the newspapers went so far as to say that the next jury will surely convict Quinlan. In other words, they

in substance, declared that the failure of the jury to convict, the failure of the jury to agree, was a disgrace to the community, and that some ulterior motives must have controlled the jurors. That had its effect, of course, necessarily must have had its effect on the second trial, which lasted about—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). What other publications, what dates, what papers?

Mr. MARELLI. The Call and the Press.

Mr. THOMPSON. What dates? If you haven't got those handy, will you furnish them to the commission at some later date?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. To-morrow?

Mr. MARELLI. May 10 was the date.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is there anything further you want to say?

Mr. MARELLI. Well, I think that the commission ought to know the attitude of the authorities toward the strikers and toward the others; how there was a general spirit of antagonism that was created and that existed here. I have told you how very strict the jury was, the grand jury was, toward those detectives, very considerate, the detective who committed the murder during the strike. There were three men—one German and two Italians—who were indicted for an atrocious assault and battery on Officer Love. When the case was tried, witness after witness was placed on the stand by the State, and not a particle of evidence was adduced as to one of the defendants. After the State's case was closed, the judge was constrained to ask the prosecutor if the indictment contained the names of two instead of three defendants, and the prosecutor said there were three defendants named. The three defendants were present in court, and, of course, the judge ordered that the indictment be quashed so far as this one defendant was concerned.

So you see how careless the grand jury was to indict workers. Here was a man whose name was not mentioned at all in the trial, and yet he was indicted and had to go through the trial. How careless they were with regard to the strikers, and yet how careful they were with regard to some one representing the manufacturers' side.

Mr. THOMPSON. In what other form did this spirit you speak about manifest itself?

Mr. MARELLI. Well, it made itself manifest, I think, in those wholesale arrests that were made.

Chairman WALSH. Commissioner Lennon would like to ask you a question.

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. Were these arrests and indictments really because of the fact that the men refused to work, or were they because of a violation of law?

Mr. MARELLI. I think because the men refused to work. I think it was an attempt to break up the strike. Judge Minturn agreed with us that a fair and impartial trial could not be had by a jury composed of Passaic County men, and it was on these papers which I presented to him on an application that we made for a foreign jury to try all the indicted leaders after Quinlan had been convicted. We applied for a foreign jury, for men composed of people from a county other than Passaic County after Quinlan had been convicted, and to sustain our contention that a fair and impartial trial could not be had we produced those papers, and it was on those newspaper articles alone that Judge Minturn granted our application. He said that it was as a result of the articles in those papers that the state of public mind was created, two states of public mind, one for the strikers and one against the strikers, and that it would be impossible to get anyone possessing a state of mind absolutely fair and impartial.

We tried the cases with a foreign jury, and in neither case was there a conviction. Disagreements in each case.

Chairman WALSH. The commission will now stand adjourned until to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock.

Mr. Marelli, please return at that time.

(Thereupon, at 5 o'clock p. m., June 16, 1914, an adjournment was taken until June 17, 1914, at 10 o'clock a. m.)

PATERSON, N. J., *June 17, 1914*—10 a. m.

Present: Chairman Walsh, Commissioners Lennon and Commons; also William O. Thompson, counsel.

Chairman WALSH. The commission will be in order.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Marelli will please take the stand.

Chairman WALSH. I think you were right in the midst of a statement when we adjourned.

TESTIMONY OF MR. HENRY MARELLI—Continued.

Mr. MARELLI. I wish to make clear to the commission the matter of the illegal convictions made during the strike to which I called your attention. I have stated to you that every case of conviction for disorderly conduct that was appealed to the higher courts resulted in a victory for the strikers, either by the decision by the court or by the abandonment by the city authorities. We took up in this manner about eight or nine cases. I don't wish to be understood that these were the only cases of illegal convictions for disorderly conduct. In fact, in our judgment, most of the convictions for disorderly conduct were illegal. We did not take them up because of the costs involved, and also because of the fact that the penalties imposed were small, and it was deemed better for the strikers to pay the penalty either in fines or jail sentences than to take the matter up to the higher courts.

In the matter of the costs, I would like to show the viewpoint of the courts in regard to them in order to show the discrimination that is made between property and human rights. In each of the cases of Haywood, Tresca, and Lessig, which were appealed to the supreme court, reference to which I made yesterday, the costs—that is, the actual disbursements—amounted to about \$50 for the printing of the cases and the court costs.

Chairman WALSH. Each individual case?

Mr. MARELLI. Each case. The court rendered its opinion in each case without reference to costs. We, on notice to the city attorney, asked the supreme court for costs. The supreme court refused to allow us costs on the theory that costs were never allowed in matters where a public official was a defendant. Some time ago in the city of Paterson an ordinance was passed by the board of alderman requiring the Erie Railroad, which passes through this city, to establish a grade crossing at one of the crossings in this city. If this crossing could have been established it would have been for the benefit of the public. The Erie Railroad believed that the ordinance was an illegal one, and by writ of certiorari, the same kind of a writ that we obtained in the striker cases to review the convictions before the recorder, asked the supreme court to review the legality of the ordinance. The supreme court decided in favor of the Erie Railroad and allowed the Erie Railroads costs against the city. I wish to bring out this point, that in the one case we have an appeal made where property rights alone are involved, where, if the city had been successful, the public would have benefited, but where costs were allowed, and in the other cases where human rights alone were involved costs were denied.

In the early part of the strike the strikers were held mostly on charges of disorderly conduct. But I presume the city authorities believed that perhaps the convictions for disorderly conduct would not be sustained by the upper courts, and so therefore the strikers were held under a law passed during the reign of Charles II in 1665, called a law against unlawful assemblages; and most of the strikers, as I say, were therefore held under this charge, and most of the strikers, as I have indicated to you, who were held under this charge were ultimately discharged. Their cases were not brought to trial. They were not indicted—most of them were not—and the cases against most of them that were indicted were dismissed on trial or were nolle-prossed without trial.

Patrick Quinlan was the first of the leaders who was tried. He was indicted for inciting to riot. There were three indictments returned against him on that charge, and one indictment was returned against him for unlawful assemblage. His case was tried before a jury in Paterson, and the trial resulted in a disagreement.

Immediately the prosecutor gave notice that he would try the case in the course of two days. I think the jury's return was made on Saturday morning and the prosecutor announced that he would retry the case on Monday morning.

The second trial resulted in a conviction.

At each of these trials there were about eight or nine police officers who testified that Quinlan had uttered the words he was charged with having ut-

tered in the indictment. Nobody else testified regarding this except the police officers. On the other side there were 30 or 35 working men and women who were at the meeting where these words were alleged to have been uttered who testified that not only were the words not uttered by Patrick Quinlan but that he did not speak at all on this occasion.

The case was appealed to the supreme court, and the supreme court sustained this conviction. An appeal has been taken or is about to be taken by us to the court of errors and appeals, which is the highest court in this State.

Chairman WALSH. That is the Quinlan case?

Mr. MARELLI. In the Quinlan case.

Chairman WALSH. Is he on bail now?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir; \$5,000 bail on this one charge, and then under two or three thousand dollars bail on the other indictment.

Chairman WALSH. Well, is this the case in which he has been sentenced to from 1 to 15 years?

Mr. MARELLI. From 2 to 15 years.

Chairman WALSH. Two to fifteen years?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes; and a fine of \$500.

Chairman WALSH. Was there some action on that lately, within the last few days? Was he given relief bail, or anything of that sort?

Mr. MARELLI. No; on account of my attendance here at the hearings I have been unable to get the writ, or, rather, the appeal from the supreme court to the court of errors and appeals sealed. As soon as I am through here, I will attend to that.

Chairman WALSH. But you get that as a matter of right; it is not discretionary?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes; as a matter of right. It was thereafter, after Quinlan's conviction, that we obtained an order from Justice Minturn to have all of the indicted leaders tried with a foreign jury. However, we did not ask for a foreign jury in the case of Alexander Scott, and he was tried by a local jury, made up of business men and manufacturers. The charge against him appeared to us to be so ridiculous that we did not think it necessary to get a foreign jury in his case.

However, the jury convicted him. No defense was put in in his behalf, because we did not deem it necessary. And I recall that after the conviction I had a conversation with one of the jurymen who convicted him.

This jurymen had a couple of weeks previous to the trial written a letter, or sent a letter under his signature, to the newspapers, in which he severely criticized the county judge for granting a license to a certain individual to keep a saloon near the factory of this jurymen. This jurymen keeps a tin-can factory in the city of Passaic, or near the city of Passaic.

I wish to say that our county judge here is also the county excise commissioner. He grants licenses to sell liquor to all persons who desire or who apply, to sell liquor outside of the city of Paterson and the city of Passaic.

I said to him, "Why in the world did you vote for a conviction in Scott's case for criticizing the acts, when you yourself a couple of weeks ago criticized the judge of the court for granting a certain license?" and he said to me, "Well, I had just reasons for criticizing the judge." "Well," I said, "Scott thought he had just reasons for criticizing the police." And we parried back and forth, and finally he said to me, "I will tell you why I voted for conviction." He said, "There was an article in this issue of The Issue wherein this article criticized the police, criticizing the United States Government for building new warships, and I could not stand for that, and therefore I voted to convict him on this charge."

The supreme court in its opinion in reversing the verdict brought in against Scott said that the judge of the court ought to have either quashed the indictment or ought to have directed the jury to bring in a verdict of not guilty.

Shortly after the supreme court rendered its opinion in the Scott case the prosecutor caused the grand jury that was sitting at the time in this county to indict Scott again, on the same article, only this time he caused him to be indicted on the charge of criminal libel instead of the charge of inciting hostility to any and all Government. If the lower court had done what the supreme court said it ought to have done, had instructed the jury to acquit Scott, Scott could not have been indicted again on this publication, because he would have been put twice in jeopardy for the same offense.

The next case that was tried was that of Elizabeth Girlie Flynn. She was charged with having uttered language which incited an assault on individuals.

Her trial lasted about three days before a foreign jury. The jury was out all night and returned at about 11 or 12 o'clock the next day, and the foreman said that it could not agree. The jury was discharged and Miss Flynn has never been retried.

The same witnesses—the same police officers—who testified in the Quinlan trial testified in the Flynn trial. We had 30 or 35 working men and women who were in attendance at the meeting where the words charged in the indictment were alleged to have been uttered, who testified that those words had not been uttered by Miss Flynn; that she did not advocate violence in any way, but, on the contrary, she advised peace.

And, to show the animosity of the newspapers, the next morning after the jury had returned that they could not agree, in the Morning Call there appeared an article that as the jury came in I was standing opposite the jury, and that I winked at one of the jurymen and that this jurymen winked back at me, which was an absolute falsehood, as I did not know the jurymen, I had never seen him before, and I had never in my life spoken to him.

The next one to be tried was Carlo Tresca. He was tried by a foreign jury and he was charged with inciting the strikers to an assault on individuals. His trial lasted but half a day, as we did not put in any defense, and there, too, the jury disagreed. Mr. Tresca has not been retried.

Chairman WALSH. Is Mr. Tresca still in the city?

Mr. MARELLI. I beg your pardon?

Chairman WALSH. Is Mr. Tresca still living in this city?

Mr. MARELLI. No, sir. He lives in New York, I understand.

Mr. Boyd was indicted for advocating the destruction of property. In his case we waived trial by jury, as there was no denial that he had uttered the words he was alleged to have uttered; but we held that the uttering of those words did not constitute a crime. He was tried without a jury and convicted. His case was taken to the supreme court on appeal and is still pending there.

Mr. Haywood was indicted for inciting hostility to the police force. He is alleged to have said these words:

"When we are organized we will be able to take the badges from the policemen, and the butchers will not sell them meat."

We feel so certain of success in his case that a couple of months ago I personally went to the prosecutor and told him that we would waive trial by jury in his case and have the court alone try his case, which the prosecutor refused to do. A great deal has been said against Mr. Haywood—a great deal was said against him in these newspaper articles to which I referred yesterday. He was here three or four days a week during the strike, and yet the worst they could find against him was the uttering of those words. That is all they have against him. That is the only indictment against him—an indictment which, apparently, they do not dare to bring to trial; and if they do not bring it for trial very soon we shall ask that a day be set for his trial.

I believe I have gone over the trials of the indictments of the leaders. I wish to say that Haywood was indicted only on this one charge; Miss Flynn was indicted on three charges; and Tresca was indicted on three charges. None of those charges, as I have indicated to you, have been disposed of, except the one charge against Boyd, who was indicted on two charges, and the one charge against Quinlan.

The newspapers were very severe. They did something that was unheard of, in my judgment: They criticised both Mr. Huntsecker and myself for our energy in the defense of the strikers and the strike leaders; and in one editorial we were practically urged to refrain from further defending the strike leaders. In one publication there appeared a letter written by a manufacturer, in which Mr. Huntsecker and myself were very severely criticised.

There were only two cases of alleged police brutality that were brought to our notice as counsel for the strikers. Both of the cases were referred to by Mr. Alexander Scott yesterday. One was a case of an alleged assault by Police Officer Duffy on a woman. We had the affidavit of the physician and affidavits of a number of witnesses concerning the alleged assault. A complaint was made by this woman against Police Officer Duffy, but, I believe, nothing ever came of the complaint.

The other case was against Officer Love, who was alleged to have assaulted a couple of men in the Totowa section of this city by clubbing them and knocking them down with his club. It was also said that he had beaten one of these prisoners in the patrol wagon as the prisoners were being taken from Totowa to the police station. A complaint was also made against Officer Love, but

nothing ever came of the complaint. Those were the only two cases brought to our attention as counsel for the strikers—of assault by the police. The police were generally not brutal toward the strikers, but I think that was due largely to the extraordinary self-control on the part of the strikers. There was not a single instance in the whole strike of mob violence, so far as the strikers were concerned. The only instance of violence was that one that I related yesterday with reference to this private detective. The policemen, too—some of them—had brothers and sisters employed in the silk factory who were on strike; and there were some policemen with whom I talked who were sympathetic with the strikers. But they certainly resorted to and did make indiscriminate arrests, as the results show.

The police officers sometimes do not seem to understand what constitutes disorderly conduct. Officers are given orders to make arrests, or were given orders to make arrests, and they would make them regardless of what was being done by the strikers. It seems that this is done in all strikes. I have been engaged in defending strikers in the city of Paterson for the last eight years. I am employed in almost every strike. I am employed in a strike going on here and tried a striker's case this morning, where a striker had been arrested for distributing handbills. The case, however, was dismissed against him. When I read of the conduct of the police and the constituted authorities in other places, I must say that the police of Paterson were not one-hundredth part as bad as they have been in these other places of which I read. But I say this was due to the extreme self-control exercised by the strikers. There were, of course, a few individual isolated cases of assault and battery, where strikers would, on the quiet, perhaps, assault a man; but there were very few of those cases. I do not believe there were 15 who were indicted for assault and battery during the strike.

As I say, the strikers exercised extreme self-control, and these stories about stoning of houses and the exploding of bombs were exaggerated. All these stories came to us.

Commissioner WALSH. How many allegations were there of that sort, that is, that they threw stones at houses, or stones were thrown at houses? How many complaints do you recall approximately?

Mr. MARELLI. I only recall one or two complaints.

Commissioner WALSH. Only two.

Mr. MARELLI. There were newspaper reports of them very often.

Chairman WALSH. How many conceded explosions were there?

Mr. MARELLI. All I know of is half a dozen, but there was not \$5 worth of property destroyed in any of those explosions, and the explosion—I recall the alleged explosion where I visited the scene the next day. I think it was the Helvetia Mill, one of the silk mills here in the city of Paterson, and where the explosion was alleged to have taken place was right next to a pane of glass, and the glass was not disturbed at all.

Chairman WALSH. Were any convictions had in the case of explosions?

Mr. MARELLI. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Any arrests?

Mr. MARELLI. No, sir; none that I recall; no, sir. I think I have stated all that I have in mind.

Chairman WALSH. Very well. I have just one question, then. You said that the proceedings against certain defendants on the charge of unlawful assemblage were based upon a law enacted in 1665?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Now, the information that they filed in these cases, or were they indictments?

Mr. MARELLI. Simply informations first and indictments afterwards.

Chairman WALSH. Well, does the information in New Jersey, it is required to set out the law upon which it is based?

Mr. MARELLI. No.

Chairman WALSH. And it was just for unlawful assemblage?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And the reason you say it was under the act of 1665 is that it is a common-law offense in New Jersey, unlawful assemblage?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And therefore it dates back to that act?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. It was not brought right on that act?

Mr. MARELLI. No, sir.
Chairman WALSH. That is all.

TESTIMONY OF MR. MICHAEL DUNN.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will you give us your name?

Mr. DUNN. Michael Dunn.

Mr. THOMPSON. And your address?

Mr. DUNN. Business address, Romaineville, Paterson, N. J. House address, 667 East Eighteenth Street.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are prosecuting attorney of Passaic County?

Mr. DUNN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been such?

Mr. DUNN. Since April, 1911.

Mr. THOMPSON. During the silk-mill strike here of last year you acted as such prosecuting attorney?

Mr. DUNN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And had the direction and charge of the cases brought in the courts?

Mr. DUNN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You may tell us briefly the jurisdiction that your office has. Does it take charge in the police magistrate's court or just the upper court?

Mr. DUNN. We have charge in all criminal matters, but we take special cognizance of cases after they have been committed by the committing magistrate, unless there are some matters of public import which comes to our attention before the arrest is made.

Chairman WALSH. Do you have a deputy in the lower court?

Mr. DUNN. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. In these 1,800 arrests or so that have been testified to here, if there were that number, that were brought before Recorder Carroll, did you or a representative from you appear in the police magistrate's court?

Mr. DUNN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then you have more particularly to do with these cases when they come up to the upper court?

Mr. DUNN. The cases in which commitments were made and parties held to answer to the grand jury.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you hear the testimony yesterday of Mr. Marelli?

Mr. DUNN. No, sir; I did not. Unfortunately I was engaged in the trial of an indictment in court and could not come down here.

Mr. THOMPSON. You heard his testimony this morning?

Mr. DUNN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. In which he spoke of the Quinlan case and the Scott case?

Mr. DUNN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, with reference to the 1,800 or more arrests that are alleged to have been made at that time that came before Recorder Carroll, have you got any information or knowledge regarding them?

Mr. DUNN. Only in a general way, as gleaned from the newspapers, except as to that portion where Judge Carroll did not deal with them under the disorderly act but held them under the criminal statutes, and in that way held them over for the grand jury.

Mr. THOMPSON. It was stated yesterday that the number of—if I have the figures correctly, that about 222 cases were discharged of the 1,800; about 300 cases were fined and sent to the upper court; that the other 1,300 cases were committed to jail. Now, are you able to say anything in regard to that matter?

Mr. DUNN. All I can say is that the grand jury found about 200 indictments in cases growing out of the strike, and those indictments covered about, I would say, 450 different defendants. In some of the indictments, as you gentlemen will readily understand, familiar with the law, for example unlawful assemblage, there would be probably 20 or 25 names in a single indictment, because it occurred at a specific place at specific time and in possibly some of those, some defendants might have participated a week later in some other unlawful assemblage at another place and under other circumstances, and would there be indicted. But that is about the number of indictments that were found and, as I say, it covers about 450 different defendants.

Mr. THOMPSON. In regard to the cases which were taken up. It has been testified here, in the order taking first the Tresca case, then the Haywood

case, then the Lessig case, and so on, that when the cases came up to the upper court, either heard by the judge or by a jury, that the defendants were released; and the statement has been made here as to the character of the evidence in those cases, particularly the Tresca and the Haywood and Lessig cases, where they were arrested early in the strike. What have you to say in regard to those cases?

MR. DUNN. Lessig and Tresca and the other leaders who were arrested on the first day of the strike were not discharged for inciting to riot. They were indicted, and two of them had—that is, Tresca and Girlie Flynn Jones—have been tried with a foreign jury which disagreed, and their retrial is now likely to take place within the course of 10 or 12 days, in those two cases especially. And Mr. Haywood has not been put on trial, and Mr. Marelli makes a mistake when he says he asked me to give him a trial. That is absolutely untrue. He never spoke to me urging that Haywood be tried, or to fix a day for him to be tried. It is absolutely untrue. Why he said that I don't know.

As to the other case which arose out of the first day of the strike here, the Quinlan case, that was tried and Mr. Quinlan was convicted and his conviction was appealed to the supreme court and that conviction has been upheld.

As to the Scott case, which arose out of an article published by him in his Issue, which I have here, of February 28, three days after the strike was started. My construction of a statute which had been passed in 1908 after the death of President McKinley making it a high misdemeanor for any person to advocate hostility to any and all government, was the language used in the statute, and we construed that the word "any" was there with some purpose, and that the word "all" had a function, and in investigating we found a number of cases that where those words were used in that manner in a statute that the word "and" may be translated or construed by the courts as "or" so that the statute could be read "any or all government." And with that construction in mind that indictment was framed under that statute.

It went to the supreme court, and they have recently rendered an opinion in which they have held that the intent of the legislature was that the words should be taken in a conjunctive sense, and that the word "and" should be given a separate meaning from the word "or," and that the statute should be read as though the word "any" was eliminated and the word "and," and that the sentence should be read as "hostility to any and all government" pure and simple. In other words, they thought that the public policy and the right of making proper criticism of public officers and administrations or different parties to the Government was so much of a right that it ought not to be abridged, and in that view they held that they thought that that indictment ought not to stand. That indictment was nolle prossed, but the article was of such a character that when the matter was brought to the attention of the present grand jury, a copy of which I have here and will leave the article with you, they felt it was of such a grossly libelous character, as also was indicated in the opinion of the judges of the supreme court, that Mr. Scott ought to be answerable for it to the chief of police, against whom the libel was aimed, and they returned an indictment against him and he has been arraigned on that indictment and a day fixed for his trial.

(Mr. Dunn submitted a copy of the Weekly Issue, dated Paterson, N. J., February 28, 1913, containing article entitled "Police Chief Binson overrides constitution.")

The Quinlan case has been decided and affirmed, and Mr. Quinlan has been notified to appear before the court on next Monday to take his judgment and sentence.

There are two cases, as I said, which have been tried before and are now pending, because this foreign jury is outstanding in each of them, and they will probably be disposed of between this time and the 4th of July.

MR. THOMPSON. Referring to the Tresca case, and the Haywood case, and the Lessig case, where they were arrested and charged, if I remember correctly, with disorderly conduct or unlawful assembly, when they first met at the Lafayette Oval and were walking downtown, those cases I understand they were held by the recorder, or fined, and the cases were taken to the supreme court before Judge Minturn and the cases were discharged.

MR. DUNN. The only man that was held among those that you have mentioned in those cases was Mr. Haywood. There were other persons, not of the leaders, that were arrested for unlawful assembly.

In the Haywood case the recorder, Carroll, held Mr. Haywood for unlawful assembly. There was an application made for habeas corpus—Mr. Haywood was refusing to give bail and preferring to remain in jail. There was application for habeas corpus, and on the return of that writ I appeared in court and produced before the judge the evidence that the police were able to supply as to what occurred at the time they made the arrest. The arrest was made, as you understand, without warrant.

The arrest grew out of this fact: On the Saturday or Friday night preceding this assemblage, which was arranged to take place at Lafayette Oval on Sunday afternoon, the police had sent for Mr. Lessig, who was then acting as secretary and president, I think—I think he was president of the local organization—and told them the danger that would likely follow in case on Sunday afternoon a meeting of that kind should be held in the open and any such speeches made as had been made previously at some of their meetings, and would not under any conditions consent to the holding of the meeting. They agreed with him that the meeting should not be held, and would not be held, and that it would be called off.

Now, instead of keeping their word, on Sunday afternoon their assemblage at this Lafayette—there assembled at this Lafayette Oval from different quarters of the city a crowd until there were on the grounds, as I got it from the police, in the neighborhood of 2,000 people. No one of those leaders had yet put in an appearance, but as the clock approached 2, Mr. Haywood, with some others of the leaders, was seen approaching Lafayette Oval from a different street line than that on which most of them went there, and when he approached the police who were assembled there announced to the persons who were assembled there—there were policemen, 15 or 16 there—that they could not hold that meeting, and that they had promised that it would not be held, and that the crowd must disperse and go away; no meeting could be held. At once the authority of the police was defied and hooted at. They had a cry they used to use, kind of a boo-hoo, kind of a lonesome, wailful cry of derision, and showing distaste toward the police.

The crowd carefully, in groups, seemed to scatter, as the evidence showed, and were in a disposition to go away, and just at that time Mr. Haywood appears on the scene with one or two other outside of town gentlemen who were interested in his cause. He says, "Well, if we can not hold our meeting here then we will parade somewhere else and hold it."

We have a statute in this State that prohibits any parade from being held on a Sunday through the streets of the city of Paterson without permission first obtained from the chief of police, and then only can it be granted in cases of religious societies or some fraternal organizations as mentioned in the statute. But that did not deter Mr. Haywood, and he started to assemble those men and started to parade them in Paterson, past the houses of employers, against whom derision was manifested as they went along, and hooting and interfering with people on the sidewalk, who had to get off the sidewalks and get out in the street and let the crowd pass, because they were unwilling to do so. And that continued until well on toward the outskirts of the city. At that point the police deemed it proper that Mr. Haywood, who was leading the crowd, should be arrested. He was arrested, and it was upon that charge that he was accused of having participated in an unlawful assembly, violating the statute which I have just mentioned, and also violating the unlawful assembly act and the common law governing such cases; and it was upon that charge that he was committed, and upon that charge that the investigation was made by Judge Minturn under the habeas corpus proceedings as to whether or not a crime had been committed.

Judge Minturn decided in that case that he thought, because they were not parading in orderly fashion, two or two, or four by four, that is was not a parade within the meaning of the statute, because they were going along in a haphazard formation; it was not a parade and, therefore, he did not think they came within the statute, and he excused Mr. Haywood. But in so doing he took occasion to refer to some cases—I think it was the case of Lord Gordon, when he appealed to Parliament after taking a petition there on behalf of some of his constituents on the other side—and he thought that the circumstances in that case fitted this case, and decided it with some considerable emphasis and released Mr. Haywood.

So that was all there was to that case.

Mr. THOMPSON. It has been stated here, Mr. Dunn, by Mr. Marelli, that there were six or eight cases taken up, cases growing out of the strike, grow-

ing out of the charges of disorderly conduct and unlawful assemblage. Now, not taking into consideration the Quinlan case or the Scott case, which alleged other things, or the Haywood case, which alleged some statements——

Mr. DUNN (interrupting). Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And that in all of the cases they were taken up in that way in the upper courts, either by habeas corpus or writ of certiorari, or indictment by the grand jury, and then trial, and that the defendants were acquitted. Is that true or not?

Mr. DUNN. That is not true. There were cases that were tried for violations of ordinances which reached disorderly conduct before the recorder. We have a statute which provides for a review of the recorder's judgment by the judge of the court of common pleas by simply giving notice of appeal, and notice issues from the common pleas to the recorder to send up the record before him on which the conviction was founded, and then the court of common pleas proceeds to review that record to ascertain whether or not there was sufficient in the record to justify conviction. Now, there were many cases of that kind that went before the court that were not dismissed; but with those cases I haven't anything to do when they would come up on appeal. That would be for a violation of city ordinances, and the city attorney or city counsel would appear in those cases.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, you don't know, then, of those cases of your own knowledge?

Mr. DUNN. I know that some of them went up and were upheld.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, so far as the cases that came up that you took charge of were concerned, what were they? What were their names, if you know, and what was done, leaving out the Haywood and Scott cases?

Mr. DUNN. In every case that we tried for unlawful assemblage we got a conviction. There wasn't an acquittal in any case that we tried for unlawful assemblage, unless we would discover absence of evidence in the case of A. B. or C. D., in the particular case, and in that case they would be dismissed.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the Tresca case that went up?

Mr. DUNN. There was no Tresca case that was up for review before the higher courts. Tresca is indicted for inciting to riot, and that has been tried, and the jury disagreed.

Mr. THOMPSON. And then, so far as you remember, you are positive there was no case in which he was involved that went up from Recorder Carroll——

Mr. DUNN (interrupting). Oh, that I don't know; there might have been a case before Recorder Carroll for disorderly conduct.

Mr. THOMPSON. No; a case that went up from Recorder Carroll——

Mr. DUNN (interrupting). Oh, that I don't know; there might have been a have been an appeal gone up from Recorder Carroll to the common pleas judge.

Mr. THOMPSON. You know nothing about that?

Mr. DUNN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. So that, as to the fact of these things that Mr. Marelli has testified about, as to that class of cases going up on writ of certiorari from before Recorder Carroll to the higher court, you are not acquainted with that?

Mr. DUNN. No, sir; I only dealt with the crimes.

Mr. THOMPSON. In regard to the grand jury, it has been stated here by Mr. Marelli that one O'Brien detective killed a man, Modestino Valentino; said he was shot in the back, and he said there were witnesses who say that they saw the detective shoot the revolver and saw the man fall and that the two things were concurrent; and that the proposition of the indictment of that man came up before the grand jury three times and that each of these times Judge Minturn drew the attention of the grand jury to this killing and then he finally said the last time, before the last grand jury, when they did not indict, words to this effect—I can not quote it absolutely, but he wanted to know what influence there was—unseen influence—in the community which prevented the indictment of this man which the evidence showed, at least prima facie, had shot and killed another in Paterson.

Did such a case come up before the grand jury?

Mr. DUNN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And what, if anything, did Judge Minturn say to the grand jury about the case?

Mr. DUNN. I recollect the case very well. Mr. Modestino Valentino was an employee in the file works and lived in the neighborhood of the Weidmann mill; and on the night he was shot there was a riot in front of his house. Just previous to his being shot—I am giving you now the result of the evidence, prob-

ably, from the examination of 50 witnesses who claimed to have been on the scene.

Chairman WALSH. The effect of their testimony?

Mr. DUNN. It is the substance; you are getting the pith of it.

Chairman WALSH. The substance of it.

Mr. DUNN. Yes; on that night there had been some very violent conduct on the part of the strikers and their sympathizers during the night, so that the manufacturers were—felt it their duty to supply watchmen and guards to protect the lives and the homes of these men who were working—these men who were working were not strike breakers nor scabs in any sense of the term. They were mechanics, electricians, engineers, carpenters, and others, who, while the mills were idle, the different mills, the masters were taking advantage of the opportunity to have the machinery repaired and fixed up in order to save time when they were ready to enter again upon their work. But the notion was injected into the minds of some of these poor fellows that these men were doing a great harm to the cause, and in consequence, just as I say, a few days before this riot took place, there had been stoops blown off the houses, and bombs had been exploded in the rear of houses where people were sleeping, and the glass of the windows shattered and thrown upon the beds of children and wives—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Were those the houses of these mechanics?

Mr. DUNN. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. In all instances?

Mr. DUNN. In most instances; so on this occasion the feeling was quite bitter, and there were two men to go to guard two certain houses, both houses located upon the East Side, as I recall it now. And they felt it necessary that the O'Brien detectives, of whom these men were members, these men being connected with the Weidmann works, should escort them down to the trolley car on River Street, at the corner of River Street and Fifth Avenue, near the Weidmann mill; and so they were escorted, and they reached the corner of River Street and Fifth Avenue, and while they were waiting for a car a hostile crowd assembled of two or three hundred men, who live all around there, and they began to hoot and yell, and began to make demonstrations. So that these two men, together with the five or six that accompanied them, felt unsafe to remain there, and they started back down the street to the works to get assistance, which they did, and returned with twelve or fifteen, and were then escorted in safety upon the car. Then the 15 started to return back to the works, walking down on the right-hand side of the street as they approached the works, the crowd, consisting then of seven or eight hundred strikers and their associates, and sight-seers and curiosity people, following; and they hooted and yelled at these men as they approached on down toward the works.

When the men got to a point on the corner of the street, just this side—when I say “this side” I mean this side of the Erie track, at which corner there is a saloon located—I speak of that as a geographical point—when they got to that point, the crown on the left-hand side of the street attempted to intercept them, and on the way down stones had been thrown at them, and the hooting and yelling had been carried on; but then the crowd attempted to intercept them to prevent their crossing the street at that point to go into the Weidmann works.

As the crowd made a dash, some one seeing it—one of these detectives hollered: “Turn about; charge and drive them back.” And instantly on that being done, there were in the neighborhood of 17 or 18 shots fired. That is, between the “turn about, face about, charge.” And the crowd started to run down the street. Now, one of these shots hit Mr. Modestino (Valentino), who at that time happened to be out, as these men passed, upon his porch and had turned to go in just before this command was given to “face about, charge,” And one of those shots struck Mr. Modestino under, I think it was, his right shoulder as he was on his doorsill, going into his house. When this order was given, these men turned back toward the crowd and started down the street, and this man Cullerton, who was one of the O'Brien detectives, and two or three detectives, were seen to fire their pistols in the air back toward River Street, which would be toward the east, as they were going down there. After it was discovered that Mr. Modestino was shot, and he was taken to the hospital, and after the crowd started to go back, why these detectives went on into the works and resumed their stand in there. Then it was claimed that some of these men had fired this shot. Now, to ascertain who this was was the mission of the police, and such detectives as we could employ; and the police immediately

got busy, and it seems that there was one or two persons there who claimed they could identify the man whom they saw shooting, and they did not pretend to claim that they saw him shooting at Modestino or in the direction of Modestino after they were put on examination on the stand.

And we examined all the witnesses; I think we examined in the neighborhood of 50 witnesses in that case who claimed to be present down at that scene, and had them designate on diagrams and maps as to where they stood. And where they were located; and the result of all that investigation ended up by two different grand juries going on the scene themselves and placing themselves in the position where some of these men had said they were when they observed what they had testified to, and from the evidence of some of the men standing in places where they said they were it was absolutely impossible to see either Cullerton or Modestino. And from the testimony of others it was impossible to reach any conclusion that they had seen anything at all.

There wasn't any question but what Cullerton was proved to have been seen shooting. There were 18 or 20 shots fired. There was one shot fired from the left-hand side of the street, which side the strikers were on and no question about that, and other shots fired from the middle of the road. A careful investigation was also made to ascertain whether or not there were any shots or stray bullets in the fronts of the houses where Mr. Modestino lived or either side of him or along that direction. We could not find a stray bullet, although we searched with ladders the fronts of all those houses located at that point.

So we did get evidence concerning Cullerton of creditable and very reliable sources of a man who had been down on the same side of the street as the detectives and who, when they started to shoot, got behind a telegraph pole that stands about where Cullerton says he was, and he says Cullerton fired into the air down toward the east.

Chairman WALSH. And not toward Modestino? What business did you say Modestino was in?

Mr. DUNN. He was in the file works.

Chairman WALSH. He was not a participant?

Mr. DUNN. He was not a participant, and nobody knew him—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). He was considered to be a bystander?

Mr. DUNN. He was conceded to be an innocent man. So the result of the investigation as had in three different grand juries that went on the scene, and we had to state before them all this different evidence, they say that the killing was accidental and who fired the shot they were unable to state, and so they made a presentment to the court at the last term of court.

Chairman WALSH. Did you feel that you had gotten all the witnesses before the grand jury that were obtainable?

Mr. DUNN. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And was there any evidence that any witness had been sent away, or anything of that kind?

Mr. DUNN. Oh; no, sir. The police left no stone unturned.

Chairman WALSH. Now, how many people, about, did the evidence show were in the neighborhood?

Mr. DUNN. The evidence showed in the neighborhood of 800 to 1,000 people right in front of Modestino's house when this charge was ordered to drive them back.

Chairman WALSH. And out of that you examined all that, in your judgment, might or could possibly have known?

Mr. DUNN. We examined all whose names we could get that were indicated in any way to be in a position where they could give us any information. We made a regular investigation about it in the grand jury.

Mr. THOMPSON. Where was this house of Modestino—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Just a moment. Was there any criticism by any judicial officer, Judge Minturn, or anybody else, as to the action of the grand juries?

Mr. DUNN. Not since the last presentment was made, sir. On the contrary Judge Minturn released the man on bail since that time.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, just one question: Where was the house of Modestino with reference to the entrance to the works?

Mr. DUNN. Modestino lived on Fifth Avenue, and the entrance to the works—he was about, I should say, 400 feet from the Erie Railroad, and the entrance—that is, the Erie Railroad tracks, the right of way—and the entrance to the works is just over the tracks. I should say, perhaps, 600 or 700 feet from the

gate; but he was nearer a certain portion of their land than what he was to the gate.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Dunn, is there anything else you would like to say in reference to the action of the authorities—the police authorities or the county authorities—or with reference to the action of the strikers in the conduct of the strike—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Was there any difficulty or lack of difficulty in enforcing the law under the circumstances?

Mr. DUNN. Yes, sir. I don't know that I could give you much more enlightenment than you have, but it seems to me, from what I read in the newspapers this morning, that some erroneous notions might be formed by you gentlemen, who are strangers to this scene, in reference to certain conditions that prevailed.

One thought I think you ought to get in your mind is this: As you will see by glancing over this paper, which came out three days after the strike was declared, the 28th of February, and the strike was declared on the 25th—you will see the strike leaders started out in this matter with an immoral purpose. There was no disposition on the part, so far as we could glean, of the bulk of the silk workers of this city to go on strike. At the time the announcement was made, on the 25th of February, the only people prior to that time that there had been any talk of dissatisfaction with was the dispute in Mr. Doherty's mill at Lake View concerning the working and operating of the four-loom system or two-loom system, and then there was some talk among them as to having shorter hours. But, so far as I was able to learn, during the whole progress of the strike and up to the time it was declared no individual factory had taken that matter up seriously through committee or otherwise with their masters, and it had never been debated.

I did also learn that Mr. Haywood and Tresca and these fellows had some time prior to the 25th introduced into the Doherty shop an agent for the purpose of spreading among the men a thought and views of dissatisfaction with their then conditions. And I have learned since that some of the men were planted in Weidmann's and other places.

So that, as I say, there was no individual discord between operatives in one shop and another up to the time of the declaration of the strike on the 25th of February. And at that time the only issue declared was objection to the four-loom system and shorter hours. But there was no effort made by the people who were then still at work to have any conference with their people, but the effect of the declaration that there was a strike produced such an impression that those who stayed at work would be called scabs and would be hostile to the interests of those who were out on strikes that it soon was apparent that all would close down and would go out and remain out awaiting to see what disposition would be made of the situation. Those that were allied with the I. W. W. people were influenced and guided in their conduct by the thought of direct action, and the moral of their philosophy was such that it was absolutely impossible for our manufacturers to enter into any negotiations or adjustment with them on the theory that business men ordinarily employ when adjusting a difference between master and servant. So that our manufacturers felt that it was to their interest and the interest of the people demanded that they should stand by law and order, and whenever there had been disorder to come and confer with them, they might do so.

In the meantime these troubles and difficulties arose. Now, I will call your attention to one or two matters which will put a different impression on this situation from what my friend Marelli tried to give you.

In reference to the attitude and demeanor of those strikers, and those actions were mostly among the foreign element. We had 28 houses stoned at night, windows broken, and families terrified, and most of those houses were occupied by persons who were in the mechanical line, as I have mentioned before. There were 14 bombs exploded at different houses in this city and in Prospect Borough, adjoining this city, and at Fairmont. All did damage and some of them quite serious. One of them was at the house of Harry Hellington, a superintendent in one of the silk printer's establishments. There were three attempts made to wreck trains, on which it was alleged some of these agitators made a request of the Erie Railroad that they should not carry to their homes or from their homes any persons who were working, any mechanics who were working in the silk mills during the strike, and the Erie refused to pay any attention to any such request as that, and in consequence on two different occasions in the nighttime we had attempts made to wreck

trains by the placing of bowlders upon the track, one down at Riverside, the other up toward Ridgewood, and then a third attempt, and for that offense we had the men indicted, and they will likely be tried in the next 10 days, who got some chains from a junk shop, old brake chains thrown off the old brakes they used to use on railroad trains, and fastened them together and went down to Clifton, and there on a stretch of road on either side of which there is a steep and precipitous embankment, they dug out under the rails between the ties the space and fastened those chains around for the purpose of derailling the train, and come very near succeeding—a train that comes to Paterson from New York, I think leaving at 11.44. And the train was very nearly derailed, but fortunately it was not. Those chains were discovered on the rail as the cause, and we were afterwards able to locate the men who took the chains there and placed them upon the rails, and we have them under indictment and ready for trial.

I speak of these matters for the purpose of giving you gentlemen to understand that there was prevalent in spirit among a lot of those persons who were out on strike a very hostile disposition, and, in my judgment, the man who was at the bottom of inciting most of that disposition and that temper was this man Tresca. I think he is one of the worst men in the United States to-day.

Now, we also had a large number of personal attacks on men on their way from work at night, of those mechanics that I speak of. They were attacked with lead pipe; they were attacked with gas pipe used as a bludgeon; they were attacked with clubs, and in some instances they were attacked with pistols.

Chairman WALSH. About how many such cases were there, approximately, Mr. Dunn, individual assaults, convicted and unconvicted, captured and uncaptured?

Mr. DUNN. I would say there were in the neighborhood of 40 or 50 individual assaults, and, of course, most of them occurred at night.

Chairman WALSH. You base those on reports that were officially made to you, do you, by the police and others?

Mr. DUNN. Yes, sir. Reported in the newspapers, and I saw the men who were assaulted; and they would make John Doe complaints, and we would try to see if we could not by some method ascertain who was behind the offense, but we were not able.

Now, in addition to that in this trouble, there were 20 policemen injured by stones and other missiles thrown at them while in the discharge of duty.

We found also that a number of those women were assaulted and waylaid sometimes by women.

In two instances there were cases where the wife and daughters of a person who was running a little plant of his own, not what you call a regular silk mill, but where they made fancy work, and he was operating it with the assistance of his own family, and those people were waylaid on their way home, down toward the corner of Governor Street and Summer Street one night; thrown to the ground with great violence, and the hair torn out of their heads, and they were unable to identify the parties who had assaulted them.

So that that will give you gentlemen an idea that during this struggle that we have had here there has been fanned among a certain element of the strikers a bitter hostility toward their fellow men and, in the end, all this was applauded by the leaders whom we have under indictment.

Now, there was another case of very great importance, which shows and emphasized this disposition on the part of the strikers more particularly to you. There was a case where a man was arrested by the name of De Nopoli. Mr. De Nopoli had been out on strike for about three weeks. I think this is one of the saddest cases that came to our attention. He had some little money saved, and had used it during that three weeks. He had a wife, I think, and a couple of children. His neighbor was of the same situation—I have forgotten his name. After being out three weeks and seeing no sign of settlement of the strike, they concluded they would go over and go to work at Astoria, in Long Island, where there was a silk mill in operation, and they went there and got work. After they had been working there three or four days there was a committee of the I. W. W. that went there to visit them and called on them at noon-time and told them they had to quit work there and stay on strike or they would have trouble. They explained to them—this Mr. De Nopoli explained that he had borrowed \$70 from a building and loan association here on his furniture; that he had used up what money he had; that he was behind with his rent in consequence of being out on strike, and he had not anything with which to sus-

tain his family, and he did not feel that working in a strange field over in Astoria he could be criticized as interfering with the possible adjustment of the strike in Paterson.

And begged of them to go away and let him alone, and so did his other friend, who was a neighbor living next door. And they said, "No; you have got to quit work or we will fix you." They lived up in Totowa, their families did, and they lived up in Totawa on Ryerson Street, I think. On Sunday evening following this visit to them in Astoria there appeared at the house of Mr. De Nopoli a tall fellow whose name I can't recall just now, and a shorter fellow, the shorter fellow being one of the parties who had been over to Astoria trying to get him to quit work. And they demanded to know—happened to find both men together at the front fence talking—what they were going to do in reference to quitting work, and they explained again their position, that it was impossible to do that unless they wanted their families to starve. And with that the smaller fellow pulled out a blackjack from under his coat and hit the smaller fellow across the head, and the other fellow pulled a gun, and Mr. DeNopoli, whose wife happened to be standing by, and she jumped in between them, and as she did this big brute fired his gun, struck and felled Mrs. De Nopoli to ground, and Mr. De Nopoli then stepped back and pulled his gun, and the first shot doubled up the big fellow, the second shot felled him in the ditch, and then Mr. De Nopoli picked up his wife, and a crowd had assembled, and four thugs that were on the other side of the street associating with this pair came over and helped drag De Nopoli away and they carried him down to the corner of Rip Van Winkle Avenue and Haledon Avenue or Hamburg Avenue, and there sent for a doctor. They found him suffering from two bullet wounds. He was sent to the hospital and died, I think, within 24 hours thereafter, and the result that I am giving you is from the evidence obtained from the witnesses in each case. The grand jury felt there was justifiable homicide. Mr. De Nopoli was held in jail two or three months for that.

So that this Volontino case that has been spoken of has been unnecessarily and so far as we could discover unwarrantably magnified, and it was possibly all due to the fact that it was seized upon by Mr. Haywood and Tresca and some of these other parties as being something that might give sympathy to their cause. And in order to make very sure of it they called upon Mrs. Modestino. I am stating now her story. They wanted to take charge of the funeral and were going to aid her in her troubles and in her embarrassment, and she let them take charge of the funeral, which was a great pageant. No man, no matter what his official standing has been in this town, no matter what his philanthropic manifestation of liberality may have been toward upleading his people, has ever received in this city such a pageant at the last rites as was tendered to Mr. Modestino. And afterwards it was attempted, as you know, to be reproduced in New York.

Mrs. Modestino was left with three little children, and she had a child born to her a couple of months after Mr. Modestino died. That crowd never went once or near Mrs. Modestino to give her a mouthful or a spoonful to eat. They never tendered her assistance or help of any kind, and to-day two of her children are being taken care of by the Society for the Protection of Children, which just gave this little entertainment to raise money through the Dolly-Jones circus. Two are being taken care of in that home. One of them is being taken care of in the Catholic Orphan Asylum under the supervision of Father McNulty, and the other is being assisted by Father Stein, and Mrs. Modestino was obliged yesterday to go to the hospital because of her wound.

MR. THOMPSON. There were about 25,000 people out on strike, were there not?

MR. DUNN. Yes, sir.

MR. THOMPSON. From your knowledge of the strike would you say it was a peaceful strike or one with great disorder in it?

MR. DUNN. I would not call it a peaceful strike. I have participated in peaceful strikes heretofore, and formerly before I was city counsel and before I was prosecutor used to represent the labor people. We never had such depredations during those times as transpired at these times, and this is the first time we have ever had in our midst a foreign element that seems to have no moral motive or moral policy on which an adjustment of differences should be based.

MR. THOMPSON. Then, in your opinion this was rather a violent or disorderly strike?

MR. DUNN. I would so call it.

MR. THOMPSON. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALSH. That is all. Thank you, Mr. Dunn.

(Witness excused.)

Chairman WALSH. Call your next.

Mr. MARELLI (in the audience). May I be heard?

Chairman WALSH. Not at present, Mr. Marelli.

Mr. MARELLI. In reference to certain statements Mr. Dunn has made?

Chairman WALSH. Not at this moment.

Mr. MARELLI. May I be heard later?

Chairman WALSH. I told Mr. Fitch to tell you a little while ago that if there was anything that you deemed necessary to rebut, any statement made, or anything that did not come out in your testimony, you would be given an opportunity to be heard. Did he tell you?

Mr. MARELLI. Yes, sir. May I ask if I may present to the commission the decision of Mr. Justice Minturn in discharging Haywood and Lessig under the habeas corpus proceedings?

Chairman WALSH. We will be very glad to receive any documents during the remainder of this session.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is Dr. McBride here?

TESTIMONY OF DR. ANDREW F. M'BRIDE.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will you give us your name and address?

Dr. McBRIDE. Andrew F. McBride, 397 Main Street, Paterson, N. J.

Mr. THOMPSON. And you are a physician by profession?

Dr. McBRIDE. A physician; yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And you are in active practice?

Dr. McBRIDE. I am.

Mr. THOMPSON. And you were the mayor of Paterson during the strike last year?

Dr. McBRIDE. I was.

Mr. THOMPSON. What, in your opinion, or what, in your understanding, were the main causes of the strike at that time?

Dr. McBRIDE. Why, opposition to the operation of four looms by the weavers was the main contention, as I understand it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were there any other causes of industrial unrest, say, which caused this vast number to come out of work?

Dr. McBRIDE. Well, there was quite a feeling caused by some of the manufacturers dealing unfairly with their employees, reducing the price given them for their work, and oftentimes making them operate looms that were not up to date, and also weave silk that was not good, and also for the fact that the wages in some of these factories were very low.

Mr. THOMPSON. You think those were the operating causes?

Dr. McBRIDE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Which caused these 25,000 men and women to come out?

Dr. McBRIDE. No; I think that is what caused the strike. I think many of the people who came out on strike had no intention in the beginning to strike—that the strike would last over two or three days, and came out in the spirit of a lark more than anything else, because many who came out on strike were absolutely satisfied with their conditions of employment. Once they were out, however, it was impossible to go back without being characterized as being scabs and unfair, and also in fear of injury being done themselves and their families.

Mr. THOMPSON. When you speak of the cases where there was dissatisfaction, you mean more than the Doherty mill, of course?

Dr. McBRIDE. I do.

Mr. THOMPSON. What percentage of the people who were out on strike, if you have any idea, were actually dissatisfied with their conditions?

Dr. McBRIDE. Well, probably—I am not sure about this and I can not give you an accurate statement—probably one-fourth.

Mr. THOMPSON. About one-fourth?

Dr. McBRIDE. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And the others, in your opinion, came out in sympathy with the fourth who were out?

Dr. McBRIDE. Yes. As I said, many of them came out in the beginning more in the spirit of a lark than anything else. Once they were out, however, they were unable to go back without being characterized as unfair and scabs, and they were positively in fear of injury to themselves and their families.

Mr. THOMPSON. I want to get at your idea a little more definitely for the commission as to this spirit of a lark that you speak about. Do you mean they were unpremeditated, thoughtlessly?

Dr. McBRIDE. Thoughtlessly; yes, indeed. The thing occurred—well, it had been agitated for some time, while the papers said at a certain day at certain plants the employees would cease work and come out. Nobody—that was the first time anything of that kind had occurred in Paterson, and they thought it would probably result in one or two mills, that there would not be any general strike, and lots of the employees came out laughing and singing and on a real lark.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, then, after these people—many of the people who came out on a real lark thoughtlessly and were out of work, then they stayed out purposely?

Dr. McBRIDE. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, what, in your opinion, were the causes which made them stay out purposely?

Dr. McBRIDE. I think they were largely influenced by the out-of-town agitators who came here and preached to them daily for all of the time the strike was in operation.

Mr. THOMPSON. What sort of influence, Doctor, would you feel that these out-of-town agitators had in order to keep approximately 18,000 or 20,000 people away from their work if they were satisfied with it?

Dr. McBRIDE. Well, of the 18,000 or 20,000 or more people who were out on strike—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Well, assuming there were 25,000, and three-quarters went out on a lark thoughtlessly, that would make about 18,000 or 20,000; now, of those 18,000 or 20,000 who went out thoughtlessly at first but who finally stayed out for many weeks, I would like to know what influence, in your opinion, the agitators would have in influencing 18,000 or 20,000 people to stay out of work for weeks, from work, the wages and conditions of which were satisfactory to the workers?

Dr. McBRIDE. The agitators preached if there was any break in the line that of course they would be treated worse than they were before the strike began, and those who were apparently satisfied with their conditions would be brought down to a level of those who were badly treated; and the vast majority of the strikers did not take any active part in the meetings of the strikers. They rather stayed at home waiting for some solution of the trouble, and the people who were at the head of the strike preached continuously that unless there was a solid front, if there was any break, why of course conditions would remain as they were and be made worse; that in place of improved conditions, conditions would be much worse and that they would be compelled to operate four looms generally throughout the entire industry here, and that the bosses would become more arrogant and conditions would become more intolerable, and finally they would be treated just as slaves. And on the other hand, if they kept a united front, that they must positively win, and they would win, and they assured them from week to week that in a little longer time everything would be as they desired it, that everything that they asked would be given them and that, in place of being employees that they would be the employers, as they created the wealth for the manufacturers and that eventually they would be in possession of the mills.

Mr. THOMPSON. These people stayed out quite a few months?

Dr. McBRIDE. Yes; some of them five, almost.

Mr. THOMPSON. And during that time have you any idea whether they suffered for lack of money and means of living?

Dr. McBRIDE. They did.

Mr. THOMPSON. Pretty severely or not?

Dr. McBRIDE. Yes, sir; many of them very severely, indeed.

Mr. THOMPSON. And these people had been working in the mills for some time before they went out on strike?

Dr. McBRIDE. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. They were acquainted with the employers?

Dr. McBRIDE. Largely, I believe.

Mr. THOMPSON. But in your opinion they preferred to take the word and the say-so of outside agitators who came in at that time, and so they stayed out?

Dr. McBRIDE. Why, many of them were absolutely influenced by the preaching of the outside agitators. They believed everything that was told them, and

they worshiped them really as heroes, and you could not talk with them. In my practice, which is composed almost entirely of working people, and I have been in practice 25 years and have treated many of them for years and years and was very intimate with them, but I could not talk with them. It got so I would not discuss it with any of my patients at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the attitude assumed by the city administration at the beginning of the strike?

Dr. McBRIDE. Why, the administration was concerned in the peace and order of the city entirely, and we bent every effort along that line.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did any organization, volunteer or otherwise, of citizens, assist the city administration during the progress of the strike, either in advising or otherwise?

Dr. McBRIDE. Why, yes. There were a number of committees, one appointed by myself, who endeavored to try and arrange the differences, but without success. I appointed a committee of 25 citizens, which did not include any manufacturer or any worker, composed of professional and business men, also clergymen, doctors, lawyers, and business men, all of them, who endeavored and had hearings in city hall and had both sides specify their differences or grievances, which was done, but there was no result possible.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did both sides come before this committee?

Dr. McBRIDE. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. How early in this strike was this committee appointed?

Dr. McBRIDE. I imagine about a month after the strike began.

Mr. THOMPSON. About the latter part of March?

Dr. McBRIDE. Yes. Other committees were appointed, too.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long did this committee meet during this time treating with both sides, if you know?

Dr. McBRIDE. Several weeks.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did they have many meetings?

Dr. McBRIDE. A number of them; yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did this committee have any particular name?

Dr. McBRIDE. Why, the citizens' committee.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was there any change in attitude by the city authorities during the course of the strike?

Dr. McBRIDE. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Toward the strikers or other people?

Dr. McBRIDE. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. What organization or what class of individuals were considered in the picking of this committee? I believe you said you did not pick any manufacturers or any strikers or workers.

Dr. McBRIDE. Why, former Gov. Griggs, former Attorney General, was chairman, former Attorney General of the United States; Mr. Deyoe; Mr. Wilson, superintendent of schools; Rev. Deav McNulty; Rev. Dr. Isaacs; Rev. Dr. Hamilton; Mr. Fanning, an architect; Mr. Lynch, a contractor; Mr. Bishop, who is retired, ran mines up in the upper part of the State; Mr. Conklin, a grocer; Mr. Cleveland, a hardware merchant. Those were among some of the names that I remember now. Mr. Beggs, who was a lawyer and surrogate of the county; former Judge Scott; Dr. Agnew; Dr. Johnson; and Dr. Todd were among some of the members. They were all professional and business men.

Mr. THOMPSON. What action did you take, or any other of the constituted authorities take, to assist this committee?

Dr. McBRIDE. Why, I met with the committee in the council chamber here on the night of their organization and outlined the desire of the city authorities that some peaceable solution be speedily obtained of the difficulty. I enumerated the harm that was being done to the thousands of people who were on strike, the suffering they were enduring, many of them, and the harm that was being done the name of the city, and in every way pointed out, in so far as I was able, the necessity for some amicable arrangement whereby the difficulties might be smoothed out. This committee subdivided into a number of smaller committees and held meetings in this building, where hearings were held, and both sides heard; but there did not appear to be a possibility at that time of getting either side to yield. Both sides were unruly, unyielding, and there was a lot of feeling existing on both sides, so that it was impossible to have any amicable arrangement settled upon.

Mr. THOMPSON. At any of these meetings, Doctor, who appeared for the strikers, if you recall any names?

Dr. McBRIDE. The names of the persons?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes. Who appeared to present the strikers' case before this committee of citizens?

Dr. McBRIDE. Deyoe was chairman of the arbitration committee. He will be a witness here. I could not recall.

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean on behalf of the workers, who appeared?

Dr. McBRIDE. Many of the workers themselves.

Mr. THOMPSON. You don't recall any special man?

Dr. McBRIDE. No; I do not.

Mr. THOMPSON. They did not send any leaders that you know of?

Dr. McBRIDE. No; I don't recall any that they sent.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Haywood did not appear?

Dr. McBRIDE. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did Mr. Lessig appear?

Dr. McBRIDE. I can't recall that he did. I do not recall that he did.

Mr. THOMPSON. You don't recall any particular individual appearing for the strikers before this committee?

Dr. McBRIDE. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. What orders, if any, did you give to the police or to special deputies with reference to the action they should take during the strike?

Dr. McBRIDE. There was a meeting. This is the contemplated action. There was a meeting that had been advertised for some time prior to the occurrence of the strike, and the night before the strike was to take place I visited the police station and conferred with the chief of police, and while there he called up the prosecutor, and had him come down at half past 11 at night, or 11 or thereabouts that night, and there had been a meeting in Turn Hall that night. This was before the strike began. And at that meeting some of the speakers, even before the strike started, began a tirade of abuse directed against the city authorities. Some of them were very bitter. Some of the attacks were very bitter. And after the prosecutor arrived we conferred, with the result that the police were directed by the chief to maintain law and order; there must not be any digression from the proper course by either the employee or the employer; that both sides must strictly adhere to the law. And that policy was continued as fairly and as impartially as it was possible during the entire course of the strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was the question of the coming in of outsiders taken up at all?

Dr. McBRIDE. By the—you mean the people who came in.

Mr. THOMPSON. The outsiders?

Dr. McBRIDE. Yes; it was taken up, and it was felt that as long as they obeyed the law they had a perfect right to come here, and they were considered in that light, and were treated as such just as long as they obeyed the law.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were any instructions given to interfere with them or prevent them coming to Paterson?

Dr. McBRIDE. Well, there was a feeling that Paterson was much better off without some of them. That was talked over, but no action was taken.

Mr. THOMPSON. That was general public feeling?

Dr. McBRIDE. Yes; and it was a feeling on the part of the city authorities largely that Paterson would be much better off without the outsiders, and we desired to see our own people, if possible, settle their own differences; and we believed they would be able to settle them much better and much quicker if left to themselves. The city authorities thought the people here could.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were special guards employed by any of the mills, or special deputies; and if so, what, if any, instructions were given them by the authorities, if any such were employed?

Dr. McBRIDE. The O'Brien detectives were employed by the Weidmann Silk Dyeing Co. There were no instructions given by the authorities at all. They were sworn in as deputies by the sheriff of the county.

Mr. THOMPSON. You had nothing to do with them?

Dr. McBRIDE. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Nor did the city?

Dr. McBRIDE. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. You simply know that as public knowledge?

Dr. McBRIDE. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. No instruction was given to the police at all in regard to them?

Dr. McBRIDE. Not that I know of; no, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And you gave none?

Dr. McBRIDE. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What, in your opinion is the cause of the industrial unrest, if any, that exists in the city of Paterson, or did exist at that time, or have you stated it before?

Dr. McBRIDE. I think that a number of the employees were underpaid and badly treated. I don't think there is any question about that. On the other hand, a large number were satisfied with their conditions; conditions were proper and right, their employers were fair and honorable men and treated them in that light. Others, on the contrary, were not fair and did not treat their help right. That created the feeling of unrest, and a great number of the weavers were concerned particularly about the four-loom system, for fear that a number of them would be put out of employment as a consequence of adopting the four-loom system; whether they were able to operate four looms or not, they felt that was one of the causes. And they felt also if they operated four looms they should be paid for the amount of work that they turned off, just as though they were operating one loom—if they operated four looms that they should be paid four times as much as if they operated one. That is another point that caused uneasiness and a feeling of unrest.

Chairman WALSH. In your experience, Doctor, is there any suggestion that you feel you could make relating to the providing of machinery to prevent such disturbances in the future, either by the voluntary cooperation of the employers and employees, or the interposition of the Government, city or National?

Dr. McBRIDE. One suggestion I have to make, and one I made to the young man who waited on me downstairs the third day of the strike, complaining about the action of the police: I asked these men to specify some instance where the police exceeded their authority or were unlawful, and they could not, they did not. They said, "Generally." I said that is too broad; if you will specify some case or a number of cases I will certainly have them investigated, and if the police did wrong we will certainly punish them. They could not. It was just a general statement that they were all doing wrong in everything they did. Well, we discussed the situation for a long time, probably for an hour and a half, and they finally did the thing that I wanted them to, although I would not offer my advice unless asked for. They asked me what I would advise in the matter. Well, I said, now that you have asked me for my advice, I will gladly give it to you. If I were you, gentlemen, I would advocate the formation of a union of your own or some sane organization of your own, and I would try to gather into that organization everybody engaged in the making of silk in the United States, and I would select from your ranks some of the brightest men and women you have to represent you, the level-headed people you have, the most intelligent you have, and I would pay them properly, and I would know just what was being done in the silk industry throughout the entire United States. I would try to make conditions equal all over, and I would not have the people in Paterson working eight hours a day and those in Pennsylvania 10 hours, or elsewhere; and I would not have them operating four looms in Paterson and only two somewhere else. I would have the conditions equal in so far as I could possibly do it.

Of course, that may seem impossible to you, gentlemen, but I think at least it is worthy of trial. They immediately began to tell me that they could not secure from their ranks anybody who was able to represent them; that is why they had the outside people to come in here and manage their affairs for them. I told them that either they thought I was a fool or that they were fools; that some of the brightest people in the world were employed in the silk mills in Paterson. That I know to be so. And able to represent anybody. And we finally could not get anywhere. They were just bent on one thing, whether right or wrong—to go ahead and follow the teachings of the men who were there then, and nothing could be done to change them from that course, from that feeling.

I believe that there ought to be equal conditions everywhere in the silk industry. I think an impartial investigation should be made to ascertain what is just and right as to hours of labor, the amount of labor to be performed, and the sanitary arrangements of the places where they work. And I think that ought to be uniform. I think it ought to exist not only in the State of New Jersey but in all States.

Chairman WALSH. That would imply, then, that there should be some national body or some machinery provided by the Government, would it?

Dr. McBRIDE. Yes; some national body; and if machinery would lighten the burden of the employee I would say yes, that should be done, too.

(Witness excused.)

TESTIMONY OF CAPT. ANDREW J. McBRIDE.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will you please state your name and address?

Capt. McBRIDE. Andrew J. McBride; 35 Jackson Street.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are captain of police?

Capt. McBRIDE. Captain of police in this city.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been captain of police?

Capt. McBRIDE. I was appointed a year ago in November.

Mr. THOMPSON. A year ago in November?

Capt. McBRIDE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And you were captain of police all during the strike of last year?

Capt. McBRIDE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Captain, what was the size and character of the police force of Paterson prior to the strike?

Capt. McBRIDE. We had 149 members.

Chairman WALSH. How many, Captain?

Capt. McBRIDE. One hundred and forty-nine members in the department.

Mr. THOMPSON. That included the entire force?

Capt. McBRIDE. Yes, sir. They consisted of chief, 1 captain of police, 1 captain of detectives, 1 lieutenant, 13 sergeants, 3 detective sergeants, 6 detectives, and 123 patrolmen.

Mr. THOMPSON. That included all the detective squad, didn't it?

Capt. McBRIDE. Number of members in the detective squad, nine and captain.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were there any additions made to the regular force during the strike?

Capt. McBRIDE. There were. Special police and deputy sheriffs.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are speaking now more particularly of the police force of the city? How many special police were sworn in during the strike?

Capt. McBRIDE. We had about 60 additions, both deputy sheriffs and special police.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many special police did you have, if you know?

Capt. McBRIDE. Thirty-five.

Mr. THOMPSON. That would make 25 extra special deputies?

Capt. McBRIDE. Provided for by the sheriff, and paid for by the county.

Mr. THOMPSON. Under what authority were those deputies sworn in? And by whom were they paid? I mean, the police?

Capt. McBRIDE. The special police were sworn in by the recorder. The deputy sheriffs were sworn in through the sheriff. The deputy sheriffs were paid by the county, and the special police by the city.

Mr. THOMPSON. Under whose orders did the deputies act during the strike?

Capt. McBRIDE. The chief of police.

Mr. THOMPSON. Had he the same authority over them that he had over the regular force?

Capt. McBRIDE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What instructions, if any, were issued by the mayor, or other responsible authorities, in reference to the action of the police and special deputies during the strike?

Capt. McBRIDE. Well, whatever the instructions were between the mayor and the chief of police, I don't know that because the chief is on his vacation now, and he is at the chiefs' convention to-day in Michigan.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were there any orders issued by the chief to the force directly as coming from the mayor?

Capt. McBRIDE. Why, he took all those new men in the recorder's court room in the evening, and instructed them in the school of instruction in police business, and made them understand that they were expected to do their duty, to protect life and property, and be very careful in getting evidence and making arrests, and be very sure they were right before they would act; that they themselves would be held individually responsible for their acts.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, with reference to the entire force, not considering for the moment the special men what, if any, instructions were issued by the chief to the force during the strike as coming from the mayor?

Capt. McBRIDE. Well, when occasions would arise to show necessity for instructions, he instructed them as occasion would require.

Mr. THOMPSON. You don't recall those instructions now?

Capt. McBRIDE. Why, there were various instructions. Where there would be great instructions and great complaints coming in from workers, that they

could not go along without being molested, people would come to the police headquarters and complain to myself. We would try and have a thing covered by the officers on the posts or by sending special details with them at various times. We divided the force up as best we could. Of course, it was small in number to cover the section required.

MR. THOMPSON. Under whose orders did the detective force act during the strike, and what special instructions were issued to them then?

Capt. McBRIDE. Chief Bimson, I don't know what instructions they gave, because that was between Capt. Tracy and himself.

MR. THOMPSON. Have you any explanation to make of the circumstances leading to the arrest of Haywood, Scott, and John Reed?

Capt. McBRIDE. Well, I could say in regard to Haywood, I had information on the Friday evening previous to the Sunday intended meeting that they had the oval hired, and they would hold a meeting there. I notified the chief in the morning when he came on duty, asked him to provide for it. It was given out in the hall, in Turn Hall, that they would have a meeting there. They were ordered to go. Lieut. Mosely was in charge in the station house on that Sunday afternoon—possibly I am going ahead of my story. A number of the representative people of the I. W. W. called on the chief and told him of their intention to hold a meeting. He said, "I will not permit a meeting on Sunday to be held in the open."

He said, "On what authority are you acting?"

"The law," he told them. He said, "You permit ball playing on Sunday." He says, "I recognize the board of aldermen as the governing body, and they have the power to make ordinances that provide to allow that." He says, "You allow the Holy Name to parade on Sunday." The chief said, "Yes; but I won't permit a circus to parade on Sunday."

They said in answer to that, "Well, we did not come here to make trouble, and we want to be agreeable, and we will send out scouts to-morrow morning and try to intercept those that would attempt to go to that meeting."

This visit to the police was after the papers had gone to press, and it was announced that the meeting was to be held. We couldn't call another meeting to notify them, and the chief told me, realizing that that was only an excuse to have the leaders gather, no matter what leaders—where the leaders go the crowd will follow. To prevent that he said: "I have counseled peace and quietness and no bloodshed in this strike, and I warn your leaders to get away from the oval to-morrow. I ask no assistance from you and don't want it. We will take care of the situation."

The result was the leaders went up there just the same; the crowd followed. Lieut. Mosely was in charge in the afternoon, and he sent Sergt. Fitzpatrick with two or three men up there to see that there would be no meeting held. The crowd gathered so large before the leaders came, and when the leaders assembled, why, particularly Mr. Haywood, and, I understand, Lessig was there, the sergeant told—oh, the sergeant thought that possibly he did not have sufficient force to cope with the situation correctly, and he phoned down for help to disperse the crowd when he chose to do so. The lieutenant sent up the wagon with Sergt. Ryan and about six or eight men, I think. But in the meantime he was able to disperse them, and the throng went on, and the sergeant, of course, was ordered to remain on the ground—Sergt. Fitzpatrick—to see that there would be no attempt at making a speech there; so, of course, he remained there, and told Sergt. Ryan that he better proceed with the wagon and squad and see what might turn out with that mob that went down in his direction, out of sight. As a result, Sergt. Ryan told me that when they got at Haledon Avenue the mob was marching in the streets, on the sidewalk, more or less disorder, the people couldn't pass orderly on the sidewalks coming in the opposite direction, and to stop the commotions of that kind, as the leaders had been warned not to go there, he decided, for the peace of the community on Sunday, he would take them in, which he did.

As you are possibly aware of the arrest of Haywood through the courts; I was not up there and did not keep in touch with it.

MR. THOMPSON. In regard to the arrest of John Reed, do you recall anything about that?

Capt. McBRIDE. John Reed?

MR. THOMPSON. Or of Alexander Scott?

Capt. McBRIDE. John Reed, arrested by Edward McCormick April 28, 7.22 in the morning; charge, being a disorderly person. That occurrence happened on Van Houten Street, opposite where all the large mills are. It is a thickly set-

tled population of Italians; all Italians in that neighborhood, practically, and they are very old-time, neat houses, according to the old architecture; there are some very old stoops, old-fashioned, and hold a number of people, and it had been the worst place that we had to contend with for disorder from the Edison Works down to Mill Street during the strike. They would gather in large numbers on the stoops, hiss, and insult, and at sometimes stone people; look around, you couldn't see. Of course, we didn't have so many police there; we had to distribute them around the different parts of the city.

Edward McCormick is a fine, decent, level-headed, careful policeman, and a great sympathizer as a labor man. He ordered them to get off that step. This man Reed, whom he never saw, to his knowledge, before, or knew, he seemed to become the spokesman of the crowd; he refused. He said, "If you don't get off and go about your business, I will arrest you." He says, "I came here for that purpose." Of course, he didn't know that he was from out of town at the time, and McCormick is a very determined fellow, perfectly fearless, but sympathetic, but he did his duty when required to do it; I can assure you of that. He took him to the box and had quite a scene, and sent him in; and, of course, all the New York newspapers were phoning all day about Reed's arrest. He was a newspaper man. We had more inquiries about him than about Haywood all through the strike. That was, I claim, a good deal of the cause of the New York papers making a burlesque out of the action of the police on every occasion—the arrest of John Reed. He was the promoter of that agent, I believe, down there in Madison Square Garden for the I. W. W., and was, from all I could learn, affiliated in every way with them—one of the indirect leaders, managers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Referring to the Alexander Scott case.

Capt. McBRIDE. Mr. Scott—I was about sending out the night forces, which were small at the time—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Captain, I guess we might desist now. You will be recalled at 2 o'clock.

The commission will now adjourn until 2 o'clock sharp.

(Whereupon, at 12.30 o'clock p. m., the commission adjourned, to meet again at 2 o'clock.)

AFTER RECESS—2 O'CLOCK P. M.

Chairman WALSH. Capt. McBride, please resume the stand. You were just referring to the Alexander Scott case when we adjourned.

Capt. McBRIDE. Scott was arrested by Sergt. Lord February 28 in the auditorium on Ellison Street, at a meeting held there by the labor people that night, and which Mr. Scott had addressed. He was arrested by Sergt. Lord on a warrant issued on the complaint of Chief Bimson, charging criminal libel. He was not arrested until after the meeting was finished. It was announced from the platform that he was arrested. The howling mob that followed threatening violence, kicking the detectives that surrounded Sergt. Lord, and firing missiles at them. The sergeant and squad were prevented from coming direct to the station house down Ellison Street, which was the nearest way. They had to take down Church Street as a subterfuge and up Van Houten to Washington; thence back up to the station. When they reached Ellison and Church the crowd became threatening and demonstrative and abusive. A number of them, when they seen them take down that direction, they shouted, "We will prevent them from locking him up by heading them off," and the mob divided. As it happened, luckily, as I was on night duty all the time during the strike—and that was my tour of duty in addition to the extra duty I did half of the day—I was about sending out the night squads, knew nothing of the arrest; did not know they had a warrant or were going to make the arrest. There was two sergeants in charge of the city, with two squads going out the alleyway out of the police station. Sergt. Ryan, with a squad, had just turned to go uptown. Sergt. College, with his squad, turned down Ellison, north, to go downtown. They met both mobs, and they seen and heard by their actions—there was no trouble to determine what was the trouble. They had to start right in and disperse them with violence, and even with all that, when they came into the station house, the station house became filled and thronged with people, denouncing the arrest by Sergt. Lord legally on a warrant in the open, did not disturb the meeting, did not do as he might have done, as Mr. Scott said he fooled the police in Passaic because he was going to speak there that night. As to that I don't know; but he did not take any mean advantage of them. They simply executed their authority at a nice time, without provoking any unnecessary

feeling. And it was one of the luckiest things during the strike, in my judgment and in the judgment of the people that were passing at the time—disinterested citizens—that those two squads of policemen were present and the detectives, who are trained and attached to the department for some time; that is, Sergts. Lord and Kepler and Connell. It was their judgment that it was a very fortunate thing for the detective department that the police were there, handy, without any previous arrangement; just was lucky. That is the arrest that he would have you understand was an outrage on justice.

And he spoke of Nat Love's arrest.

Chairman WALSH. Whose?

Capt. MCBRIDE. Officer Love's arrest. Officer Love was sent out from the station house, as was customary, about 5.30 or 5.35 or 5.40, to the corner of West Street and the river to escort some people who had been threatened and had complained to us, up to about North Seventh Street and Temple. He was ordered then to report, after making that escort, to Sergt. Coyle at the Bamford mill, which is located on Cliff Street near Belmont Avenue. When he arrived there he saw a large crowd on Belmont Avenue, directly opposite Cliff Street about, waiting to make a demonstration when the workers would come out that were working in that mill. There were some in that mill; some of the hands were on strike and some were not, but the effort of the organization was to get all hands out. They even went so far one time as to declare that everybody in the building, even the watchmen, must get out. They even threatened the watchmen with Black Hand letters, signed by the I. W. W., which was presented to me, for fear that the mill would be blowed up at the Brown Dye Works, and that if they did not leave—if he did not leave he would be killed in two days. Four days later, I believe, the mill was—shots fired into it for to intimidate—you couldn't make anything else out of it. There was the previous warning. It is pretty hard to keep a man in a mill alone when they are in an outlying district, without any people passing by and not very well lighted, and all those things are put up to the police; we can't ignore them. It was our duty to protect life and property, as the chief has continuously explained to the officers. People have a right to walk the streets peacefully without annoyance or insult.

When officer Love reported to Sergt. Coyle, the sergeant said, "We will have to disperse this mob now before there can possibly be any trouble." He asked them all to disperse. With some effort and difficulty they got them dispersed without any trouble, from going toward Haledon and part toward the city, toward Hamburg Avenue, which crosses Belmont. When the part of the crowd that was going toward Belmont Avenue arrived at that place the sergeant and the officer observed people running up Hamburg Avenue toward Union. He asked officer Love to go down there and see what might be the trouble. The officer, who was young and athletic, very cool fellow, he makes haste and gets down, and as he gets there he sees this throng turn up Union Avenue; he sees Officer Stapleton on the corner pulling the box to headquarters. He didn't know the nature of the trouble then. He gets up one block on Union Avenue to the corner of Marion Street; he sees those two men that he recognized, or some men that were going to their home on Totowa Avenue, and it was in Marion Street and this throng followed. Officer Love was in plain clothes, recollect, escorting people in the beginning. He warned the people that he was an officer and that they must not annoy or bother those people. They grappled with him at once and they throwed him. You heard it mentioned here that he pulled his stick and beat them. He was a fearless fellow, but he uses judgment and tact, and he did in that case.

I can prove that by two witnesses here, who were present on the car and seen the occurrence. They throwed him, and he didn't know where he was, but being athletic—oh, he didn't attempt to pull his club he said, because he know there were so many, and so violent with their actions in kicking and punching, and he had scars over his face from those punches; he grabs a number by the legs and throws them and gets down and backs up against the wall. He was then roughly handled again. One grabbed him by the throat, several punched him; one young fellow kicked him like toward his privates, but he just escaped that, as if he had he would probably have been down unconscious; he realized that if he could get his back against the wall he could use his fists, and that was all he did until it came so bad he pulled his gun and threatened them, and they still kept on; and this fellow that grabbed him by the throat he shot him in the leg, as he supposed, and the man that

made all this complaint—Veterinary Surgeon Cooper his name is—I have never met him, I have seen him on the platform several times at the Water Street meetings of the I. W. W., evenings, he was the one who made all that complaint.

This man who the officer believes he shot, because he seen traces of blood on the sidewalk afterwards, he never made any appearance about that assault, the man who got shot. The fellow who had him by the throat, he recognized him as Stapleton, came along pulling the box for help, and he had passed by Stapleton, but one fellow that he seen assaulted him, and he got him by the throat and there was two other fellows arrested. I think I have their names here: Frank Bruno was one who was locked up as a disorderly person by Sergt. Coyle, about 6.01 p. m. he was brought to the station house, charged as a disorderly person. He gave his residence as 233 Mulberry Street, New York. We had learned through the New York police that he was connected with that waiters' and barbers' strike which created such a demonstration for violence in New York at that time. Quite a strapping, husky fellow. I saw him in the cell.

Another was Pellegrino Pezzanni, of 153 North Fifth Street. He was charged by Officer Love with assault and battery. The recorder allowed him to go on his own bail. William Van Ent, of 284 North Ninth Street, was also charged with assault and battery by Love. He was committed to jail in default of bail. I don't know how long he stayed there. Most all of them got out in a short time.

The other was Cervino Grund, of 659 North Tenth Street, charged with assault and battery by Love. Also committed.

This Dr. Cooper, the veterinary surgeon, who was said to have no office that anybody knew of, and who drives a wagon for the Hessler Laundry Co., or did at that time—I haven't any record of what he has been doing since—that is the man who would have the public understand that this officer exceeded his authority. He was sent out by Lieut. Moseley on duty; he did his duty in the open, and there were not any witnesses present except those who were in the mob who never testify in behalf of policemen in troubles of that kind. And it has been my experience there to see them swearing to all kinds of things before the recorder, in cases that I have known myself that they were testifying untruths, knowingly, many cases.

In regard to that man that was shot down on Fifth Avenue, who worked in the file shop. They did not tell you there was a riot down there before that shooting took place. There was a saloon on the corner which was frequented, and at hundreds and at times thousands of people around there, particularly mornings and evenings. On that occasion there were a number of beer boxes on the stoop—there is a large stoop outside the saloon. Those beer boxes were filled with empty beer bottles. There were some of those O'Brien detectives, as they are called, or specials, going to guard houses, going to take a car at that corner to go to guard the houses that they were paid for, \$5 a night each, that a boss or a foreman that might be working in the shop would not be bothered, would not be worried to death for fear that his family would have the house blown up on him, house stoned in his absence. As I had numerous letters from people who were threatened, and personal complaints to the station house to provide protection for their families, we did the best we could, but our department could not go around. We were glad that the manufacturers were good enough to pay their money to help protect their plants, protect those people's houses and assist us.

We realize that the detectives were a despised body of men by the strikers during strike time. Even our own policemen despises them, because the presence of them are a source of danger. I have had to tell the officers time and again when I went into complaints with them that every person, according to law, is entitled to walk the street peaceably. Naturally, because those people are detectives or watchmen for the firm, or watching private houses, they must have the same right as others.

I tried as forcibly as I could to make our men understand that they had to protect them as well as others. And it should be more so, because they were sworn to protect life and property and keep the peace.

Mind you, I had a great deal of difficulty in making them understand that. It had to be individual cases that I had to cite to them, to show them where they were taking the shortest way to make the peace for the little trouble that was put up to them at that time.

Mind you, the police all sympathize with the laboring men and women in getting better conditions, but when it becomes that there is a war in the town they have to take the side of defending law and order and protecting life and property, positively, without any fear of consequences or what people may think about the situation, when they know they are right and the evidence is so plain, under all conditions, they must go to the front. And I want to say that they did that splendidly and honestly in this case in the last strike. They did splendid service. They were well encouraged, and what possibly made it so easy was the terrible effort made on the part of the strikers the first morning of the strike to make the success of the police work possible. They practically declared open war in Turn Hall the first morning by Quinlan having a resolution passed to leave that hall in a body and march through the streets to the different mills, that did not see fit to come out like those assembled, and drive them out. When that message came to Chief Bimson, and I was there, from Capt. Tracy, who was in the hall with the whole detective department, I said, "Chief, there never was a plainer declaration of war issued, and our late Chief Groehl has always said in addressing his men that it is the duty of the police to prevent trouble rather than wait until trouble gets too great." In other words, he cited instances of men patrolling at night, discovering a man attempting to enter or break in a place, that it is his duty to get the man for the lesser offense rather than to wait until he breaks in and robs the place and comes out and get him. His chances for reform is much easier and simpler and more possible by reason of the lesser charge, and it is our duty to prevent crime.

The chief, in answer to that telephone communication from Captain of Detectives Tracy, he proceeded with the department to Turn Hall with Lieut. Moseley. He ordered me to remain in the house in charge. I called his attention to the fact that Sergt. Rickert was there in charge, and there was practically nobody in the house but the door man, desk man, and sergeant, and the assistant in reserve, two empty wagons. I received a telephone message from Traffic Officer McGuirk, possibly half an hour after he left the hall, that two plain-clothes detectives which were assigned that morning, Parola and Lewin, which was sent from Turn Hall to follow the crowd that went south to Cross Street and afterwards got into Main Street, had formed a procession which the chief had went down to prevent at Turn Hall with the department.

It is the law in first and second class cities in this State that no processions can parade the street without a permit from the chief of police. It is his duty and his judgment to know whether it is lawful, or legal, or wise to have a parade. He never refuses anything that is asked and, of course, they don't usually ask anything unreasonable. In this case they did not ask.

The first morning of the strike, as I say, they declared war the first morning. They put the police on their mettle, and in my judgment that is the cause of the success of the police. They realize where they got off at, as the fellow says, first crack out of the box.

And while they were patient in many cases——

Oh, when I asked the desk officer to telephone that message from Traffic Officer McGuirk that the crowd had begun marching in an organized body up Main Street toward Lake View, toward Doherty's, and the rumor was that they were going to take Doherty's among the crowd, why, I knew that Doherty's was closed down for that day, and that was possibly a ruse to have us think they were not going to do anything in our city. And I realized that one, two, or five minutes might make a lot of trouble, because when they go to mills and surround them, and there are a few stones thrown, their hands become fearful—that is, they may get injured, and they don't want to be considered scabs in the mill—out like a lot of sheep, quick. So it was to get quick action to prevent an epidemic like that that I tried to get information to the chief promptly. The desk sergeant was unable to get Turn Hall. Tried on two occasions. I thought possibly it might be some prearranged plan of the strikers, through the telephone system, to delay five minutes for damage, and I tried it myself, and I got Turn Hall without any difficulty, and in order that they would not delay and say that they could not find the chief or some officer, I said, "Would you kindly step outside the door and ask any policeman to come to this 'phone? This is Capt. McBride wants to speak to them." Capt. Tracy happened to come to the phone quick. I told him of the report of Officer McGuirk, of the two of his men that he had sent after the crowd, and he thought that they had everything under control down there, but I said, "Captain, remember, you have them busy down there, but you don't know what is happening up above. Your men are calling for help, that they are powerless to control the

mob. Wait until I consult the chief. Let me send you down the wagons; delay is dangerous. Just wait until I consult the chief." He consulted the chief, and both wagons were sent down, and the chief, with Sergt. Draper, and, I think, Sergt. Fitzpatrick, with wagons loaded, both wagons loaded with men, went after the mob, and four mounted men who were mounted on horses were ordered ahead. They rushed up Main Street and they had gotten a half a mile distance before they came up with them. They had then stoned the Jansen & Pretzfeld mill, and some of them had passed by the superintendent and the two plain-clothes men, and entered the mill. The mob jeered the police, hooted at them, instead of desisting or breaking up. So much so that Sergt. Draper said to the chief, "Isn't it pretty near time to get busy?" and the chief ordered them to charge and disperse the crowd, and they dispersed them with some effort.

Of course, they ran when they could and used the baton on their backs.

They will tell you about it being a peaceful strike. To my mind, that was the plainest declaration of war that was ever written, that they would parade the street in violation of law, and throw the people out of the works, which they attempted to do, until they were prevented by two auto loads of police. I would say, too, that the facilities that we had with automobiles was more than helpful to us. Had it not been for them we could not have gotten along. We could never have made the time. Between the telephone and the automobiles and the willingness of the men to work, is what made the thing successful.

They were quite good and peaceful after that for a couple of weeks, and as I always claim they showed their hand what they intended to do to drive them out to walk the streets the first morning. Now we have had strikes before and I have been 28½ years in the police business in this city, and I have never seen any such tactics used in any strike. They went out in a businesslike way with just demands and tried peaceful means and influential means, and occasionally when agitators did come in—they once did catch us when we hadn't any reserve in the station house, didn't know there was going to be a meeting. That is some 10 or 12 years ago, possibly 15, but that learned us a lesson to keep on guard. They had the chief up on charges for not handling the situation correctly. The men for the first month had to work practically night and day and were worked out until the commission gave us 10 men off the civil-service list. That is, the chief requested those who had not good positions or were willing to serve, that they would be accepted first. So we had 10 of them. The rest were busily engaged at better employment, and there was no guarantee how long the job would last, and it was not a pleasant one. Then the commission empowered the chief to hire 25 other men, and he asked the different sergeants to suggest responsible people to him, which they did. He asked me as well and at the time I really couldn't give him the name of a man that was out of work that I could think of that I could recommend. But we got the number and they did fine work, those specials—they did fine, honest work and intelligent work.

Chairman WALSH. How many were there?

Capt. McBride. We had altogether 60 doing night duty and they assisted us in trying to keep mobs from assaulting the workers around the mills or avenues leading to the mills around about 7 o'clock in the morning; and then their services were dispensed with about 8 until the same evening at 8 o'clock when they would go on night duty patrolling the city to guard the houses. We had possibly during the strike 40 to 50 houses stoned belonging principally to bosses and people who worked, who had been threatened by letter or by persons in numbers that they did not know—mostly foreigners—that if they did not desist from work something would happen to their families. There were some of the houses stoned five times—the same houses. There were the two Searing girls lived on Main Street, around Clay. They were working, I think, in the Strange mill. They went to work every morning with the mob insulting them and shouting at them; never stopped during the strike, and their house was stoned five times. And stoning a house is one of the simplest things to do without being detected. An ordinary man can walk along with a few stones in his pocket as though he were on business, and in many cases the police have heard sounds and come back and there was no proof on the man who threw it. He was looking for the man who threw the stone. He heard the noise as well as the rest, so we couldn't prove it; couldn't prove that the stone in the house had been in his possession and that he pulled it out of his pocket and hurled it. That was all there was to it.

There were several bombs blown off at houses and mills. I notice particularly, being on the night tour all the time, that bombs were always discharged

at night; where we would have notice that a number were likely to break and wanted to go to work—they always started on Monday—and Sunday night there would be a bomb go off in that neighborhood to terrify those not to go to work, and it would have its effect. Some were willing, but there would be so many timid ones that would not. I told the chief of police in the midst of the strike that there ought to be 2,000 militia in Paterson. He says: "Why, we are able to handle the situation; have been able to cope with all the violations." I said, "Yes, but remember the tactics of the I. W. W. are different from the tactics of all other organizations in strikes, and it is up to us to meet the requirements and devise ways and means to protect life and property and to make it possible for any citizen to walk the streets without being in fear and terror in doing what he chooses in a lawful manner." Now, I said, "The presence of the militia on the different corners would give more hope to a person walking that he would have some protection, have somebody to shout to or look to in case of attack." The presence of the police, except in a terrible crowd and when there is only a small number of police, prevents crime—prevents trouble.

Then they talk of them halls being closed. The prosecutor had a stenographer by the name of Sidney Turner. It was found absolutely necessary to have a stenographer take notes of the meetings, because they would phrase the sentences differently by the omission or addition of one or two words so as to make the thing seem reasonable so that they could get away with it—something ridiculous in the line of language. The most horrifying language they could use and evade the law was used. Of course to the very intelligent man who thought that would not have any very great effect on them; but the ordinary foreigner who would hear a man saying: "I want you to have a thousand men down on that picket line in the morning—be there in such force, or the noon hour, that it will be impossible for those people to go into work; and if they attempt to go in don't let them in. Drive them away. If it is a distance where they are on cars get on the car and stop the car before getting there, and, if necessary, run the car." And then they would say, "And when you go on that picket line"—it is not one of the agitators that would say that, but all of them at different times; they did not say it at every meeting, but to spur them up occasionally when they were quieting down, two or three meetings a week, or maybe two or maybe one grand rally in the week—"when you go on that picket line be sure and have your gun. Never go without your gun." That would be the way that it would be impressed. "And when you get there don't forget to use your gun." And the poor foreigners would all look around to see the police and see how they would stand for such things; and then the speaker would pull out the due book and refer to that as the gun, but would repeat it in a low voice, that that was the gun referred to, but he would not make that too plain so that too many people would understand it in the right sense. All those things had a demoralizing influence on the people and destroyed their respect for the law; and instead of educating those poor earnest and honest foreigners they were demoralizing them and making the American citizen look on them with disrespect.

Now, then, they started the strike. The previous week it was decided that the strike should start at 7 o'clock, I think, Tuesday morning, February 25. The orders were in the papers issued from the meeting. "You will all go to work in your mills at 7 o'clock and at 8 leave the mill and proceed in a body to your headquarters, Turn Hall." Now, it has been our experience from the first day with the complaints and it would seem like the purpose of that order was to give them the legal right to leave the mills in a large body the same as they would leave a circus in a large body or a church in a large body; and then they would not have the police to keep them from serenading the mill and keep it from being stoned, and which they did. In one morning we had several telephone complaints of their serenading the mills, and in only two cases in all the mills south of Market, by which I mean from Lincoln Bridge to Cedar Long Bridge, all south of there the records of our men show that there were 44 men—44 people—that came out from work the first day of the strike. To my mind it did not show that they wanted to strike. It showed that the leaders came here and declared a strike and adopted tactics to get them out by this sort of methods and by serenading and hollering and throwing stones to intimidate the workers. As quick as two or three leave the rest will all leave, because they don't want to be considered scabs by staying. We have been warned by people working in the mill that if we stayed around there they would leave work; that they did not want to work in a mill which was

considered a scab mill by the police being around it, and if you were not around it they would drive them out.

That Turn Hall affair was with that stenographer from the prosecutor's office being present had to be guarded by our detectives. He was threatened personally on the street, I think, on the 20th day of May and told—he had led them to believe when they questioned him that he was representing a newspaper; but some of them learned differently, and he was threatened that if he would go in the hall he would be thrown out. They gave him to understand that it would not be very wise for him to come in the hall and the way he would be handled. We were notified, of course, what to look out for; and they went down to the mill, as had been their custom, and when they got down there they were notified by Mr. Koettgen—I think he was chairman of the strikers; president or chairman—that that man must leave the hall. He was in the rear of the hall sitting on a radiator and the detectives around him; and he was told by the detectives that that man would not leave the hall; that it was an open meeting and a public meeting, and there was nothing there of a secret nature that the public did not have to know; and he was there because it was necessary to have the stenographer to get the correct notes, because our own detectives varied at times as to the exact language, as well as the citizens, and of course the strikers would be entirely the opposite. So that the presence of a stenographer was necessary, particularly when you are dealing with people who are quite masterful in the use of language to evade the law and which would carry out the purpose of incendiarism just the same. He was also told by the secretary, who I believe is present in the room now, that he would have to leave or it would not be safe for him. The owner of the building, or the party that kept the place there, told them that they would have to leave; he was afraid of the safety of his building. He was told plainly that that man would not leave, and that the detectives and he would be the last people to leave that hall.

Koettgen went up and spoke to the chairman that was addressing the meeting—Lotta was his name—that this man was in the hall, and immediately he addressed the audience, to the number of about 3,000, in Italian. We had some Italian detectives there who understood the language, and he said, "The spy is in the rear of the hall." The 3,000 turned like tigers, and they made a demonstration toward the detectives and the stenographer. They had made their demand and it had been refused, and they had been told that they would be the last to leave the hall. They then drew their revolvers, and the proprietor of the hall, who is a very intelligent and a forceful character and an influential man among the Italians—he tried the hardest he could then the opposite way to keep peace. Detective Elvin was sent then to telephone the chief of police at headquarters by Detective Close. The chief thought that the presence of a large body at that moment might provoke a riot, but he ordered them to stand their ground. And I want to say to you that they had a trying position, as trying as any man was in, with an excited mob with an elegant, forceful leader in front of them. Lotta was a forceful leader and recognized as such here. And they stayed at the meeting and left, just as they had said, when all hands were out. They were followed by the band after that and hooted and yelled at, and they serenaded them at the police station.

There were some of the police around the station in the morning to see how things were going on, and they saw the demonstration and the insults heaped on them. And if one of them turned around all hands looked up as though they were looking for stars in the heavens, but as quick as they turned around and walked it was the same thing again. Of course, there were no stones there to use. I don't know whether they would have used them or not, but in the judgment of the detectives it only required a leader to have made a bloody scene in that hall that morning, for those men would not have left had it cost life. They were there to stand to the last, as they had said, legally and under the law and in broad daylight. This was about the 20th of May, I think. The commissioners, seeing that they could get away with so much legally by reason of sympathy for working people, and all that, said they were not going to subject their detectives to such chances of making a riot, and those halls would be closed. I understand that they advised the chief to close the halls, and the halls were closed.

They took the matter up later, had an investigation before the courts in regard to the question of closing them, and the thing stood—the hall stood closed.

That afternoon they held their meeting in Haledon, where they are pretty near all Socialists, or those who are not are so few that they have very little to say; that they can not say a thing—useless. They went up there and, as Mr. Scott would have you believe, everybody in Haledon was peaceful; there never was no trouble in Haledon. They have got one little policeman there who they call a policeman. He says there was no trouble, but he didn't tell me that. He was continually handicapped; he could do nothing; they were all against him; and he was only one man; and whenever deputies were appointed they were all Socialists and attempted to lock up our detectives for being in that borough.

On that afternoon the halls were closed they went up to that meeting. There were supposed to be 15,000, because the closing of the halls made quite a noise around; created quite a lot of hatred and ill feeling among the workers; and they went up there, I suppose, in great numbers to see what was likely to be the outcome of the next move.

The detectives were ordered out of there by the councilmen, and the councilmen ordered them to lock up Sergt. Lloyd for carrying a revolver. The sergeant said, "I have always carried that, as my rules call for, and I will always carry it as long as I am a policeman." He went to the mayor, and the mayor told all the detectives that he would not guarantee the safety for their lives there 10 minutes. There were stones thrown—a very large number of crowds to start a riot, apparently purposely there, because the meetings were held on the public street and adjoining vacant land there. Nothing private about it. Anybody could walk there. You couldn't see why the policemen for Paterson, who have rights and powers to make arrests throughout the United States when he has a warrant properly certified, had not the right to be there as well as any place else, and their purpose in going there was to guard the stenographer. They were going there to guard the rights of the people in regard to any business that was going on in our city, which it was necessary we should keep in touch with.

The chief was communicated with and he ordered them home. They evidently took the rights of a person being there. Our chief—our old chief—on many occasions has told us that a prostitute has a perfect right to walk the streets so long as they behave themselves; so has a burglar.

I didn't see why a policeman had not the right to protect a stenographer to take the minutes of the meeting. If the mayor of Paterson had ordered them out, it would have been in the papers of Italy to-morrow morning and all over the United States; that I feel quite certain about.

Now, in regard to that riot down there, where this man from the file works was killed, or shot in the back, in a little store at 132 Fifth Avenue, about 500 feet from the corner of River Street, where the cars run, and where the mobs assembled in front of that saloon with a stoop on it. There were some private detectives of O'Brien's going to that car between 5 and 6 o'clock, as was their custom every night, Sunday included. When they reached the corner the car had not quite come. The crowd became so demonstrative and abusive and fired some missiles they thought it wiser to go back to the Weidmann plant, their headquarters, which was about 1,000 feet down the street. They went back. The crowd had gathered, so a couple detectives gathered, and somebody telephoned for the wagon and Sergt. Alsott came down with about 10 reserves and cleaned the sidewalks—apparently, the streets. A half hour later those people from the works that were to go to watch those houses were late. They thought everything was quiet, or seemingly so, but you could never tell when it was quiet in that section, because they are all foreigners who live there—all Italians, and some Polish down around the other end, and some Hungarians and some Belgians. While they came back with one of the O'Brien men—I think the officer in charge was called Dowd, a fine, clever, cool fellow. Sergt. Fitzpatrick, who knew him, said he is a very decent fellow, an ex-policeman in Newark, who was dismissed from the service for drink, but otherwise was a fine officer, cool fellow, charitable, and careful.

Those crowds were afraid to go back to their work and, of course, it was his duty to try and allay their fears. He said, "Boys, we will go up there and the chances are there will be no trouble, and to show you there won't I will go with you in such numbers as will be safe, get you on a car, and the car would fly along and they would be reasonably safe."

They got them on the car, but he told them going out, he said, "Now, don't be afraid. I will be in the front, and if there is anybody gets any trouble, I will be the one to get it first, and when we put our two or three people on the

car, I will give you the command 'about face,' and I will be in the rear, and if there is anybody to be hit, I will be the first to be hit, so don't be alarmed." And he said, "Above all things, don't use a gun." That I know myself from personal experience, is the particular order with those men, never to use their gun, because guns make serious trouble. You can do a lot with sticks, but as quick as you drop people in the street, that is awful work. And, of course, they have to stand their ground and carry out their work, but they try to do it with as least force as possible. The successful use of the stick is what does the work.

He gave them the command, "About face," and had proceeded down a short ways past this saloon, when these bottles began to fly from this—empty bottles from the stoop. He looks around and sees them being fired. He follows one man that he seen. And he ordered them to charge the crowd. They were also seen, to show you that it looked like a concerted effort on their part to attack, there were two boys in there seen with two hats full of stones that the men could use them; that is, they grasped the stones and sling them into the crowd, in addition to the bottles they were firing.

After the charge and the bottles were all thrown and the stones fired there was some guns fired, some shots fired, several shots fired, and from the information the detectives could learn, this Dowd, being the head of the squad, in command, and another man who was pointed out to one of the detectives as one who was seen firing the gun, was arrested, and they were held, and there was two Italian detectives present, by the name of Parola and De Lucci. De Lucci told me, on questioning him, that—I wanted to know why he did not get somebody. Why, he made an effort to try to keep people from stoning and doing damage. He was using peaceful means, instead of using the means he should have used on such an occasion to make an arrest.

Of course, they were young in the business, and being of their own kind, they knew more of them than Americans, and possibly they have several reasons that we don't know about. Sometimes you know so much it may deter you in your work a bit. In other words, if you don't know the danger you are in, sometimes you will take a chance and get away successfully. And they, possibly, realized the danger more fully than an American person would have done, and acted differently.

But this Parola told me he knew 50 in the crowd. Well, I said, then, "You go before the recorder and make out 50 John Doe warrants, and we will place them in the hands of the sergeant and squad in the Riverside section, and from time to time, as they appear on the picket line, we will get those people," as we had done in other cases before, of assault, and which was very successful. The great success in running down crime is to get the fellow afterwards and show him he can be got. "Well," he said, "De Lucci knows a hundred; he is much more acquainted in that section than I am." I reported the matter to the chief, with the suggestion that there should be 150 John Doe warrants up there. I never heard anything more about the John Doe warrants. I never asked the chief anything further about it.

But they don't tell you about the men being killed—they don't tell you that there was a riot. They don't tell you that these people were paid high prices to go and watch a man's house, that his family would not go into hysterics because he might have his head cut off in the work, as I have had cases reported to me by wives and daughters. In one case, 22 Polacks and Hungarians came filing in a house. "If you don't have your husband out of work by 12 o'clock we will cut his throat in the works." Why, the women would be half crazy. You can not imagine the state of their minds. We learned of cases—we learned of people that did that, traced them. And we came to the conclusion that the best method of dealing with that case, they had so much sympathy in the courts with grand jurors and petit jurors, they will tell you here that the police have the look-in with all those things, but I can tell you differently. I can tell you that the petit jurors came and told me on different occasions they were afraid to do their sworn duty by reason of consequences, by reason of effect to their business, and there is no doubt about it that they have a whole lot of reasons. But, of course, they were not really game as good citizens. That is the only way you can make people civilized, is to learn them that they must respect the law, and bring out things as the law calls for. Wait patiently. Grand jurors have told me that, and petit jurors, too. In asking me to protect their homes. They have had threatening letters, and their friends have told them of gatherings that have spoken about them and threatened them.

I have known men that sent their wives and children out of town who could afford it, and stayed in the houses alone. "I don't want any panic in my home if it is bombarded, or any scene if there is any window breaking, and I want to be alone. When they wreck my house I will have nobody to look out for but myself, and between the telephone and the police I will take a chance," because our automobiles can get to any part of the city in five minutes, and they can't do a great deal of damage in that time. They can make a start, and we can make a finish, and they knew it. They learned that the first morning of the strike, and they never forgot it, and I never forgot to tell them. I told them plainly in the cells. I appealed to several who appeared to be intelligent, and tried to tell them, if they wanted to be respected in this community, they must try to do as Americans usually do. I said, "I am a foreigner as well as you are. I came from Ireland."

And I said, "40 years ago the Irish were despised as much as the Italian is to-day, and more, to my own knowledge, and had bad treatment by reason of such." And I had to appeal to our people many a time after becoming a policeman. I had possibly a little insight into police work by reason of my father being a sergeant of police for 39 years previous to me, which enabled me to be in communication with people talking police matters, or criticizing the police, and on account of my father being a policeman I would be possibly a little more interested. I noted the view being expressed. I knew how to handle our people. I went among them, and I told them, "If you want to be respected as citizens, you must, if your neighborhood is in trouble, and you see something grievously happening, state what you seen."

They don't like to be "informers." I said, "If something happens to your father or mother or daughter, if the other fellow who sees it won't testify, how is justice going to be meted out in high crimes?"

I pictured it; took it home. I said, "You are not an informer." "Don't look on police work in this country the same as in the old country, where it is their duty to put them out of their homes, and that sort of thing. They are here simply to prevent crime, look after the criminal end of it. We haven't anything to do with civil business whatever." That is the way the foreigners here should be educated, poor Italians and Polacks and Hungarians. I find them a fine, honest lot of willing people to work, very industrious, but they are misled by those agitators who are very able and resourceful; carried away by misleading statements, things that seem not what they are.

I could possibly go on and keep your time for a week.

Chairman WALSH. I have no doubt, but have you covered the things now that you think are salient facts in connection with these various matters?

Capt. McBRIDE. Another fact that just occurs to my mind. I read a letter shown me by the head detective of the Erie Railroad, signed by the I. W. W., and a black hand on it, stating: "If you don't discontinue the service of the train to Weldmann's Dye Works at 6.15 in the morning, which conveys scabs there, serious injury will happen to your trains which will probably involve the company in millions of dollars of loss." I read that letter and turned it over to Capt. Tracy of the detective bureau.

Mr. THOMPSON. In addition to these special officers that you say were put on, how many of those O'Brien detectives were there in the city at any one time? Could you approximate it?

Capt. McBRIDE. Well, I should imagine it would be possibly at least 100 in the city.

Chairman WALSH. Were they all sworn in by the sheriff?

Capt. McBRIDE. I understood they were.

Chairman WALSH. Were there any private officers of any kind or officers of any kind that were not sworn in that you know of?

Capt. McBRIDE. Not that I know of.

Chairman WALSH. Were there any detectives that you discovered that were working in the mills or among the men that were put in there without—

Capt. McBRIDE. Except you would call these O'Brien men detectives.

Chairman WALSH. Well, they were known detectives?

Capt. McBRIDE. They were known.

Chairman WALSH. Well, did you have any among the men pretending that they were strikers, or pretending that they were sympathizers, that you know of—Secret Service men?

Capt. McBRIDE. Yes; they did.

Chairman WALSH. And you heard that some of those also had been put in the mills, did you?

Capt. McBRIDE. No, sir; simply for getting information as regarding bomb trouble or blowing up houses.

Chairman WALSH. Where were they from, that class of Secret Service men?

Capt. McBRIDE. Why, I don't know just where they would come from, but I know the headquarters was in Newark.

Chairman WALSH. Who?

Capt. McBRIDE. Mr. O'Brien.

Chairman WALSH. O'Brien furnished those men to do it?

Capt. McBRIDE. Well, the man who furnished me with the information at different times was his, O'Brien's, head man in the city, Mr. Manning.

Chairman WALSH. Was there any other detective agency except the O'Brien agency that had workers here during the trouble?

Capt. McBRIDE. There may have been a few, but very few. There was others tried to get in, but I don't think the others succeeded.

Chairman WALSH. Well, did the detective agencies, or did the agencies try to get the business, try to bid into the business, as it were?

Capt. McBRIDE. Why, I think I have seen them around; yes.

Chairman WALSH. Trying to get employment from the mill owners?

Capt. McBRIDE. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Did you hear of any circumstances such as detectives representing any detective agencies being in the mills before the strike came, as Secret Service men before the strike was called?

Capt. McBRIDE. Learning about the strike, you mean?

Chairman WALSH. Yes; learning about the strike, and pretending to be workers themselves, and so on.

Capt. McBRIDE. Why, the nearest I came to that would be, I have heard of men being employed there to determine whether or not a foreman was competent, or was partial to certain classes, or something of that kind. A machinist could go into a machine shop, or a dyer to a dye shop, and they could furnish any machinist or anybody, after three months' learning, they could tell whether it was deficient for the firm.

Chairman WALSH. It has been stated to the commission by somebody, as I understand from a mill owner, that he suspected that there were men of that character; that is, from certain detective agencies that had gotten in this particular mill, at least, and were fomenting strike and discord, helping out the proposition of calling a strike, so that the company might have men employed. Have you heard anything of that sort?

Capt. McBRIDE. No.

Chairman WALSH. This came to us as a mere rumor, but a rather definite rumor.

Capt. McBRIDE. I did not. Captain of Detectives Tracy may have.

Chairman WALSH. Will you ask him if he has anything of that kind, or any information that will lead up to it?

Capt. McBRIDE. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Mr. Thompson has a list of one or two questions.

Capt. McBRIDE. I was going to say in regard to that railroad letter—

Chairman WALSH. Yes.

Capt. McBRIDE. About four days later, the Chicago express was derailed about 8.30. Came pretty near being a serious wreck. And there was a large truck pole and whiffletrees chained to the track, and bowlders placed on the track down near the Weidman section four days after I read that letter, and had instructed our men on the line of the railroad to be very careful and watchful. And they said they had their detectives covering the territory. But, of course, the letter was so vague that you could not tell where they would strike, and you could not tell but it might be, as the fellow said, "a bunco game." They do a lot of bluffing, too, you know.

But the train was derailed. Possibly it ran several hundred feet down the track before they got it stopped. It tore up the ties and rails, but no other damage resulted at that time.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was Haywood arrested during the course of the strike? He wasn't, was he?

Capt. McBRIDE. Arrested during what?

Mr. THOMPSON. The course of the strike?

Capt. McBRIDE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was he arrested more than once?

Capt. McBRIDE. Once to my knowledge.

Mr. THOMPSON. At what place was he arrested, if you remember?

Capt. McBRIDE. He was arrested at Haledon Avenue.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is that the only place?

Capt. McBRIDE. Coming from the—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Is that the only place?

Capt. McBRIDE. The only time I know of. I have that record here, the date, if you wish it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were any other people coming from the outside arrested? Any other people connected with the strike on the part of the strikers?

Capt. McBRIDE. At that time?

Mr. THOMPSON. Or at any time during the strike?

Capt. McBRIDE. Coming from the outside?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. For instance, were any persons arrested as they got off trains before they had given any expression at all?

Capt. McBRIDE. No.

Chairman WALSH. Was Mr. Haywood arrested at any time at the station?

Capt. McBRIDE. Oh, Mr. Haywood was arrested in Passaic once.

Chairman WALSH. Where?

Capt. McBRIDE. In Passaic, on a warrant, and taken by automobile or trolley, I don't remember which, to the county jail. I think by automobile.

Chairman WALSH. Was it an officer from Paterson that arrested him?

Capt. McBRIDE. I think so, with the assistance of the officer in Passaic.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you know what the warrant was? What the charge was?

Capt. McBRIDE. I don't know—but I know that they expected to make a terrible demonstration at the train when he was arrested, and to avoid that demonstration they had him arrested in Passaic. The crowd was so disappointed they came down and serenaded us and started a racket down in front of the police station there, so our men had to go out and disperse them with the sticks.

Mr. THOMPSON. It was true, then, they had a warrant out for his arrest?

Capt. McBRIDE. Yes, sir; it was in the papers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you know what the charge was at that time?

Capt. McBRIDE. I don't recollect.

Mr. THOMPSON. You don't recollect?

Capt. McBRIDE. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. It was something that had occurred before that?

Capt. McBRIDE. Something that had occurred before that. Oh, yes; he was arrested on a warrant.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you know anything about the arrest of Rudolph Katz?

Capt. McBRIDE. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. That was not during this strike?

Capt. McBRIDE. During this strike?

Mr. THOMPSON. During this strike?

Capt. McBRIDE. No, sir; not during the last strike. Mr. Katz had nothing to do with the strike this time, as far as I know.

Mr. THOMPSON. You may tell us, as briefly as you can, Captain, about his arrest.

Capt. McBRIDE. I know that he testified here the other morning that he was arrested by an officer, by Sergt. Nolan, whom he said is now dead, as he alighted from the car on Clay Street. He said he was railroaded for six months without a trial, or without a formal charge. I am looking for the date. I find on our books, and I recollect the time, that he was arrested by William Taylor instead of Sergt. Nolan, and the complaint was made by William Taylor. He said he no sooner alighted off the car than he was grabbed. He shook hands with one man, as I understood his testimony, and was arrested. Officer Taylor saw him say to the crowds of people, "Don't go into work" after getting on the car. "Don't go into work; there is a strike there." The people complained to him they were working in the main, because in that Reinhart mill, and they were not on strike. Some of the firms were on strike and others were not. A lot of people did not want to be annoyed, but, of course, they wanted them all out. The third person that complained—Officer Taylor went and arrested him. I am just looking for that date. I have it here somewhere.

"Rudolph Katz, May 31, 1912, at 7 a. m. Arrested by Officer William Taylor, near the Reinhart mill, Clay Street, charged as a disorderly person." He was given six months in the county jail. He was tried before the recorder, and Officer Taylor told me that there was witnesses testified, and the trial

lasted nearly half an hour, and there was a great demonstration in front of the police station before and after the time. I will say, though, in justice to Mr. Katz, that in Mr. Katz strike, in my judgment, it was a very peaceful strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did he serve six months, Captain?

Capt. McBRIDE. No, sir; he did not; he did not serve half of the time. He preached peace all of the time. It was my duty as sergeant of police at that time to be assigned to the different halls when I was on nights, and Sergt. Coyle, who would be on the opposite shift, we took one night on as patrol sergeant.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did he serve over two months?

Capt. McBRIDE. I think he served nearly three months. But he preached peace and quietness and to keep away from the mills.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is all I have, Captain.

Chairman WALSH. That is all, thank you, Captain.

Call the next.

Capt. McBRIDE. Mr. Chairman, I have the number of arrests here that was arrested. The number is quite different from what I see given. The total number of arrests here is twenty-three hundred and something.

Chairman WALSH. It is just on one page, is it?

Capt. McBRIDE. On a separate slip by itself.

Chairman WALSH. Read it into the record.

Capt. McBRIDE. Arrests during the strike of 1913: February, 119; March, 281; April, 628; May, 591; June, 374; July, 245; total, 2,338.

Chairman WALSH. That just refers to disturbances growing out of the strike?

Capt. McBRIDE. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Thank you very much.

Mr. THOMPSON. I will call Mr. Deyoe.

(No response.)

Capt. McBRIDE. I would like to state, Mr. Katz's case is still pending; it is not finished yet.

Chairman WALSH. Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF MR. LOUIS MAGNET.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will you give us your name and address and your occupation?

Mr. MAGNET. Louis Magnet; 853 Market Street, Paterson, N. J. At the present time a silk ribbon weaver.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been a silk ribbon weaver here?

Mr. MAGNET. On and off for about 22 years.

Mr. THOMPSON. About 22 years?

Mr. MAGNET. I did not follow up the operation continuously.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you engaged in that occupation during the strike?

Mr. MAGNET. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Where did you work then?

Mr. MAGNET. Sweeney Co., silk-ribbon manufacturers.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you out on a strike?

Mr. MAGNET. I was.

Mr. THOMPSON. When did you go out and when did you return to work?

Mr. MAGNET. As near as my memory serves me, it was about the fourth or fifth day after the strike was first declared, and I remained out upward of five months or more.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the cause, as you look at it, for this strike? And what were the conditions under which the workers generally worked?

Mr. MAGNET. Well, in my opinion, Dr. McBride came as nearly stating the immediate cause of the strike as any other person who has thus far taken the stand.

You will remember he stated it was due to some of the manufacturers reducing the wages and demanding an increase in the production of the weavers and other workers in the silk mill, etc., and so on. That is a fact. Of course, the manufacturers themselves, from their own statements, they brought about a deplorable condition in the market, due to what many of them term cut-throat competition. And in order to realize profit, which is the main object in going into business, they would come back and reduce the wages of their employees, or they would demand an increased production which the weavers were

capable of getting, owing to the improvements in machinery. In respect to that matter, I think there are other persons who will testify here who are better acquainted with detail than what I am. However, I am aware of the fact that many of the manufacturers did take every opportunity that presented itself—and by opportunity I mean such as falling off in orders, a slight or great depression in the trade—would afford an opportunity which many of them were not slow to take advantage of.

Mr. Dunn, in his statement, said there was no apparent desire on the part of the workers to go on strike; for the most part they seemed satisfied. That is true. There was no apparent desire, and least of all was there any desire to go on strike; but there was a deep-seated grievance in the minds and the hearts of the strikers, produced or caused by the manner in which the employers had been treating them for the past four or five years previous to the strike.

Now, I want to say right here, in reply to what Mr. Dunn said—he further said they did not show any disposition to bring their grievances before the employers, and the reasons that I have given a moment ago and what I am going to say had more to do with the bringing about of a general strike in the city of Paterson, in conjunction with the action of the authorities in attempting to close up the halls in the very beginning of the strike, than any other thing or factor that entered into the strike. Conditions in most of the silk mills in the city of Paterson up to the time of the strike had become such that if a weaver—I am speaking of the weavers; I know more of their affairs than those of the winders or warpers, and so on. We asked the boss what are you paying for this job; if we did it it would amount to an offense to the boss, and if you were to ask, "Can you not pay a little more for this job?" it was almost equivalent to a discharge, so domineering did some of the employers—had they become—that the workers were afraid to go before the boss, almost afraid to state their grievances to one another, for fear that the employer would use that weapon that his economic position gives him in discharging them.

I want to say, in justice to the manufacturers of the city of Paterson, that among them there are a number who are fair and courteous and who treat their help in as considerate a manner as is consistent with their interests.

A great deal has been said about the foreign element in the city of Paterson, and among the manufacturers there are a large number who have entered into business during the past 10 or 15 years, and they naturally—we term them upstarts—were the worst to deal with. They were the most inconsiderate; they were the most domineering, despotic, and tyrannical of all manufacturers we had to deal with. It was this continual nagging at the employees, demanding more work, always taking advantage of an opportunity that presented itself to reduce the wages that filled the workers with so much indignation and hard feeling against employers, that there was a fruitful and fertile soil when the I. W. W. dropped its seed here into the city of Paterson which rapidly took root and spread. That was, in my opinion, the immediate cause of the rapid spread of the strike. No doubt the action of the city authorities in trying to suppress the constitutional right of free speech had a great deal to do with inciting into those law-abiding liberty-loving Americans who believed the constitutional rights of each and every citizen should be preserved under any and all circumstances, had its effect, and in a small degree only with the workers who were satisfied with conditions as they existed up to the time of the strike. In some of the mills, as I said, employers who were considerate and inclined to be more liberal and satisfied with less profits, why, in these mills the employees were satisfied. But there was a general desire among the workers of the city of Paterson for an improvement in their conditions; and that seemed to center on a shorter workday.

It seemed to me the weavers, or the workers, would have been satisfied to have sacrificed, or rather waived every other consideration could they have obtained a shorter workday at the time of the strike.

It is true there were no demands made upon the employers previous to the strike that I know of in the mills, but it was for the reason that I have stated. Had a committee—if it should have reached the ears of some employers that a committee was going to be formed or there was even talk of a committee being sent to the employers, they would be singled out and systematically discharged. In other mills some of the employers were only too glad to meet their employees, listen to their grievances, and tell them whether they could, yes or no, adjust those grievances, but in most cases it was the opposite. The workers were afraid to make known their grievances. In many of the mills

there were a small part of the workers who were satisfied, but they were what we term as favorites. For example, take 25 weavers, all equal in their ability to produce a given amount of work in a given time; out of that 25 there may be 10 or 12 who would be continually working in good and bad times, in busy and dull times. Now, naturally, those workers had no great grievance. When dull times would occur, many of the workers would be laid off, but some would invariably be employed continuously. Naturally, they had no grievances.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would the strike have occurred, in your opinion, if the workers in the different mills had been organized and had had committees who could have approached the employers in order to negotiate for things which they wanted, and in order to take up the grievances which the people might have had?

Mr. MAGNET. That is the deplorable condition in which we found the workers of the city of Paterson. Their apathy, their indifference, their disregard of their own interests is, in a great measure, responsible for the condition they found themselves in or did find themselves in up to the time of the strike. I think if the workers had been organized, the condition of things would have been quite different. I don't think we would have witnessed any such spectacle as the general strike that we had throughout the city of Paterson last year. The workers in the city of Paterson, and I presume for the most part it is so all over the country, seemed to concern themselves more about other things than they do about their own immediate material welfare. And if the workers—while I have the opportunity I want to say it—unless the workers of the city of Paterson are working to a realization that it is absolutely necessary for them to study their own interests as the employer studies his, we shall be visited periodically with such scenes and such affairs as the general strike in the city of Paterson last year. As I said, I repeat, had the workers been organized, I don't think there would have been a general strike in the city of Paterson.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALSH. Are you working now, Mr. Magnet?

Mr. MAGNET. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Whereabouts?

Mr. MAGNET. C. E. Miller Manufacturing Co.

Chairman WALSH. Have you been a member of any organization of mill employees?

Mr. MAGNET. In that shop or in any shop?

Chairman WALSH. In any shop? Did you ever belong to a union of your craft?

Mr. MAGNET. I have; I belonged to two or three.

Chairman WALSH. Are you a member of a union now?

Mr. MAGNET. I am not.

Chairman WALSH. Were you prior to the strike?

Mr. MAGNET. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. The Paterson strike?

Mr. MAGNET. No, sir; I had been out of the trade for a certain length of time up until four months previous to the strike.

Chairman WALSH. And you were a member of no organization³ at the time of the strike?

Mr. MAGNET. No, sir.

Chairman WALSH. What mill were you in at the time of the strike?

Mr. MAGNET. I worked for the Sweeney Silk Ribbon Manufacturing Co.

Chairman WALSH. Did you go out when the rest of the men went out?

Mr. MAGNET. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Did you remain out while it was on?

Mr. MAGNET. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Did you take part in the strike itself, in the way of making speeches or things of that sort?

Mr. MAGNET. I did.

Chairman WALSH. In a general way?

Mr. MAGNET. In a general way.

Chairman WALSH. And catered to the solidarity of the workers in the strike?

Mr. MAGNET. I did.

Chairman WALSH. Did you meet with any of the conference committees that have been spoken of here, the citizens' committee appointed by the mayor or any of those?

Mr. MAGNET. I met with two committees that I recollect. One was the aldermanic committee, and I think one was a citizens' committee. I am not quite sure.

Chairman WALSH. So that it may be fairly said that you were on the side of the workers in the struggle while it was going on?

Mr. MAGNET. Yes, sir. I championed their cause. I thought it was a just cause. I addressed public meetings for about two months or more.

Chairman WALSH. What, if any, plan would you have, from the standpoint of the worker to-day, to prevent the recurrence of such conditions as you had here in Paterson?

Mr. MAGNET. Well, of course, fundamentally we must first discover the causes of these conflicts between capital and labor.

Chairman WALSH. On this particular proposition you have a pronounced opinion as to the cause, and have stated it?

Mr. MAGNET. I gave the immediate cause of the last strike.

Chairman WALSH. The immediate cause?

Mr. MAGNET. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Do you think there has to be some change in fundamentals?

Mr. MAGNET. I am positively convinced of that.

Chairman WALSH. Briefly, in what respect?

Mr. MAGNET. Well, it would seem that the cause of all strikes, or nearly all strikes, is a conflict of material interests between the worker and the employer.

Chairman WALSH. Express it broadly, in what way, please? One side or the other trying to get—

Mr. MAGNET. In that both sides are always striving for a larger share of the work that the working class produced.

Chairman WALSH. What change, then, in fundamentals, in your opinion, would there have to be before the matter could hope to be adjusted?

Mr. MAGNET. Well, we would have to remove the cause. Since, as I have said, the fundamental cause is a desire of both parties to obtain a larger and larger share of the sum total of the wealth produced, we must make it so or have a condition of affairs where the wealth producer shall receive the full product of his labor.

Chairman WALSH. And that you think, then, would require a fundamental change in the present system?

Mr. MAGNET. Undoubtedly.

Chairman WALSH. Short of that, is it your idea that anything can be done?

Mr. MAGNET. Oh, yes; I think a great deal can be done.

Chairman WALSH. What?

Mr. MAGNET. While we are going through that transitory period.

Chairman WALSH. What would you say might be done to better conditions and prevent a recurrence of trouble like that which transpired here in Paterson?

Mr. MAGNET. As I have said, I think the workers must awaken to a realization of the fact that they must study their own interests, and then when a difficulty shall arise between them and their employers they can discuss and argue the matter in hand in an intelligent manner. And if, for instance, due to the law of competition, a reduction in wages is necessary—and oftentimes I believe it is—the manufacturer or the employer producing the facts to prove his statements, there is only one thing for the worker to do, and that is submit to the reduction, and then he is taught all the more forcibly the hopelessness of his condition under the present system or order of things.

Chairman WALSH. And then, on the other hand, when it is believed by the worker that the wage is too low—

Mr. MAGNET. Then he will endeavor as best he can and circumstances will permit to convince his employer that he should raise his wages.

Chairman WALSH. Can he do it individually, do you think?

Mr. MAGNET. Oh, no; I don't look for an individual regeneration.

Chairman WALSH. He would have to have, then, in your opinion, some sort of an organization?

Mr. MAGNET. Undoubtedly. As I said before, I consider that the workers have neglected their interests considerably by not forming an organization, and by having an organization when differences arise that they could go before their employer, state their grievances, argue them, and come to a peaceful and, under the circumstances, a satisfactory settlement of the difficulty.

Chairman WALSH. In the meantime, if you can state it briefly, because we are being a little crowded for time now, and you have said what you had to say very concisely, what would be your means of bringing about this fundamental change which you claim to be necessary before justice can be established?

Mr. MAGNET. Well, as I said, a great deal could be done while we are marching in that direction.

Chairman WALSH. I mean to reach the ultimate goal?

Mr. MAGNET. Well, I would suggest, as the first step, as a palliative to the present—

Chairman WALSH. Now, I am afraid you did not understand me. You say there must be a fundamental change in our system. How do you propose to develop a system to bring about that change?

Mr. MAGNET. Oh, through the ballot.

Chairman WALSH. Through the ballot?

Mr. MAGNET. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. That is all, thank you.

Mr. MAGNET. I would like to add, with your permission—

Chairman WALSH. Certainly.

Mr. MAGNET. As a remedy, as a palliative for the present condition of affairs, that the enactment of a Federal eight-hour law, applicable to every man, woman, and child throughout the country, would be one of the most effective means to relieve the congested labor market and generally to relieve the condition of the workers throughout the country.

TESTIMONY OF REV. DR. ANTHONY H. STEIN.

Mr. THOMPSON. Please give us your name and address.

Dr. STEIN. Anthony H. Stein; 440 River Street, Paterson, N. J. I am rector of Our Lady of Lourdes, Roman Catholic Church.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you in Paterson at the time of the strike a year ago?

Dr. STEIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Officiating then as rector?

Dr. STEIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. At that time did you take an interest in the strike?

Dr. STEIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And did you form a committee of clergymen to see what could be done about the strike?

Dr. STEIN. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. You might tell us, if you please, how that committee was formed, and when, and who constituted the committee.

Dr. STEIN. The committee was formed in this way: The situation in the city became very chaotic, and the clergymen of the city felt that perhaps they might use some moral influence in obtaining a conference between the manufacturers and the workers; and so several clergymen, including Dr. Hamilton, of St. Paul's, and Dr. Snodgrass, of the Methodist Church, here on Market Street—we called upon all the clergy of the city to meet at the Y. M. C. A. headquarters, and we there discussed the general conditions of the city and concluded, after much talk, that it would be well to form a committee of five, of which I was elected chairman; and these five gentlemen were to make a presentation of their judgment of the situation, their idea of the remedy, to a conference which had been called under the auspices of the board of aldermen. We drew up a little adjudication and we presented that—I read it at the conference that night in the high school. The substance of it was simply this: That the strike that was led by men who advocated lawlessness and anarchy was foredoomed to failure; that we placed ourselves on public record for justice between all men at any cost. We called upon the manufacturers to meet their employees in a spirit of fairness, and we suggested, as a present means of getting out of the difficulty, a Federal or State probe—I forget which it was, as we were discussing the two.

Mr. THOMPSON. When was that committee formed?

Dr. STEIN. It was formed, perhaps, in March.

Mr. THOMPSON. A few weeks or a month after the strike had started, or sooner?

Dr. STEIN. About a month.

Mr. THOMPSON. Along about the latter part of March?

Dr. STEIN. This committee also waited upon the manufacturers in meeting assembled, and we asked them to meet a committee of the workers. This the manufacturers' association refused to do, on the ground that the workers at that time were absolutely dominated and led by the I. W. W. organization, and we concluded that they could not meet the workers under the auspices of that association.

We met the workers—a committee of the workers—and while they told us that they had no right to arrive at any settlement with the employers, even though we should arrange a conference, yet they would have to submit the matter to shop committees, and so on, under their own—under the domination, however, of this association which was fighting their battle. Of course, that we could not accomplish, nor did we think it was fair to the workers to ask that. But the manufacturers steadfastly stated they would meet their own employees, and discuss the situation with them. We were simply deadlocked.

Mr. THOMPSON. First, how was the committee formed? Of various denominations?

Dr. STEIN. Yes, sir. I was the chairman. Dr. Jones, of the Second Presbyterian Church, was on that committee. Dr. Hamilton, of the St. Paul's Episcopal Church; Dr. Snodgrass, of the Methodist Church here; and Dr. Shaw, of the Trinity M. E. Church. We did not purposely select the committee in that way; they were simply elected by the 50 or 60 clergymen who met.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did your committee have more than one conference with this committee of the workers?

Dr. STEIN. We had several; yes, sir; but in no case would the men who came to us say they had any authorization.

Mr. THOMPSON. What did the men tell you—at least I understood you to say so—they were shop committees?

Dr. STEIN. They simply reported their grievances.

Mr. THOMPSON. What did they say those grievances were?

Dr. STEIN. Well, they were from different crafts in the industry; the dyers, helpers, and weavers and broad silk men, and ribbon weavers. The dyers, for instance, said that the work hours were too long; and we agreed absolutely with them on that proposition. We favored the eight-hour law, and we talked so to the manufacturers, but we felt that it was not equitable to enforce it on Paterson as against the country or the world in the industry.

Mr. THOMPSON. You rather agree with the last witness, that a Federal eight-hour law would be a good thing?

Dr. STEIN. I agree with every word that was uttered here by Mr. Magnet—every word he spoke, saving, of course, that latter part when there was a question of the introduction of some economic or philosophic system for the final judgment of this matter. There I am not qualified. I rather feel that the whole thing would be solved—I am not saying this just because I am a priest, but because we all subscribe to it—that the whole matter would be finally settled if we could only democratize humanity, or the industrial world to the recognition of the Golden Rule and the observance of "Thou shalt not steal." I think if we could follow that rule of moral arithmetic, the whole matter would be settled.

Mr. THOMPSON. I think we will agree with you on that. When you met with the workers and they would tell you that their shop committees only had power to take matters up with each shop, was the suggestion made to the manufacturers that they take up with the committees of the shops, and did the manufacturers say they would meet the committees or not?

Dr. STEIN. The manufacturers said to us—to our committee—that the men went out without making any demand, that they simply left their looms and left their work and that they gave no reason for it; and consequently that they would not deal with them until they came back to those looms and to their work. Then they would listen to their grievances and do the best they could.

So far as the wages were concerned, they said they could not pay any greater wages; and that is one of the reasons why we thought if a probe could be had it would be a good thing to probe into the financial condition of the silk world, to find out whether, according to the estimates of justice and equity in that business, more wages could be paid or not.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many times did you meet, if you remember, with the employers?

Dr. STEIN. We met twice with them. Of course, they were very firm in their determination that the men should come back first and deal with them, and we felt that we had no moral right to interfere with that request.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you get the impression that when they said they would deal with their own men after they came back, that they would deal with them as an organization to a committee, or deal with that committee, or did you get any impression as to that?

Dr. STEIN. I got no impression definitely, because I never sought any absolute information.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was there any talk in any of these committee meetings in reference to dealing with organizations of workingmen?

Dr. STEIN. Yes; our committee advocated in the high-school meeting, at the conference held there, that the silk workers of Paterson, at that time and for the purpose then under consideration, should bind themselves together under the leadership of Paterson workers, and that then we would stand behind them strongly and ask the manufacturers again to listen to them in that way with the I. W. W. eliminated.

Mr. THOMPSON. Was there any expression of opinion on behalf of the manufacturers in regard to that question at that meeting?

Dr. STEIN. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you know whether or not the condition of the workers here generally has been helped since the strike?

Dr. STEIN. I think it has, but not because of the strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you still feel about the organization of the workers as you did then?

Dr. STEIN. I believe that the workers should be organized; that they should have unions. I absolutely believe in it.

Mr. THOMPSON. What, in your opinion, if you care to state, was the cause of the industrial unrest which led to the strike and led to the coming here of these persons from the outside?

Dr. STEIN. In this strike in Paterson?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Dr. STEIN. Just what Mr. Magnet said. There is no use of repeating it, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is there anything more that you would like to say?

Dr. STEIN. Well, in listening to all the witnesses here, I was very much surprised to hear some witnesses assert that there was no disorder in the city. There was disorder—sad disorder—and I would not be doing my duty, I think, as a sort of moral custodian of the city if I did not say that I believe that the civil authorities conscientiously did their duty, and unflinchingly did it, and did it with a great deal of wisdom.

Mr. Chairman, that is all I have to say.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is all.

Chairman WALSH. That is all; thank you, Dr. Stein.

(Witness excused.)

TESTIMONY OF MR. JOHN W. FERGUSON.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Ferguson, give us your name.

Mr. FERGUSON. John W. Ferguson.

Mr. THOMPSON. And your address.

Mr. FERGUSON. House or business? 152 Market Street is my business address and 421 Twelfth Avenue my home address.

Mr. THOMPSON. And your business.

Mr. FERGUSON. Engineering and building contractor.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been a resident of Paterson?

Mr. FERGUSON. Since 1884.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you here in Paterson during the strike last year?

Mr. FERGUSON. I was; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. At that time did you form any opinion as to the method and way of handling the strike or as to the attitude of the parties—the employers and employees?

Mr. FERGUSON. I don't think I did.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you form any opinion as to the organization called I. W. W.? You know what I mean?

Mr. FERGUSON. I know what you mean. I have an opinion of the I. W. W.; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, during that strike did you have a talk with Mr. Fitch, who sits here at my right hand, or do you remember?

Mr. FERGUSON. I don't remember that I did.

Mr. THOMPSON. And at that talk did you say to him that the community would be justified in adopting any means, legal or illegal, to get rid of the I. W. W. leaders?

Mr. FERGUSON. If he so states, I will accept that as a statement of mine.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would you feel that you might have said that at that time?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think I might; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. That would represent your feeling at that time?

Mr. FERGUSON. By "those leaders" I wish to qualify the people who came from outside of Paterson to foment trouble here in this city.

Mr. THOMPSON. I am referring to those people.

Mr. FERGUSON. I don't mean the local people here that were representing the working people, but I mean the outside element that came here to foment and increase this disturbance as it had done in other places in the United States previous to the Paterson trouble.

Mr. THOMPSON. That being so, I would like to get from you, if you care to state, Mr. Ferguson, any reasons that led you to that opinion and which you would give to the commission, or did you have that opinion at that time?

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, I believed firmly, as I do to-day, that the object of these promoters of disturbance in these communities—that is, the outside leaders of the I. W. W.—was, first, to acquire revenue for themselves, and, second, to foment trouble among the workers, particularly the non-English-speaking workers, who are easily led and believe much that is told them of what freedom is in this country; and they are led believe much in that word freedom means license. I have employed a great many non-English-speaking people. I know their ways fairly well, and they are easily led and hard to control when their passions are excited.

Mr. THOMPSON. You paid more or less attention to the strike, of course.

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, not in detail.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you form any judgment or opinion as to the causes which led to the strike?

Mr. FERGUSON. To a certain extent; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would you mind telling the commission?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe that the strike was due largely to the unrest of the workers in the silk industry, due to the low wages and the conditions under which they had been working for several years, due, so far as I was able to judge, to the conditions in the silk industry. In other words, the silk industry had been at a low ebb for a long time, due to fashion and mercantile conditions; that when the business did improve the workers were not receiving the remuneration and compensation which they thought they were entitled to. And there is another thing, which has been stated by the witnesses here this afternoon: There has been a large increase in the silk-shops, or the number of the shops in Paterson, in the last few years, mostly of small manufacturers; and from my experience with employers as a whole, taking them in all trades and conditions, they are the ones who are hardest and most exacting on their employees, and it was that spirit of unrest that had the kernel from which this trouble arose. I am not prepared to say, and I do not say, that the people were receiving just compensation; but I do feel strongly, from what I know of the conditions here, that had there been no outside influence, no stirring up of this spirit of resentment, that in all probability the condition would have been remedied between the employers and the workmen, particularly in the larger mills. Any employer who has a large interest and a great deal at stake, from my experience, is more willing to listen and concede and do for his employees than those who employ only a few; and my impression would be that there was a reason at that time for the employees in the silk mills to be dissatisfied with what they were receiving.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you hear Mr. Magnet's statements this afternoon?

Mr. FERGUSON. I did; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. He is a worker in the mills here.

Mr. FERGUSON. I understand so.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did his statement of the fact and causes of dissatisfaction coincide with your ideas?

Mr. FERGUSON. They do; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What would you say, if you have an opinion, with reference to the question of the organization of the workers? Have you considered that at all as a means of eradicating the unrest, or do you care to state?

Mr. FERGUSON. I would like to state my views perhaps briefly. I believe that there is a great deal of benefit to all working people in organization. In the

past, unfortunately, the leaders of organized labor have been what you might call the pugnacious or the fighting element, and I must say, even as an employer, that that was necessary to get what they have gotten in the past. I think in many departments, many branches, of employment to-day the leaders of some unions—many of the leaders—have reached a more conservative basis, and they look more that their interests and that of the employers could be considered similar and allied. And I am very glad to say that I believe the employers have gotten a different view of the relationship between themselves and the working people. I think the larger the employer, the larger the corporation, the more they see it from that standpoint, because it is entirely an economic proposition, because if the employee is satisfied and contented and has pleasant surroundings and a good place to work he is going to do more and accomplish more and bring more business to the employer than he would if he was working under harassing conditions or conditions he would like to get away from but can not because there is no other place for employment.

MR. THOMPSON. Do you think that in that view the employer takes into consideration the question of organization?

MR. FERGUSON. I do; yes.

MR. THOMPSON. You do?

MR. FERGUSON. Yes. I employ union labor almost exclusively, and I have no trouble with them. But I will tell you frankly from past experience the employers—I am speaking of the smaller ones—they will make agreements with these organizations, and they will be breaking them the next morning; in fact, before they can get downstairs they are trying to find a way to break them.

MR. THOMPSON. That is, the employers?

MR. FERGUSON. Yes. The workmen, as a rule, desire to live up to them. There are a great many workmen in the skilled trades that are members of the union because that will give them the least trouble; and there are many union leaders that I respect and know well and admire for their broad-mindedness; and I believe that the relationship between the employers and the workmen through proper organizations is improving, and improving materially.

MR. THOMPSON. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALSH. Mr. Ferguson, apparently from what you have said here and what you evidently said to Mr. Fitch, the feeling had become very intense here on both sides, had it not, as the strike progressed?

MR. FERGUSON. It had; yes.

Chairman WALSH. It had. And the workers felt that they should be allowed to organize in their own way with their own leaders; and the employers and what might be called the disinterested citizenship thought that the bringing in of persons from outside was not only conducive to industrial chaos but threatened the public welfare?

MR. FERGUSON. I think so. But we had the experience of Lawrence in front of us.

Chairman WALSH. Yes; that is what I say——

MR. FERGUSON (interrupting). Now, the workers themselves—the majority of them, as far as I could learn it—were not prepared to strike—did not want to strike. But if you had had experience with this non-English speaking labor, and they get together on the street and at times in front of a mill where there is a respectable law-abiding class of people working, they become very timid. Paterson has had its notoriety in the past, and we who think a great deal of our city and are interested in its prosperity and welfare did not want to have a repetition of the conditions in Lawrence.

Chairman WALSH. Yes; that is what I say. But I am trying to direct your attention to the feeling that existed on both sides after the strike began. The feeling was intense, was it not?

MR. FERGUSON. It was very strong. It was strong among those who were not directly interested in this trouble, but who were interested to maintain the good name and character of this city without having a disturbance and having the militia coming here and all that sort of thing, which would only add to the notoriety which we had had in the past.

Chairman WALSH. And you probably, in any expressions you made, gave forth the sentiment of the innocent bystanders, as it were—the business men, and so on?

MR. FERGUSON. I think so.

Chairman WALSH. And so deep-seated had the feeling become that you are willing to say that these outsiders should be dispersed or gotten away by means, illegal or otherwise?

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, I would hardly say illegal, because I believe that legal means are means taken by the authorities. That is what we were advocating. That is what I meant. It was not that I would personally form a vigilance committee and go out and misuse these people; but I believed that the city authorities should take means perhaps beyond the technical legal point to get rid of them. I thought that would be justified.

Chairman WALSH. In other words, did you think that they would be justified, if a man was a known agitator and had caused trouble, as you understood it, at other places, to arrest him as he got off a train and not give him a chance to be heard?

Mr. FERGUSON. Not give him a change; simply say, "When the next train goes out you go out on it."

Chairman WALSH. We must keep perfect order, please, in the room. And that was without regard to what the law might have been under the circumstances?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes. I believed that the city authorities had the right and the power in an emergency to go beyond the law. It has been done in New York City.

Chairman WALSH. Sir?

Mr. FERGUSON. And let me tell you, isn't it better to tell a man to get out of town on the next train, and, perhaps, compel him to, than to have a condition created where 15 or 20 people are going to be killed?

Chairman WALSH. If you are asking me the question, I can not draw the distinction really, and without criticising you in any way, but I can not draw the distinction between your philosophy and that of the gentleman who gets on the stand and says that in order to accomplish his means he would not object to blowing up a building if there was nobody in it, for instance. That is a violation of the law. He says the building is not so valuable, but my personal liberty is valuable. Now, don't you think that those two conflicting viewpoints had a large play in producing the condition that came about, the feeling that came about toward the end of this controversy?

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, I don't—

Mr. THOMPSON. In other words, wouldn't it make you very angry if somebody said to you in New York for some reason that they saw sufficient, "We will handle you regardless of the law"? Wouldn't that incite bitter resentment on your part, don't you believe, toward the person who attempted to do it?

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, I think probably it would.

Chairman WALSH. And wouldn't you also, and do you not also feel that a man would say "To gain my ends, I will defy the constitution and blow up property," that would make you angry?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And isn't finally the solution of it the adoption of machinery; that is, schemes through the cooperation between employers and employees, or resident, lodged in the laws of the State or Nation, some means of arriving approximately at human justice. That is the end of it, is it not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I think so.

Chairman WALSH. I think that is all.

Mr. FERGUSON. I just want to say that—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Very good. If there is any other point, just state it.

Mr. FERGUSON. One other point in connection with this. The one thing that prompted me in feeling that way toward the outside leaders is this, that I know from experience of a considerable length of time that the fee, the remuneration, the money that can be collected in these times of strife is used for the personal—apparently so—for the personal benefit of the leaders. They have to live, and they live very well.

Chairman WALSH. Well, we had a suggestion here that if we could establish a golden rule, a principle of not stealing, we would all be better off, and is not that a cause of industrial unrest?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. That those that are not engaged in the industry and don't pay any of this money resent the ideas that the others who are not in the organization, accusing their leaders of dishonesty or misappropriation of funds or so forth. Haven't you noticed that that is one of the things that excites what you might call class hatred or ill feeling between them?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. That is, that these men that don't have any part in the strike, that these men feel if they select their own leaders and pay their own money it is nobody's business whether the leaders steal or not?

Mr. FERGUSON. I want to say about this non-English speaking labor, that we to-day are dependent on foreign labor for our unskilled trades. They come in here not knowing the language, not knowing the customs, and they are misinformed as to the industrial situation in this country. They think that freedom is license. There has been an enormous injustice done to these foreign people by their employers, through their subordinates, in the past, and there is a great deal to be done in the future, and as I have told my associates in some organizations that I belong to, that what they want to do is not to exploit the animosity between the employer and the workmen, but to take every instance that comes to their notice and make much of the good feeling while it exists, and get that cooperation. The employer must start first. His interests are larger, his education is supposed to be greater, and his whole surroundings are such that he has got to take the first step to help these ignorant people, and I do not think that anything can be done so much to help this labor situation in this country as a means of giving these people a chance for vocational and industrial education.

To-day in the skilled trades we are making no mechanics of apprentices. Their fellow workmen do not want to give them any information at all that will help them, for fear they are younger men and will take their jobs. And there is nothing can help this situation so much as to give the grown person a chance to learn and supplement his daily occupation with the technique of the trade which he is following. And I have personally endeavored to bring that about in this community, and I think I would have succeeded had not it been for the depression of 1907. And I believe it is the great remedy. And I think that the foreigner who comes here with these ideas of freedom and then gets this licensed thing thrown into him should be made to respect the laws of this country and understand that he is to obey the law, and that we have laws and they should be enforced.

Chairman WALSH. But the whole thing, according to your idea, is largely a matter of education?

Mr. FERGUSON. Absolutely.

Chairman WALSH. How long have you been here, Mr. Ferguson?

Mr. FERGUSON. I have been in Paterson 30 years.

Chairman WALSH. You are an old resident here?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Would you say the assimilation—and you saw the development or assimilation, I might say, of the different foreign elements into the industrial life of the city?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Now, the mill hands of 25 years ago contained many foreigners?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; but they were English-speaking foreigners, all of them.

Chairman WALSH. Well, what were they—English, Scotch, Irish?

Mr. FERGUSON. Well, Irish, English, and Scotch and Hollanders. There were a great many Hollanders.

Chairman WALSH. The Irish are assimilated?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. I notice lots of them are officials?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; we find them in most all of the cities.

Chairman WALSH. Now, we have heard statements a great deal here of the good class of Italians that come in. I see also by the usual way that we note progress, signs over stores and occupations in the public service that those men have assimilated quite well.

Mr. FERGUSON. There are some wonderfully fine men among the Italians.

Chairman WALSH. And we may hope that those men that are coming in now will assimilate in the same way if we can have an understanding—

Mr. FERGUSON (interrupting). I believe so.

Chairman WALSH. And respect both property and personal liberty?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes; and I think that they can be made the best of citizens. But I think they should be given a chance—I am speaking of the grown men now—of learning the customs and ways of this country and be permitted to develop their abilities along the lines, perhaps, which they follow on the other side. We have had men come to us and start as day laborers because they could not speak the language. They went in in gangs and would follow the leader, but

we learned they had ability in other directions, and we have used that and been glad to use it.

Chairman WALSH. You have observed now that these men that have become assimilated, the old timers, take part in the civic life of the community and have pride in the city and everything of that sort?

Mr. FERGUSON. I believe they do.

Chairman WALSH. Just like a native?

Mr. FERGUSON. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. That is all, thank you. Call your next.

TESTIMONY OF MR. JOHN L. MATTHEWS.

Mr. THOMPSON. Give us your name and address?

Mr. MATTHEWS. John L. Matthews, 251. Seventeenth Avenue.

Mr. THOMPSON. And your occupation?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Editor of the Paterson Press.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been editor of the Paterson Press?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Three years.

Mr. THOMPSON. You were in active charge of the paper as editor during the strike of last year?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And during that time did you publish a great many articles about the strike and the strike leaders?

Mr. MATTHEWS. A great many.

Mr. THOMPSON. And particularly with reference to the leaders who came from out of town?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, I will read you very briefly some extracts from articles which appeared in your paper and ask you whether you can recall or whether they probably did appear.

On Monday, March 10, 1913, there occurred this language in an article there published:

"This morning the following message was received from Los Angeles:

"LOS ANGELES, CAL., *March 9.*

"Los Angeles and San Diego handled the I. W. W. agitators without gloves last summer when they invaded the two cities in force. Since then both towns have been given a wide berth by them. Merchants, manufacturers, and the police authorities cooperated in ridding the communities of the disturbers as rapidly as they arrived. Grand juries indicted the more violent ones, while the police drove the others out of the city with dispatch. Previous to that plain-clothes men awaited incoming trains and threw the unwelcome arrivals into jail on vagrancy charges, half a hundred at a time. Federal immigration officers visited the jails of Los Angeles and near-by cities and took steps to deport all those who had not been in the country three years. Meetings at which incendiary speeches were to be delivered were broken up without communication and all out-of-town I. W. W. agitators were driven out of the city. Since then this part of the State has been pretty free from I. W. W. agitation."

"The Press gives the Los Angeles and San Diego information merely to show how the I. W. W. leaders and the I. W. W. propaganda are regarded in other cities. It may suggest some ideas to the manufacturer and to the silk workers. It may convince them that the sooner the I. W. W. outfit leave town the better it will be for all concerned, no matter how it is accomplished."

Do you remember whether or not that appeared in your paper?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; that appeared.

Mr. THOMPSON. On the front page on Wednesday, April 23, 1913, among other things there occurred this language, and I will read it very briefly:

"No violence of consequence has occurred, but it is a question how much longer Paterson can stand for the Haywood's the Tresca's, and the Hogan's and still be a place of safety. Los Angeles, Akron, Denver, Ottawa, and other cities kicked the I. W. W. out of town in short order. What is Paterson doing to discourage this revolutionary horde?"

Did that probably appear?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then on Thursday, April 24, 1913, on the front page appears this article:

"Akron could not find a law to banish this dangerous revolutionist and his cohorts, but a citizens' committee of 1,000 men did the trick in short order. Can Akron accomplish something that Paterson, N. J., can not duplicate? The Paterson Press dislikes to believe it, but time will tell."

There are many other quotations, which I will not take the time to read. Did that last appear?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I think it did, so far as I can remember.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, Mr. Matthews, I ask you to state for the benefit of the commission, the reason for these articles and your views as to their necessity, the conditions which caused them to be published?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, we felt that the I. W. W. was a real menace to the community, a material menace, as afterwards developed. This strike cost Paterson probably \$18,000,000. It is pretty hard to compute it, but I think that is a very conservative estimate. In reciting what took place in Los Angeles we were simply repeating a matter of record, and we published it because we felt that it had a bearing upon the situation here. Los Angeles and other cities had experiences with the I. W. W. They handled the situation in a way that seemed to be satisfactory to the people of those cities, and we felt that possibly the same kind of treatment here would be acceptable and legal, decent and orderly, and satisfactory to the people generally.

Mr. THOMPSON. And that was the cause of the articles?

Mr. MATTHEWS. That was the motive; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is all.

Chairman WALSH. How long have you lived here, Mr. Matthews?

Mr. MATTHEWS. A little over three years.

Chairman WALSH. A little over three years?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. Where did you live before you came here?

Mr. MATTHEWS. In Brooklyn.

Chairman WALSH. In Brooklyn?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And you are the editor of the Paterson Press, the paper in which these articles appeared?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And that represented your views, the views of your paper on the situation and the necessities that you thought confronted you and called for such action?

Mr. MATTHEWS. We thought the situation warranted the publication of news matters and things of that kind.

Chairman WALSH. I notice that you estimated the cost of the strike in your paper at one time, and I think your testimony here now is that it was about \$13,000,000—the estimate of the approximate cost?

Mr. MATTHEWS. As I recall it, the loss in wages was about \$5,000,000.

Chairman WALSH. I was going to ask you how did you think that was distributed, how much of it fell upon the workers, how much of it fell upon the owners of the plants, and how much of it fell upon the public generally?

Mr. MATTHEWS. I should say that the loss in wages to the workers was about \$5,000,000, and the loss to the manufacturers was about \$2,500,000, as nearly as you can get at the figures. But the city suffered a still greater loss than that. It is almost impossible to compute it, but it has been estimated to be about \$10,000,000, by reason of the fact that many of the silk mills here have since—during the strike and since the strike have established branches, mostly in Pennsylvania, and I believe there are six or seven Paterson mills that now have branches in Pennsylvania, and these branches were established principally, in fact, mainly, on account of the agitation and the strife that resulted here during the strike. And it is also a fact that two plants other than silk plants were ready to settle in Paterson at about the time that the strike was going on, one of them an automobile plant that would have employed 200 hands; both of them gave up the idea of coming here because they were really scared off by the industrial unrest here.

Chairman WALSH. Before the strike had you made observation of the general characteristics of the workers in the industries here?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I had not.

Chairman WALSH. You had not made enough observation of them to state to the commission how they rank as home owners, we will say, and of the part they took in the civic life of the community, and such things as that?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Well, I can not give any exact figures as to the number of homes owned by silk workers, but I think it is a fact that the amount of money in the savings banks of Paterson per capita is away in the lead, taking all of the cities of the country, which would show that thrift is very pronounced here and that working conditions could not be so very bad, else they would not have that condition.

Chairman WALSH. Is your paper an old-established paper here—the Paterson Press?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; 49 years.

Chairman WALSH. Been here 45 years?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. And is it under the same management, practically, and has it been all these years?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No.

Chairman WALSH. Do you come in under a new management?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Yes; we established a new management.

Chairman WALSH. And the ownership of the paper, generally speaking, is what? Is it owned by local capital?

Mr. MATTHEWS. Why, it is owned principally by Mr. Curie—Charles Curie—whose home is in New York but who has interests here other than the paper.

Chairman WALSH. Does he live here?

Mr. MATTHEWS. His father was one of the oldest citizens here—Capt. Charles Curie.

Chairman WALSH. What line of industry; in this that the trouble occurred in?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; he is a lawyer—his father; and Charles Curie, jr., is also a lawyer.

Chairman WALSH. He could not have had any ulterior motive?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I could not see any.

Chairman WALSH. That is all; call your next.

Mr. MATTHEWS. I would like to make a denial of a statement made by Mr. Marelli here yesterday and by Mr. Scott, to the effect that the Paterson Press had advocated out-and-out violence. I deny that we have advocated violence. We took a stand against the I. W. W., and we advised the silk workers to organize. We were the first paper—I think the first—we published the first suggestion of the silk workers organizing their own organization here. We offered to provide a hall for them and to help them in any way possible. We still believe that they should be organized. But in asking the silk workers to withdraw from the I. W. W. we did not mean that we expected or wanted the silk workers to forcibly eject any of the I. W. W. leaders.

Chairman WALSH. Is there any other statement now that you desire to volunteer, or any explanation or amplification of the testimony already given?

Mr. MATTHEWS. No; I don't think of anything else.

Chairman WALSH. That is all. Call your next.

(Witness excused.)

TESTIMONY OF MR. EDWARD ZUERSHER.

Mr. THOMPSON. Give us your name, please.

Mr. ZUERSHER. Edward Zuersher.

Mr. THOMPSON. And your address.

Mr. ZUERSHER. Prince Street, Paterson.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been a resident of Paterson?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Twenty-five years.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are you connected with the Industrial Workers of the World?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I am.

Mr. THOMPSON. What position do you hold with them?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Secretary-treasurer.

Mr. THOMPSON. Of the local union here?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Of the local union here.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you here in Paterson during the time of the strike?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Last year I was.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you do work in the mill at all?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I did at that time.

Mr. THOMPSON. At that time?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes. I have worked in the mills up to a month ago.

Mr. THOMPSON. Up to a month ago. What work did you do and what mill did you work in?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I am a ribbon weaver by trade, and I worked in the United Ribbon Co.

Mr. THOMPSON. As a weaver?

Mr. ZUERSHER. As a weaver.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you working as a weaver at this place before the strike began?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. What were you working at before the strike began?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I was working as a weaver, but not in this mill.

Mr. THOMPSON. What mill?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Fisher's, the Colonial.

Mr. THOMPSON. And you went out on strike with the rest of them?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you pretty well acquainted with the conditions in the silk mills around Paterson at that time?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I am thoroughly acquainted with the conditions in the silk mills in Paterson.

Mr. THOMPSON. You have been here this afternoon?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You have heard some of the testimony in reference to the opinions of the witness as to the cause of the strike and industrial unrest?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will you state what is your idea and opinion as to the cause of the strike and unrest among the workmen and any other thing you may wish to state?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, there are several things which led to this strike. In fact, the unrest dates back as far as 11 years to my knowledge, and the continuous antagonism of the foremen of the different shops and the manufacturers of the different concerns has helped to bring this strike about. For instance, take in the broad-silk plants, especially among the Jewish manufacturers. They were in the habit of stealing yardage from the weavers accounts and paying him for less than what they really done. And that was done in this way: You take the broad-silk looms, they generally cut off in 60-yard pieces, they are stamped, at every 60 yards there is a stamp in the warp. That is, before it is woven, and when that mark comes out in the warp it is supposed to be 60 yards. No weaver is allowed to cut his warp off only at this mark. Consequently, as a rule, they stamp these warps probably 2 or 3 yards above the 60-yard mark, so that at the end of the warp a warp of probably 600 yards or 700 yards, the manufacturer would gain probably 20 or 30 yards of cloth without pay to the weaver.

I know of one particular instance. This happens to be a brother-in-law of mine who is not in the business any longer and does not care. He wove on a loom, and he found these conditions on this particular loom where the cut mark, as they call it, was, instead of being at the 60-yard mark, was at 63 yards the first time he received the cut mark, and the second time starting with the cut over again the cut mark was at 64 yards, and so on through the warp. He found out at the end of the warp he was short somewhere between 30 and 35 yards. That is, he would have to do that much that he did not get paid for. So he did not say anything to the firm at that time, but he got another set of warps, and when the other set of warps come in he measured the warps himself as he wove them; had a yard measure, and every time he made a yard he put it on and made a note of it, and when he had his 60 yards done he cut it off, irrespective of where the cut mark was, and put his new warp in, and that went all right for three or four days. Then finally the foreman or owner together, I don't remember which now, he told him he was discharged. He wanted to know what for. Well, he said "You are too slick. We don't want you." This was one instance. There are different instances. Done in most of the broad silk mills; that is, especially among the Jewish manufacturers. I can't say so much about the others. But those instances have come to our attention time and time again as we mingle with these different wage workers and we hear these things mentioned.

This one instance has caused a great deal of ill feeling among the manufacturers. Also another thing that has happened in regards to the women in the ribbon trade. I have known of an instance where the foreman has gone

to a woman and said to her, "How many yards are you making?" And she would say, "nine or ten," whatever the case might be, and the foreman would say, "Why, such and such a person on loom so and so is making two or three yards a day more than you. How is that? I thought you could make as much as she. I think you are just as good a weaver as she is; why don't you try to make just as much?" Naturally this woman, as is the case in most instances, wanted this man to believe that she was just as good a weaver as the other woman was. Naturally, she would speed herself up to the limit of her capacity in order to turn out two extra yards more a day, notwithstanding the fact that the foreman who had told this told a lie. We would not find this out, probably, at the same time. Sometimes the weaver would not ask the other weaver about that, but at every time they did they found it was not so, that the weaver did not turn out that amount of work; that the manufacturer used that means to speed up these women to the limit that they could endure.

That is another case that the commission could take notice of. Also in some mills, especially in daywork mills, where they get paid so much a day, they use what we term as pacemakers. They will take, probably, three or four men or women whom we may class as favorites of the firm, or some particular member of the firm. They will give them the best material, the best filling, and the best silk, and the best running loom, and they will turn off their day's work. Other looms in the shop will get poorer class of silk, a poorer machine to work with, poorer filling, and so on, and they are supposed to come up to the standard of the pacemakers in order to receive the same amount of pay that the pacemakers get.

Now, I have known of a case where three men received \$20 a week. They were pacemakers, and every man on that floor had to make the same amount of work, perhaps the same amount of yardage, in order to get the same pay. I can briefly state there was not one other man on that floor that did the same amount of work. He could not. It was impossible, because he did not have the same material. That is another method that is used by the manufacturers to a great extent, especially among the daywork shops.

MR. THOMPSON. Referring to the kind of silk used, you say the best silk and the poorest. What effect has the silk upon the capacity to make speed in work and in weaving?

MR. ZUERSHER. What effect has it? I don't quite get you.

MR. THOMPSON. You said some workers, the favorites, were given the best silk?

MR. ZUERSHER. Yes.

MR. THOMPSON. What effect would that have in helping them to make speed to weave?

MR. ZUERSHER. Well, the silk would break off much less, while the poorer silk, as a rule, would not be cleaned by the warpers. That is, the lumps would not be taken out of it—the long ends would not be taken out of it. While the pacemakers would have their silk cleaned before they got it, so they really would not have much work to do except watch the loom run. That is the difference between good and bad silk. And the bad filling would break offener than the good filling would, and naturally it would keep the weaver back in regards to the speed of the loom all the time.

We have a case in this city where they use contract labor, many children who are 14 years old, and some have been less, but their mothers have been forced to put them in the mill in order to help the family out, and probably have made false statements as to their age. But we have had them on strike with us, and we knew they were not 14 years of age. They work under a system in these places; they sign a contract with the firm to work for that firm one year while they are learning to weave. During that period the firm takes 50 per cent of their wages and holds it. The girl who is learning receives only 50 per cent of her wages during the year, and the other 50 per cent is held by the firm.

When the year is up, if she works there a year, she receives that 50 per cent in one lump sum, but, as usually is the case, they don't reach their time limit of one year. They usually discharge them before that, and any person who is discharged or leaves the employ does not receive that 50 per cent wages which has been withheld. So there, as a matter of fact, they really only receive half the wages that they bargain for. There are cases where they have run to a year and received their full amount of wages, but there are a greater number of cases where they did not receive them.

These are statements from the girls who work in the mills themselves. I have seen some of the pay envelopes during the strike, where they have received \$1 for two weeks' work, \$1.05 for two weeks' work, \$2.40 for two weeks' work, and it averages so on. I believe that the highest pay they receive, the highest envelope with pay marked on it that I have seen, was \$6 for two weeks' work. The firm is still in business in this city.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is it still continuing the practice of holding back 50 per cent of the wages of employees?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I could not say positively whether they are or not, but I believe they are.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, what is the latest data or information that you have?

Mr. ZUERSHER. My information comes from before the strike of last year—that is, during the strike of last year; up to the starting of the strike that system was in vogue in that mill.

Mr. THOMPSON. Go ahead.

Mr. ZUERSHER. In regards to Mr. Doherty's statement that a weaver only works when his loom is stopped, that is false, and as a weaver I know it to be false. A weaver works whether his loom is stopped or whether it is running. It does not make any difference, because he has to use his eyes all day long, and that is a very tedious job to do that. You have got to watch very closely that nothing happens while the loom is in motion. If he says a weaver only works while the loom is stopped, he may mean he only has to exert himself in order to remove something, or something like that, but he really has to watch that loom continuously for the 10 hours he is there. If he does not, an accident may happen which probably will require the stoppage of a loom for two or three hours at a time, or sometimes a day. I have woven on what we call tubular ties, which was a very tedious operation for any weaver. The tie has two sides that you have got to watch. You have got to watch the top and the bottom of the tie in the making. There is ends breaking, and floats, as we call them, come into the tie. Now, on a loom of that kind the stoppage is a little more than it is on another loom—that is, on plainer work—but to say a weaver does not work while his loom is working is a false statement, absolutely, because a weaver is working just as hard when it is running as when it is not. In fact, many a time I felt that I was getting a rest if the loom stopped and I could lay over on the railings and put in the ends. I did not consider myself working hard then.

Mr. THOMPSON. In speaking of that loom, are you speaking now of the looms that stop automatically when the thread is broken, or the old-style looms that go on and make poor cloth?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I am speaking of looms in general.

Mr. THOMPSON. Take the modern loom, where the loom stops on the breaking of one thread, does that require the same constant watching as the other looms do?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes; in my opinion, it does.

Chairman WALSH. Just state why.

Mr. ZUERSHER. They all need the same amount of watching.

Chairman WALSH. Yes; of course. But when the loom automatically stops when there is anything wrong it naturally would appear reasonable that watching would be eliminated and you would not have so much to do. Explain that.

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, there are lots of things that could happen while the loom is in motion that you can eradicate when it is in motion to prevent the loom from stopping, and for that reason you have to watch just as much, although the loom stops automatically.

There are lots of things that you can remove or do while the loom is in motion that would prevent the loom stopping, even automatically, and for that reason you would have to watch it.

In regards to the blacklist—a thing which most of the workers fear to a certain extent—that has been in existence for a number of years. I have a clipping taken from a paper, in which one Mr. Rosenheim, of the August Ribbon Co., a man who, I believe, is present here this afternoon—a manufacturer—in whose plant there is at present a strike on, emphatically states that there is a blacklist in existence—an active blacklist in operation here—says Mr. Rosenheim, taken from one of the local papers. This I will leave with the commission, if they care to have it.

Chairman WALSH. Just file it.

(Received and marked "Zuersher Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2, of June 17, 1914.")

The exhibits referred to are newspaper clippings, entitled "'An active black-list is in operation here,' says Mr. Rosenheim.")

Mr. ZUERSHER. My experience in the blacklist has been this: When I went on strike last year I worked for the Colonial Ribbon Co., and when the strike was over I went back to this mill, in a body, with the men working in that mill. The foreman or head of the firm took whom he felt like taking back, and those whom he had no positions for at the time he had some other excuse for them. He told me to come back the day after the entire shop went in and he would let me know what could be done in my case. I came back next morning and he said, "I have nothing for you and I don't think I will have anything for you for at least 10 days." And notwithstanding the fact that there were looms standing with warps in them, where weavers had left his employ and he knew positively they were not coming back, still, in all, he had no work for me.

I told him then and there I would take what tools belonged to me and what wages I had coming and would seek work elsewhere. And he gave me what wages I had and my tools, with the understanding that I was no longer in his employ.

I then sought employment in other mills, and whenever I mentioned the firm's name who I worked for last I was told to leave my name and address and they would send for me, but none of them ever sent for me. I worked in a mill called the Craft Hat Band—started at 1 o'clock in the afternoon and at half past 4 was discharged. I immediately asked the reason for my discharge and the foreman told me that he had instructions from the office. He would not give me any further information.

I then went to another firm and asked for a position. They asked me whom I worked for last, and I mentioned Fisher, as he was more popularly known by that name than by the firm name. Well, he said, "I can't hire anybody from his place. I don't want him coming up here raising a racket here." I said, "Very well." I went over immediately to Fisher, but before I went in there I took a slip of paper and wrote on this paper:

"This is to certify that Edward Zuersher is no longer in my employ."

With that in my pocket I went in to Mr. Fisher and asked him was he stopping me from getting employment in other mills. He said he was not. Then I asked him whether he understood that I was not in his employ. He said he did. Then I pulled out this paper and said, "Would you mind signing this paper, so that when I ask for a position in any other place those people will take your signature for it that I am not in your employ?" He said he would not sign it, showing plainly that he believed in the blacklist and was, in fact, forcing the blacklist wherever he could do it.

I only cite this case of mine, as other cases of similar nature to mine; hundreds of them in the city of Paterson; there are hundreds of them. That is one thing that causes unrest in the city, because during the periods of depression, such as exist at the present time in the city in the silk industry, the manufacturer has a line on all men whom he knows are active in the movement for better conditions, and those men he weeds out first, keeping those whom he knows are not so active, who are more submissive to the conditions of the mill.

For those reasons there is a considerable army of unemployed and poor conditions in the mills of the city of Paterson, because they take the advantage every time a depression arises to get rid of those who are active—force them out on the streets for periods of two to three months. They never hire those people back unless they are compelled to for the want of weavers, which sometimes is the case, but as soon as the depression comes in again they get rid of those men.

Mr. THOMPSON. If you are through, I will ask you some questions; but if not, go ahead.

Mr. ZUERSHER. I am not quite through yet.

Mr. THOMPSON. Go ahead.

Mr. ZUERSHER. I wish to show the difference in the trade from 20 years ago up to the present time. Twenty years ago we used to have what we call 540 lines, which consisted a full loom. A weaver on those looms made anywhere from \$20 to \$35 a week for a 10-hour day. To-day, instead of 540 lines, we have looms with 2,000 lines. A decrease in wages of 50 to 75 per cent from 20 years. A man to-day has to produce three times as much work and does not receive probably more than one-third the same wages as he did 20 years ago. Those are facts that no manufacturer in the business can deny, and deny them honestly.

The conditions in the mills to-day, since the big strike, in my opinion, are almost as bad, and in some cases worse than they were before the big strike, due to the fact, mostly, that the strike was lost to a certain extent.

I can cite one case in particular. A mill which suffered during the strike went back as an organized body. They signed a contract, which is contrary to the principles of the I. W. W. Nevertheless we made no objection. They signed a contract until April 1 of this year, I believe, not to ask for any more wages nor a reduction of hours, nor to have any other grievances presented to the firm until April 1 or thereafter. They agreed to that. When they went back to work they received quite an increase in wages. They were enabled to to make a fair day's pay.

On April 1, I believe it was, then, or before that, the firm asked the weavers of that shop, or the committee, I don't know which, to sign another contract for another year, and since there had been some grievances which had arisen in the shop in the meantime, the committee did not feel as though they should sign another contract without first stating other grievances that they wished to have remedied. I believe they laid that matter on the table for three months at their meeting. Whether that time has expired or not I don't remember. I don't remember whether they have taken any action since or not, but as an organized shop the conditions in that shop were fine.

They at one time had a few men in there, and I would like to state before I say this that the shop is composed of quite a few relations to the firm, and it was those relations who did not belong to not only the I. W. W. or any other organization that might exist, but they did not believe in an organization at all. Those few men got around and tried to have the shop withdraw from the I. W. W. altogether. They succeeded in having a motion of that kind passed, and immediately afterwards they reconsidered that motion and adjourned in a body into the organization, or, rather, stayed in the organization.

Now, we have in organized shops an assessment of \$1 a pay toward the strikers of these two shops that I have mentioned, the United and the Augusta. In this particular shop they got tired of paying the assessment; that is, some of the favorites worked it up so as to have the shop drop the assessment. They did drop the assessment. There is no rule where they have to do it. When they dropped the assessment the firm took advantage of the fact, seeing or believing that that indicated a disorganized affair in their shop. They immediately got rid of some of the leaders in that shop—some of the men who were active during the strike. The shop to-day is in a deplorable condition through that. They even went so far as to tell them the reason they were discharged was because they were too active. He discharged one man that I know of, and this man, it seems, had never said anything at the shop meetings, anything against the firm, never has raised his voice in any way, shape, or form, and when asked why he was discharged the head of the firm told him they had discharged him for not having anything to say at the meetings. He said: "Instead of getting up at the meetings you go around to the saloons and on the corners and voice your grievances among that class of people whom you find around the corners and in saloons instead of at the meetings. You don't have the courage to stand up at the meetings and express your opinions for fear I might hear it, and you went on the outside, thinking I might not hear what you said. That is the reason you are discharged."

This is the man's own statement.

In the United Ribbon Co., when this big strike ended, they began a nine-hour day with, I believe, a 10 per cent increase in wages. The nine-hour day in that mill has been the bone of contention ever since they received it from the firm. The firm, as it happens, was a member of the manufacturers' association and, for that reason, they were able to give a nine-hour day.

Now, then, they tried time and again to take that nine-hour day away, and in order to accomplish that they would first cut the wages of a certain class of goods, and I might say that that shop was an organized shop, and is to-day. The committee would wait on the firm and prevent them from making any reductions, and many a time they have been forced to strike from a day to two days to two weeks in order to gain their point. Of late, they had reduced the wages on a loom. Before this happened the new superintendent in charge, a man by the name of Minet, who has quite a bad reputation among silk workers in Philadelphia and other cities, he decided that he would have nothing to do with the shop committee any more, and he told this committee that he did not want the committee running in the office every day with any grievances; that

if there was any slight grievance in the shop that this committee should individually, through the shop, as he passed through, mention those grievances, and he would see that they were adjusted. So there was a grievance came up, and the committee, instead of going to the office, thinking they could settle it without stopping their looms, they decided that the one whoever might see him first might stop him and explain this thing to him. So they did. One man stopped Mr. Minet and told him of the condition of this one loom where they were cutting the wages after having made an agreement that they would pay a certain amount, and he said, "Well, I will tell you; that loom is not going to pay any more. And, furthermore, I am going to start another job, and it is going to pay the same as this; and I don't have nothing to do with no more committees."

Then the committee was forced to go to the office. They got no satisfaction in the office. They attempted to leave the mill to hold a meeting. There are two divisions to that mill, one they call a back shop. In the back shop there are men and women working together; and in this back shop they locked the doors when they saw the men were leaving the looms to hold a meeting; they locked the door to prevent the hands from going out, but they finally had to leave them out because they would not go to their looms until they were let out. They would not return to their looms until the grievance was settled.

That was on April 18. The mill is still out on strike.

In the Augusta mill they are making a fight for a nine-hour day, and have been out since sometime in February; I don't know just exactly what date.

As far as the silk industry is concerned—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). If you are starting on another topic, we will desist until morning.

We will adjourn at this point until 10.30 to-morrow morning. Please resume the stand at that time.

(Thereupon at 5 o'clock p. m. on June 17, 1914, an adjournment was taken till June 18, 1914, at 10.30 o'clock a. m.)

PATERSON, N. J., *June 18, 1914—10 a. m.*

Present: Chairman Walsh, Commissioners Lennon and Commons; also William O. Thompson, counsel.

Chairman WALSH. Mr. Zuersher, will you resume the stand, please.

TESTIMONY OF MR. EDWARD ZUERSHER—Continued.

MR. THOMPSON. You may proceed with your statement, Mr. Zuersher.

MR. ZUERSHER. There has been a statement made by some of the witnesses that the manufacturers were willing to confer with the strikers at any time. The manufacturers were given this opportunity, but never took advantage of it. Their statement was that if the workers came back into the mills, the same as they went out, that they would treat with their own help individually. Such a state of affairs was not favorable to the strikers and they would not listen to anything of that kind.

Now, in regard to the ill feeling that was bred during the strike, there was one manufacturer in the city who has made himself the most unpopular man in the city of Paterson, and he still is to-day. That was Mose Straus, from Frank & Dugan. He took some of his girls together and told them that if they were to economize in their homes—he said there are lots of things wasted from their tables, thrown into the garbage cans, which could be used in order to keep down the high cost of living. He also told the girls in the mill that instead of them throwing a half pail of soup away, as is the custom of some of the girls who eat their lunch in the mills, if they was to send out for 5 cents worth of soup it would do for two girls. Some of the girls he said would throw away probably half of the soup. He said they could make a saving by one girl buying a pail of soup and dividing it with another girl, thereby saving $2\frac{1}{2}$ cents. He thought that was one of the causes of the high cost of living, and told them if they were more economical in their homes in regard to eating and not throwing things away, not causing so much waste, as he called it, probably they could reduce their cost of living. The strikers themselves took that as a great insult to them. It incensed them a great deal, and they seemed—the conclusions they drew from a statement of that kind was simply that he wanted to be enabled to make a bigger profit through their

savings; even if they had been economical in their homes, as he stated, he would have still been able to draw more profit from them than he would have been if they were wasteful. Through that statement he has made himself one of the most unpopular men in the city of Paterson to-day.

He also, at times when pickets were around the mill, would advise the policemen as to whom should be arrested, and usually the man that he pointed out was arrested.

Several of the manufacturers were sworn in as deputies and had the authority of making arrests.

Chairman WALSH. By whom?

Mr. ZUERSHER. By the city authorities, I believe.

Chairman WALSH. What were their names?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, I only remember one name, and that is Gustave Fisher, of the—I just forget the name of the firm, a ribbon manufacturer.

Chairman WALSH. From where did you derive your information as to the others?

Mr. ZUERSHER. From strikers who have been on the picket lines, saw their badges.

Chairman WALSH. Would you please give us their names, so our investigators may talk to them afterwards?

Mr. ZUERSHER. The strikers' names?

Chairman WALSH. Yes. Any person familiar with this matter, the names of the particular manufacturers who were sworn in, the names of the officials, and the name of the strikers?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I would have to refer to the data in the office, and give it to you afterwards.

Chairman WALSH. Please do that, and give it to our investigator, who will call on you.

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

There was a statement made, I believe it was by Dr. McBride, that the majority of the workers came out for a lark. That statement is absolutely false, because I don't believe you could get 25,000 workers out on a strike for 22 weeks of a lark; they would not have stayed 22 weeks out on a lark; they must have had some reason for staying out that length of time. The strike was not called for any immoral purpose, as stated here. The strike was called for the purpose of bettering the working conditions in Paterson, not only here, but elsewhere.

The main issue at stake was a shorter workday. Mr. Straus made a statement that in his mill there had been no grievances. Perhaps as he went to the individuals they would not state their grievances and—but when they came to our meetings they all stated their grievances, and every one of them were in accord with an eight-hour movement, and I know positively had the manufacturers at the time of the strike granted an eight-hour day the strikers would have thrown all other grievances aside in preference to the eight hours. We would not have asked for an increase in wages outside of eight hours had they but granted that.

There was a statement made here that some 40 houses had been stoned. Probably that is true. I will not dispute the statement, but I wish to state that they did not tell you that Lessig's house was stoned as well, who was then secretary of the local here. They did not make that statement.

At the time of the strike Beach Street was closed to all traffic.

Chairman WALSH. What street?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Beach Street. That is a street that leads in between the Colonial Ribbon Co. or the old Strange Mill and Doherty & Wadsworth's place. There are mills on each side of that street running the full length of the block. They had quite a lengthy picket line that morning, and the police closed the street to all traffic, would not let people go to their homes who lived anywhere near that street where they had to go through that street. That street was closed, I think, from the order of Capt. McBride.

On the police commission board during the strike there was a manufacturer, a silk manufacturer, by the name of Bailey, a commissioner on that board.

Chairman WALSH. How many members of the commission are there?

Mr. ZUERSHER. There are four members on the commission. And the mayor acts with the commission.

Chairman WALSH. Did the mayor have a vote on the commission?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I don't know positively whether he has a vote or not. There was a statement made that this was one of the most violent strikes in the city

of Paterson. That is not true. The strike of 1892, the dyers' strike, was by far more violent than any strike that has taken place in this city. That was a strike where Mulqueen and Grossman, I believe, were convicted for some part that they took in the strike.

Now, I make a statement right here, that if 25,000 clergymen had been on a strike with the same conditions facing them that had faced the strikers, that they would not have been any more peaceful than the strikers themselves. While there were isolated cases of assault; in my opinion, for a strike of that magnitude it was conducted very peaceably, as peaceably as could be expected from the elements we had to contend with. There have been a few cases of assault and battery, that is true, but we never counseled the workers to use any violence; and where there was violence used, in a majority of the cases it was caused through the arrogant stand taken by the police authorities. The statement was made that the outside agitators were responsible for bringing out the workers. Such a statement is not so, because a committee had worked for the last five years previous to the strike in organizing the workers quietly and establishing committees in all shops to get the feeling of the people to see whether they really wished to make a stand for better conditions or not, and it only required two or three men in each place to come to the conclusion that a strike was necessary in order to force the manufacturers to give them better conditions, and in that way the strike was ordered out. The call was issued first for the broad silk. The broad silk responded within three days, all broad silk mills were out. Then the dyers were called upon to come out, and last the ribbon weavers were then asked to come out.

The ribbon weavers sent delegates to the central body to discuss the proposition of a general strike among the ribbon trade, and each and every delegate presented grievances that he was instructed to present by his shop through a shop meeting; and every shop, including dyers, broad silk, and ribbons, came to one conclusion—that the eight-hour day should be the main issue. And with that in view, that established the fact that every worker who was out on strike really had a grievance, because there was not one worker who did not want an eight-hour day.

So you see that the outside agitators really had nothing to do in bringing about the strike any more than they acted as an advisory board or made speeches in enlightening the workers as to how they should organize, and so forth.

The statement was made by the manufacturers during the strike that if we organized in another organization outside of the I. W. W. they might treat with us. And I wish to cite a case of an A. F. of L. shop in Pompton, who were forced to strike nine months to get a nine-hour day and a slight increase in wages; showing you that they did not wish to treat with organized labor, no matter what organization they were affiliated with. So that the statement of the manufacturers was merely a ruse to disorganize the workers.

In regard to the meeting in the armory, the workers, I know myself, were told not to go near the armory at all, to keep away from it, that it was not called by the I. W. W., it was called by Golden and Mrs. Conboy and by the A. F. of L. organization. They were told not to go to the armory, to keep away from it. Still, we could not prevent them from going there. They went there by the thousands, and naturally they did quite some hooting and howling and showing their union books, and when they were told that our side could not be heard, Ewald Koettgen, organizer then of the I. W. W., advised the workers to go home, all of them, and probably a thousand left the hall and went to their own meeting place, where they discussed the proceedings of that night.

Now, in regard to the A. F. of L. Personally, I have no ill feeling toward that organization—that is, the rank and file. The only thing that I differ with in regard to the A. F. of L. is that they do not organize on the industrial plan; they organize in craft unions, while we organize in industrial unions.

The statement was made that the agitators were in this city merely for their own pockets—for their own profit. As a matter of fact, and I have records to prove that, some of the agitators had to wait for their pay. Pat Quinlan, we owed him a hundred and some odd dollars when he was sent to State's prison, and other agitators had to wait until some time when we had the money on hand to pay them. We always had money on hand, but it was strikers' money, and we did not care to use their money to pay any salaries. We always used our own money for that purpose; and I know from time to time different ones

of the speakers had to wait for their pay, and all they received for their services was \$3 a day—\$18 a week.

Now, in my opinion, when they make such remarks as to salaries, and so on, that the agitators are in it for the money, I wish to state that Gompers receives \$5,000 a year, according to my information that I have received, and I know if you will—I don't begrudge him the \$5,000 a year if he does any good, nor I don't begrudge Bill Haywood or Tresca or any other of the agitators their pay if they bring about better business conditions. It don't make any difference to me what pay these men have, if we have it to pay and they can accomplish anything. So far as graft is concerned, there was never any graft in our organization. That is simply newspaper talk. They have never proved any statement of graft, and our books are there to show it.

Chairman WALSH. It is a matter of irritation on the part of the workers to be told by the employers that their organizers steal money that way?

Mr. ZUERSHER. It certainly is. It did incense them a great deal, and they thought it was a great injustice for them to make such statements, especially in view of the fact that they knew that some of the manufacturers themselves were not above criticism in regard to honesty.

Chairman WALSH. You speak about an investigation. Was an investigation made by persons outside of your organization, or undertaken to be made, to find out what became of your funds?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I don't know of any investigation.

Chairman WALSH. The investigation you referred to is the investigation of the organization itself?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. The reason I am asking you, it seems that I saw published some place that certain citizens made an investigation of certain outside organizations.

Mr. ZUERSHER. I never heard of any.

Chairman WALSH. That is all right. Go ahead.

Mr. ZUERSHER. In regard to bombs that were thrown and houses that were blown up, as has been stated by some of the witnesses, very little damages ever occurred from any of these bomb outrages; and it was always the opinion of the strikers that these bombs had been thrown by O'Brien men or men affiliated with some sort of detective agency in order to get positions with the firms where the bombs were thrown, such as the different mills that they were stationed at, in order to make it appear to the manufacturers that their services were needed.

In regards to the wreck on the railroad, I don't know of any striker who has ever been accused of trying to wreck any trains. There have been no cases of that kind brought to court, and no one has been arrested as a suspicious character in that respect. And the train wreck that was to have taken place near Weidmann's was, in my opinion, engineered by O'Brien men, and it has been the opinion of all of the strikers, the consensus of opinion, that O'Brien men were at work in order to gain positions.

In regards to the police when they would disperse pickets, if we were to believe the statement made by Capt. McBride, it would appear that a police officer would come to the pickets and say, "Now, boys, disperse from here and get away," which was not the case. He did not come in that way. They generally came with a drawn club, and sometimes with curses on their lips, especially if there were a foreign element on the picket line, and told them to get out of there, and called them Waps and Jews and such names as that, which incensed the workers a great deal. While there was no extensive clubbing done by the police, it was due to the fact that there was no resistance offered to their orders. But while there was no clubbing done, they arrested indiscriminately at every instance.

Chairman WALSH. Have you a record of the number of arrests that were made growing out of the industrial disputes?

Mr. ZUERSHER. We have no record.

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Were any kept by outside organizations?

Mr. ZUERSHER. That I don't know—outside of the police department.

Chairman WALSH. You heard the statement of Capt. McBride, of the department. Would you say that was approximately correct? He seemed to have given it from the record of the police department.

Mr. ZUERSHER. I believe he stated 2,000.

Chairman WALSH. Two thousand four hundred, wasn't it?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, whatever his statement was, I am satisfied it was about correct. They speak of outside concerns not coming into the city of Paterson, because there was always an industrial war going on here—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Well, I want to ask you a question right there. Were the arrests all males?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No; there were females and males both.

Chairman WALSH. About how many women would you say were included there?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, I should judge probably about one-fourth of the entire arrests.

Chairman WALSH. And generally speaking, what were the charges against the women?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Unlawful assemblage.

Chairman WALSH. That is, they were arrested at meetings?

Mr. ZUERSHER. On picket lines.

Chairman WALSH. Principally on picket lines?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Principally on picket lines.

Chairman WALSH. Were any of them convicted—any of the women?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No.

Chairman WALSH. Go ahead.

Mr. ZUERSHER. The statement has been made that the cause of not having other manufacturing concerns coming into the city was due to the fact that there was continually a case of strike in the city, which is not so. The fact is that we had a board of trade in the city of Paterson composed of silk manufacturers and others who naturally did not want to see any other concern come into the city of Paterson which would draw the workers away from other places. For that reason they were opposed to any other concern outside of a silk concern coming into the city. Some silk concerns have located here, but outside of that no other industries have been allowed to locate in the city. That is from information we have received from offhand different sources. That is one of the reasons why the manufacturers are enabled to oppress the silk workers so easily. They have no means of getting into any other position outside of the silk.

I wish to state in regard to the piecework system in the silk mills, that is one of the systems which makes it hard to organize the workers. It makes it so you can not organize them unless you strike first and organize while they are on the strike. It makes it hard to keep the organization up, it don't matter whether it is the A. F. of L. or the I. W. W., due to the fact that if any of the workers are active in forming an organization, if they are first-class mechanics and the boss does not feel like he would like to get rid of him he gives him a very good job, where he can make more than the average weaver can make. The reason for that is this man naturally, if he gets a good position, will not do any agitating. He will keep quiet and let somebody else do it who has a poorer job and who has not so much to lose; and I believe if a law was passed to prohibit manufacturers from employing workers under a piecework system, that that would be one of the greatest remedies for the silk workers in general. Because under a piecework system years ago—20 years ago—a price was put on a job, so that a weaver knew what that job would pay before it was put in his loom. To-day he works probably a week or two weeks before he knows what is going to be received for that. The reason for that is that they watch the weaver to see how much production he can make on that loom, and then they regulate the price on the job according to the production he makes; and as a rule the price is never established so that he can make any more than \$3 a day, and he has to work his utmost to make it.

And I have often heard manufacturers state that \$3 a day was a fair day's working wages for a silk worker, which, in my estimation, is a poor day's work. They also use pacemakers on the piecework basis by giving good jobs and getting them to turn out as much as possible and then they will take that very same job, after it is run, out of that room and they will place it probably on a different floor with a different book on the loom and a different price in the book. They have discovered that the man could make—they have discovered, for instance, say, a man was to get \$4 a cut—that is, 10 yards; they call that a cut; and they find that a man could make 12 yards a day on that. Then they will take that job—after it is run they will take the harness of that job out of this loom and put into a loom on some other floor of that mill and reduce the wages so that the man could make \$3 or \$3.50 a day. And if that man individually went to the office and made complaint in regard to the price he was told that if he didn't like it he could quit; that there were lots of workers only too glad to come and take his place. And that was generally the answer of the manufacturers to the men who would individually complain.

At different times when shop meetings were held the manufacturer or superintendent or foreman or whoever it might be would tell the workers, "well, if there is anything wrong with anything in this shop I wish the weavers would come to me themselves individually in the office and I will adjust whatever grievances there are." Those things have been tried, and while in some cases grievances were adjusted, they were adjusted only until the man got his warps out and then there were no more orders for him. And there is one foreman in the city of Paterson who holds that no man in the ribbon trade has a position guaranteed to him any longer than his warps will last; and that he has the right at the end of the warps to tell the man there is no more work for him. Now, a set of warps should last six weeks or sometimes two months, and in that time a weaver can earn from \$100 or \$150 or \$175, according to the price paid on it. Those are all things that have been bred into the minds of the workers for the past 11 years; and as I said before, for the past 11 years there had always been discontent amongst the workers. It always seemed that they [employers ?] were never satisfied with the profits they were making. They were always after more, and at the same time if a weaver showed dissatisfaction why he was told that some one else could take his place and was only too glad to do so. I know of a case where they put in four or five new looms with new machinery—a Jacquard. All of it was new. And weavers put on those looms were given a very small price for the goods. When the weavers complained the manufacturer—that is, the manager—told them, "Why, who do you think is going to pay for that machinery? I can't pay you any more wages on that job; that machinery has to be paid for." Well, naturally we could only come to one conclusion, and that was that we were the ones to pay for the machinery.

And in regards to improved machinery, we don't object to improved machinery. We welcome improved machinery, if we can get some benefit from it outside of making the work easier or making it possible to produce more goods; but as a rule we never receive any benefit from any improved machinery they put into the mills. On the contrary, we get a cut in wages whenever there is a new method made on a loom. Instead of giving us a benefit from it the benefit is really taken away from us and the manufacturer gets the benefit instead of the worker. So that improved machinery does not help us. It only antagonizes the workers the more, because they can see themselves that they can produce more under the improved machinery; still they get less wages.

As I said before, 20 years ago 540 lines consisted a full loom. To-day we have looms with 2,000 lines, and the weavers receive 50 and 75 per cent less to-day than they did 20 years ago.

My father was a ribbon weaver. My home town is Yonkers, N. Y., and I remember plainly that he averaged \$90 a pay; that is, in two weeks. Those conditions existed at that time also in Paterson. To-day, for the same class of goods, you would hardly make \$30 a pay. If you made it, you would have to work very hard. To show you there has been a continuous reduction from 20 years ago until the present day.

I investigated last night as to a statement I made here yesterday in regard to Bamfort's, who used the contract system, and I am told that they still have that system in vogue in that mill, they still use that system. They hire a girl and get her to sign a contract for a year. She is to learn ribbon weaving, and she works there a year. In the meantime during that period the firm keeps 50 per cent of the wages she makes until the year is up. At the end of the year she is supposed to get this 50 per cent in a lump sum, but, as I stated before, as a rule, very few of them reach the time limit of a year. They are discharged for one thing or another. Of course, they do not receive the 50 per cent that has been held from them.

They also have a docking system in this particular matter. When a girl loses a pair of scissors, which she has paid for to the firm, she is docked a quarter. If a girl comes in with a torn apron, which is her own personal property, which does not interfere with her working, she is docked a quarter. If she should happen to be away from her loom, and the foreman sees her loom running and her not there, or her loom stopped and her not there, she is docked a quarter or whatever they feel like docking. If she comes in late, probably two or three minutes, she is docked an hour's pay. If the power should stop during the day for any breakdown or any cause from a breakdown, if it is stopped half an hour, they work half an hour overtime to make up for it but no extra pay for it.

Such conditions exist in that mill to-day.

Chairman WALSH. What mill is that?

Mr. ZUERSHER. The Bamfort mill.

There has been a law passed in this State prohibiting manufacturers from hiring girls under the age of 16 for more than eight hours a day. Bamfort Bros. discharged every girl who is under 16 years of age rather than keep her in there eight hours a day, and hired girls 16 or over and worked them 10 hours a day. Their reason for that is that they do not want to create any bad feeling between those who work 8 hours and those who are compelled to work 10 hours. They do not wish to have an 8-hour day established, and for that reason they discharged those girls and hire girls all over 15 or 16.

Mr. THOMPSON. What work do you do as secretary of your local?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I take care of the books of the local, collect the dues that is paid to the local, pay out the expenses of the local, and so on.

Mr. THOMPSON. Where you have shops organized and have shop committees that deal with the employees, do you keep in touch with those committees and have anything to say in their adjustments?

Mr. ZUERSHER. We have a meeting, what we call a delegate meeting, every Monday night. Those delegates are composed of committees from the organized shops, who come down and discuss the conditions of their shops and pass rules regulating their conditions.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you got any committees in any shops here or elsewhere that you know of where the committee in the shop has taken up with the employer the question of the adjustment of piece prices, cases where they require studies, and where studies have been made at the instance of both your organization and at the instance of the employer?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Oh, yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Or to try and work out what is the just and fair thing to do?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes; we have had committees that have done that, but they have never arrived at any satisfactory conclusion.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have those committees been in existence? How long did they work at it, and what methods, if you know, were employed?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Why, they would take, for instance, and compare with other mills, the prices of other mills, and they would take the highest-paid mill and figure their prices according to the highest-paid mill and present that as a basis to the firms, which, in most cases, has been refused. Now, in this city we have a mill that we consider pays the highest in the city, and that is Johnson & Colvin, in Riverside. In the United Ribbon Co., where I was a striker until I received this position, we made a demand for the Johnson & Colvin price list on a piecework basis. We had our jobs figured out so that we could demand—tell them exactly how much these jobs were to pay, and those demands are still pending. The strike is still on in this mill.

Mr. THOMPSON. Take a case where you have a mill organized, where you have your committees in good working shape; if any question comes up in regard to piece prices and it involves important study of the work, we will say, study of the operation, does your organization submit in that a joint grievance between your employer and your committee to study the operation?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have certain weavers do the work for a certain period of time?

Mr. ZUERSHER. We pick out probably three or five men who can do the figuring, and they meet with the firm and go over the figures and see whether they can arrive at any conclusion.

Mr. THOMPSON. And would this committee of your organization have a right to agree with the boss?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Take, for instance, three or four weavers, or a dozen, and say they work on piece work at a price for two or three weeks or a month, and then discuss whether the work was done fairly by the weavers; do they take the questions up and consider them and arrive at a conclusion?

Mr. ZUERSHER. We don't interfere with the workers in any particular mill as to what they shall do.

Mr. THOMPSON. Suppose a certain kind of work should come up and they should make this study with the employer and finally say, "This is the price for that piece of work; we have spent some time studying it and arrived at what we think is a fair plan. Now, this will stand for six months or a year." Would that be permissible under your organization?

Mr. ZUERSHER. We don't allow contracts to be made. That is, the organization does not allow contracts to be made, because we do not believe in the contract system, because the manufacturers, as a rule, never keep the contract, anyway, signed or otherwise.

Mr. THOMPSON. But the opposition to the contract system is really opposition to any time contract, but it would not include an agreement between this committee and the boss or manufacturers to make these experiments?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No; it would not include that.

Mr. THOMPSON. Anything like that that is a contract would be permissible?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes; that would be permissible.

Mr. THOMPSON. In other words, your objection is to time contracts instead of work contracts? For a year or six months during which you receive certain pay or work certain hours, or work under certain conditions; those you are against?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. But the other agreements to help make adjustments, help to determine prices are permissible; is that right?

Mr. ZUERSHER. That is right.

Mr. THOMPSON. In regard to the question of the outside agitators, have you an explanation of why they came in and of the reason that they stayed here?

Mr. ZUERSHER. They came in here at the instigation of the workers themselves; that is, the organization, and not only the organization but the workers who were not organized. And the reason they stayed here was that we held large meetings, sometimes numbering into the thousands, at which they addressed them. Their business was to educate them in the line of organization, also showing them that through organization they gain further power. And they stayed in the city during the biggest part of the strike for these purposes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were there any local leaders here at the time of the strike?

Mr. ZUERSHER. There were local men who were at the front, but very few of them took the platform outside of the secretary and the organizer.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, did the local leaders have the experience to handle a strike of the magnitude of this?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Oh, yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. They did?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Oh, yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Going back to the contract proposition again. As I understand you, this contract that might be made between a committee and the employer with reference to adjusting prices or making experiments, for that purpose, would be permissible, but any contract that would carry a definite term or a price or the hours of work—what would be the objection to it even though it be in writing, between an organization of yours and the employers, providing for the machinery to make this adjustment you have spoken of, of prices and wages, prices to stay in existence as long as the contract was in existence, but giving each side the right to terminate the contract on a minute's notice, or without any notice?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Such a contract would not be considered by the organization, because they would think it was valueless, because the manufacturer will not only break it but the workers themselves could break it.

Mr. THOMPSON. But it might be the means or the vehicle for carrying along this machinery as long as the parties both agreed, just as the protocol of New York is exactly that kind of a contract, terminated on a moment's notice by either side?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I don't suppose the organization would object to a contract of that kind.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, they are working under it in New York, and it simply furnishes the means to carry this machinery along. That is all.

Chairman WALSH. Prof. Commons would like to ask you a few questions.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did you state how many members are now in your organization in Paterson?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, we have about in the neighborhood of 3,500 members, but they are not all in good standing, due to the fact that this is a time of the year when the silker is really slack. Yet we don't press them for their dues, but as a rule the fall of the year or the latter part of July business starts to pick up and the men usually rejoin the organization, pay up their back dues. In good standing we have about between 1,300 and 1,500. What we call good standing is a man who has paid up his last month's dues.

Commissioner COMMONS. How many shops do you say you have organized?

Mr. ZUERSHER. We have probably about eight that are closed shops.

Commissioner COMMONS. And about how many employees in each shop, the total size of the shop, all classes?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, we have one shop of 130 weavers, I believe, and one with 45.

Commissioner COMMONS. What is the smallest?

Mr. ZUERSHER. About 40 is the smallest.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you include in those shops all employees? When you say it is closed, do you mean all classes of work?

Mr. ZUERSHER. It is simply closed to the weaving end of it, not to the quill winders and warpers, and so on; it is simply closed to the weavers.

Commissioner COMMONS. Loom fixers?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Loom fixers in some shops are organized in our organization, and in others they are not in any organization.

Commissioner COMMONS. Are those in the broad silk or ribbon?

Mr. ZUERSHER. In the ribbon.

Commissioner COMMONS. You have no organization in the broad silk?

Mr. ZUERSHER. We have in the manufacturing end of it. We have the members in the weaving end in our organization.

Commissioner COMMONS. Both in the broad silk and in the ribbon?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. How about the dye houses?

Mr. ZUERSHER. We have members, dyers, in our organization, as well.

Commissioner COMMONS. Dyers' helpers?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Dyers' helpers.

Commissioner COMMONS. Have you any closed shops in the dye houses?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No, sir; no closed shops.

Commissioner COMMONS. How do you enforce the closed shop?

Mr. ZUERSHER. A member not belonging to the organization can not get a job in that shop, but a member who should happen to hold an A. F. of L. card is permitted to work as long as his card is paid up and continues his dues in the A. F. of L. organization.

Commissioner COMMONS. How do you enforce the close shop?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, by having a man discharged if he does not live up to the rules of the organization.

Commissioner COMMONS. How do you get him discharged?

Mr. ZUERSHER. By holding a meeting and demanding his discharge. If it is not complied with a strike takes place until it is.

Commissioner COMMONS. There is only one agent, yourself, is there, to take care of that?

Mr. ZUERSHER. At the present, yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. When was the first I. W. W. organized here?

Mr. ZUERSHER. 1906 I think; I am not positive.

Commissioner COMMONS. Was that under the Chicago or Detroit faction?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Chicago faction.

Commissioner COMMONS. Chicago faction?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir; I believe both factions were together at that time, if I am not mistaken; they branched out afterwards.

Commissioner COMMONS. When would you say was the first one that distinctly belonged to the Chicago faction?

Mr. ZUERSHER. In 1908, I think.

Commissioner COMMONS. 1908?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. The distinction was made then?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. You heard the testimony regarding the differences between the two organizations?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. The Chicago faction, I think it was, Mr. Lessig testified to that?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did he state substantially the views of the local here? And the policy of the I. W. W.?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, that would be kind of a broad question to answer. I am not so positive that he stated correctly all the views of the local in connection with the policy of the general office.

Commissioner COMMONS. In the first place, you decline to make agreements?

Mr. ZUERSHER. We decline to make agreements.

Commissioner COMMONS. In the second place, you retain the right to strike at any moment?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. If you have lost a strike and you go back to work, do you practice sabotage?

Mr. ZUERSHER. All workers in the silk industry practice sabotage, no matter what organization they belong to. Even in the A. F. of L. organization they practice sabotage, probably knowing the terms of the word, knowing that they are doing it, but they are doing it just the same. I will show you an instance.

Before any of the silk mills were organized into the I. W. W. I remember a case of a man working in front of me one nice afternoon when the sun was shining bright and he wanted a day off. He had previously lost two or three days and knew that if he asked to get off he could not get off, so he took a screw driver and broke out the teeth of the rack that carries the shuttle back and forth. It does not take a half a day to fix it; it takes about 10 minutes to put the extra teeth in there, but probably half a day for the glue to dry out so as to be safe to run. In this way he got his half day off. That is what we call sabotage, but that is not a dangerous sabotage; that would be simply a modified form. We do not destroy property so that it can not be fixed. We may put machinery out of commission for the time being in order to gain our ends, but machinery is never destroyed so it can not be put back into its proper condition again.

Commissioner COMMONS. Under what circumstances do you advocate sabotage? Supposing you are working in a shop which is organized—a closed shop—what is your doctrine there about sabotage?

Mr. ZUERSHER. As a rule, it does not have to be applied in an organized shop so much as it does in a shop which is only partly organized—that is, probably three-quarters.

Commissioner COMMONS. Would there be occasion when you would have to use it in an organized shop?

Mr. ZUERSHER. There might be; if they would be too stubborn in regard to decisions we probably would resort to sabotage if we thought sabotage would win.

Commissioner COMMONS. Instead of going out on strike?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Instead of going out on strike.

Commissioner COMMONS. You would resort to sabotage?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. What other examples could you give of sabotage besides this one that you mentioned of breaking the teeth?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I have known them to do the same thing with the shuttle. The shuttle has the teeth, too, that go into the teeth of the rack, made of some kind of compressed paper, I believe; sometimes they are made of some kind of hard wood; break the teeth out of that and it would take probably half a day before it could be put back in a loom. Sometimes they would probably have a smash on purpose so that a warp would have to be turned over to the other end in order to get the course which separates the ends, so that it could be twisted on again and put in shape. In that respect they would gain half a day's time.

In regard to stopping an entire mill, if it was necessary to gain a point that we were having in dispute, why, the use of emery dust could be applied into the oil cans which oils the shaftings and in that way, within half an hour's time, the shaftings would cease to work. It would probably take the firm a half day or day or two or three days in order to get the shafting in condition to run.

Those are methods that could be used, but have not been used so far.

Commissioner COMMONS. Has your organization discussed these methods in its meetings?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, some of the members of the organization have discussed those methods, but have never come to any conclusion as to when they should use them or as to whether they should use them.

Commissioner COMMONS. You spoke about your meeting men who did not belong to your organization—seeing them practicing sabotage. Did they do it as an organization?

Mr. ZUERSHER. They done it as an individual.

Commissioner COMMONS. For what purpose? To get some individual advantage?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, not exactly that. It mostly has been done to get a day off or half a day off.

Commissioner COMMONS. Now, your method seems to be somewhat different from that then. It is not an individual proposition then?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, I am speaking of where we have grievances. My method is where we have grievances, but can not be adjusted in any other way. Commissioner COMMONS. Then you practice collective sabotage?

Mr. ZUERSHER. That is it.

Commissioner COMMONS. All of you?

Mr. ZUERSHER. All of us.

Commissioner COMMONS. To your knowledge, have any of your members practiced individual sabotage?

Mr. ZUERSHER. That I don't know.

Commissioner COMMONS. The matter has been talked over in your meetings, but you have taken no action?

Mr. ZUERSHER. We have not taken any action in regard to using it.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you understand that in subscribing to the constitution and by-laws, or paying dues to your organization, that a person thereby accepts the principle of sabotage as a method of conducting this struggle?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I do not.

Commissioner COMMONS. All members, then, have freedom of opinion on that, then, do they?

Mr. ZUERSHER. They have.

Commissioner COMMONS. A man does not need to subscribe to sabotage?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Has it every been acted upon by your national organization in any way? Has there been any stand taken on that?

Mr. ZUERSHER. That they should abide by that principle.

Commissioner COMMONS. That sabotage is the proper method or substitute for a strike?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes; they have, but any member joining the organization does not have to use it if he does not feel like it.

Commissioner COMMONS. Has it been adopted by the national organization?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Oh, yes.

Commissioner COMMONS. But sabotage—

Mr. ZUERSHER. It is not a local affair. It is national.

Commissioner COMMONS. So that when a person joins I presume the constitution is explained to him?

Mr. ZUERSHER. They are given the constitution to read, and after they read it, if they join, naturally we imagine that they know the contents of the constitution and agree with it, but we don't ask them whether they do or not.

Commissioner COMMONS. It was stated by one of the witnesses, and I think he represented your organization, that as a last resort it might be necessary to blow up a factory. Would that be called sabotage?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, you could term it in that way. If you wish to construe it in that way you could say it was sabotage.

Commissioner COMMONS. I just wanted to see how you would construe it.

Mr. ZUERSHER. I don't know that I would put any construction on it; that is, relating to sabotage.

Commissioner COMMONS. Sabotage, as I understood from you, is a minor injury which can be corrected within a few hours, is that it?

Mr. ZUERSHER. That is it.

Commissioner COMMONS. Blowing up a factory would, according to that definition, not be sabotage?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No, sir; not in the broad sense. I would not consider it as such.

Commissioner COMMONS. But, at any rate, you do not make any distinction which can be remedied within a short time, or one that might throw the whole works out of commission, like the blowing up of a factory?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I would make a distinction between those two. One I would term sabotage; the other, I don't know what you could term it outside of saying that you blow up a mill. There is not any term that we use for that purpose.

Commissioner COMMONS. Has your national constitution any term that would cover blowing up a mill?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Not that I know of.

Commissioner COMMONS. You understand that that is one of the beliefs of the organization, that it is legitimate or proper—I won't say legitimate, because you don't believe in using the Government, I understand, to enforce anything—but that it is a proper mode of warfare. Is there any principle that would recognize blowing up a mill as a part of the scheme?

Mr. ZUERSHER. That I couldn't state. I don't know whether there is or not.

Commissioner COMMONS. Were you one of the executive committee during the strike?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I was.

Commissioner COMMONS. At what time was that executive committee organized?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, about the same time as the strike took place; part of it was organized weeks before.

Commissioner COMMONS. At what time did you make your engagement to bring one of those outsiders in first?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I believe about a week before the strike took place.

Commissioner COMMONS. Whom did you engage at that time?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I believe it was Patrick Quinlan and Haywood, if I am not mistaken, or Tresca.

Commissioner COMMONS. Two were engaged a week before the strike?

Mr. ZUERSHER. That is, they were told to come on a certain date.

Commissioner COMMONS. On a certain date?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. When did you take up with the third one?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Probably a week or so later.

Commissioner COMMONS. There were three that you had, Quinlan, Tresca, Haywood. Were there others that you had?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Miss Flynn.

Commissioner COMMONS. When did you contract with her to come?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I am not so sure about when, probably around about in the same neighborhood. I believe all of them were engaged within a month's time.

Commissioner COMMONS. But all of them stayed there until the end? That is, along until June or July?

Mr. ZUERSHER. July.

Commissioner COMMONS. Until July?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. What did you say was the compensation that you paid them?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Eighteen dollars a week.

Commissioner COMMONS. And expenses?

Mr. ZUERSHER. And expenses back and forth to New York. They mostly always came from New York; we allowed them wages extra for that.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did you yourself take part in making speeches?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I did at times.

Commissioner COMMONS. About how many speeches did you make?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, that I can't remember. I have made quite a few. I couldn't just exactly say.

Commissioner COMMONS. You were secretary at that time?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No, sir; I was not secretary at that time.

Commissioner COMMONS. You were not on salary?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Were you present at the first meeting there, three or four days that the police—

Mr. ZUERSHER. I was not at that meeting at all. I was still working at that time.

Commissioner COMMONS. You have heard all of them make speeches, have you?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Oh, yes.

Commissioner COMMONS. What languages did they use?

Mr. ZUERSHER. In what respect do you mean, what language?

Commissioner COMMONS. I mean Italian or English?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, they talked in Italian and English. We had German speakers, we had Polish speakers; those would generally volunteer to make an address from time to time.

Commissioner COMMONS. Local people?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir; but the Italian was Tresca.

Commissioner COMMONS. Could you understand what Tresca said?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No, sir; I could not. I have often had it explained to me by Italian members. If I saw hearty applause I would want to know what was said because of the applause, and sometimes it was explained to me.

Commissioner COMMONS. What did they report to you that he said; some of the things?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Why, it was mostly on the belief of one big union and talk along that line, along organization lines.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you understand that he advocated sabotage?

Mr. ZUERSHER. That I couldn't say. I never heard any of the Italian people say he did advocate sabotage. He may have, but I don't know that he did.

Commissioner COMMONS. Did you hear the others advocate sabotage?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I heard one speaker advocate it, Sumner Boyd.

Commissioner COMMONS. Sumner Boyd?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Haywood?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Not that I know of. I don't remember of him ever advocating sabotage.

Commissioner COMMONS. Miss Flynn?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I never heard Miss Flynn.

Commissioner COMMONS. Or Quinlan?

Mr. ZUERSHER. That I couldn't say. I don't think he did.

Commissioner COMMONS. It is not your understanding, then, or your belief, that any of them advocated sabotage?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Not to my knowledge, outside of this Sumner Boyd.

Commissioner COMMONS. He was the only one who advocated sabotage?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. Was there an attempt made to settle the strike with a few of the members, few of the employers, after two or three months, and the organization then took the ground that it would not settle unless all would settle?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, no; the organization did not take that stand. The strike committee took that stand, which was composed of men belonging to the organization and men who did not belong to the organization. They were about equally divided, and they took the stand that a shop-by-shop settlement was out of the question. They put that proposition to a referendum vote of the entire strikers, and the proposition was voted down by the members that were on strike. That includes also the I. W. W. and the members who did not belong to the organization at all.

Commissioner COMMONS. About how large a vote was cast?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I believe there was about 9,000 votes cast.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you remember the vote?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I couldn't state the vote; I don't remember it.

Commissioner COMMONS. Was it a majority?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I know there was quite a majority against settling shop by shop.

Commissioner COMMONS. What was the reason for not settling?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, I suppose they did not believe in a shop-by-shop settlement at the time. They thought they could hold their ranks better by staying solid. One of the reasons was that if one shop was to settle individually, even though they got their demands, that other workers would be jealous of seeing this one shop working and there may be a break in the ranks, and for that reason I believe that the majority of the workers felt they should not have a shop-by-shop settlement.

In that conclusion I wish to state personally that to-day a big majority of the workers realize that they made a mistake in not settling shop by shop when they first came out. That is, there were some shops that, when they were called out on strike, especially in the ribbons, who would grant an eight-hour day and an increase in wages; but, as I said, the workers would not stand for a shop-by-shop settlement at that time, but to-day they realize they made a mistake by not doing that.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you know at what time that vote was taken?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I think that was some time in July; the first part of July or the latter part of June.

Commissioner COMMONS. The strike had been long advanced then?

Mr. ZUERSHER. That is the time that that proposition came up.

Commissioner COMMONS. Hadn't it come up before that?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Not to put it to a vote; it might have been discussed, but there were never any motions made either one way or the other in regard to that until around June or July.

Commissioner COMMONS. When did the strike committee first consider that proposition?

Mr. ZUERSHER. In the latter part of June or July.

Commissioner COMMONS. That was the first time?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner COMMONS. That it was presented to them?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes.

Commissioner COMMONS. Have you kept a record of your wages for the last 11 years that you averaged working?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I have not exactly kept a record, but I know pretty near what my average was.

Commissioner COMMONS. You have worked at ribbon weaving all the time?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes.

Commissioner COMMONS. About 10 years ago what would you earn in the best week you would have?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Probably \$30; \$25.

Commissioner COMMONS. And prior to the strike what could you earn in the best week?

Mr. ZUERSHER. This last strike?

Commissioner COMMONS. Yes?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, \$15 was considered the best.

Commissioner COMMONS. What was the highest that you did actually earn?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I have run as high as \$20, but never any more.

Commissioner COMMONS. And 10 years ago the highest that you drew was—

Mr. ZUERSHER (interrupting). Twenty-five or thirty; I have drawn thirty.

Commissioner COMMONS. Thirty.

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir; that is, in one week.

Commissioner COMMONS. Take the lowest week, when you worked a full week prior to this strike, what would you get?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, I have gone many a full week without getting anything.

Commissioner COMMONS. Why?

Mr. ZUERSHER. That is one of the systems in the silk trade to-day which makes it all the more acute. A man starts up a loom; that is, when he is getting a new set of warps in a loom, he is supposed to start up that loom until he has a holdfast, when the ribbon comes from the top to the bottom so that it can be run around the bottom reel, runs into a box. He has to work until he has that holdfast made without receiving any money. Sometimes, on a very particular job, very complicated job, it would take a man a week in order to start his loom. For that he receives no wages. And that yard of goods that he wove he didn't receive anything for that, because half of it would be cut away as not good. Still he would receive no wages for it. Sometimes a job of that kind would pay, probably, \$6 or \$7 for 10 yards. There would be 70 cents of goods that you have woven that you would not get anything for, besides losing your week's time in starting up this loom.

They take the position that the wages would make up; that we make up for the week's wages you lose.

Commissioner COMMONS. Are there many instances where it takes as long as a week?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Not many, but a majority of the looms it takes two and three days.

Commissioner COMMONS. Takes two and three days?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir. I don't know of any of them that can be started earlier than half a day, and that is what we call a remount, where the same class of goods goes immediately into the loom when the other side go out, and the twistors; it probably takes them two or three hours to twist into the looms again, according to the amount there is on the loom.

Commissioner COMMONS. That was the case 10 years ago?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir; and it is to-day. That is one of the big faults in the silk industry.

Commissioner COMMONS. Does this four-loom system make it more intense?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I am only speaking in regard to ribbon. I don't know much about the workings of the broad silk in that respect.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you have means of finding out what the wages of the dyers are?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I have.

Commissioner COMMONS. Dyers' helpers?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I have. I believe between \$8 and \$9 a week and some receive \$10. There was a statement made by Lotte that the dyers receive \$15.60 a week, he said, I believe. He did not say how long they worked for that \$15.60, how many hours, and from investigation I find that some of them work 15 and 16 and 12 hours a day. And through that overtime they are able to make \$15.60 a week.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you know the prevailing rate per hour for dyers' helpers?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I believe it is 20 cents an hour.

Commissioner COMMONS. That is all I have.

Commissioner LENNON. Will you tell us as to the wages that are paid to weavers in the best shops in the city, how much per yard, in the ribbon branch?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, that all depends on what kind of goods they are making. A price averages anywhere from 20 cents a yard to \$1 a yard.

Commissioner LENNON. That is the best?

Mr. ZUERSHER. The dollar a yard is what we call a plaid, which requires four or five shuttles of different colors.

Commissioner LENNON. What would be the wages in mills that pay the least wages in the city? Suppose they make one of the same kinds of goods, what would they pay?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Their goods would not be exactly the same. They would make a cheaper or an inferior grade, but they would pay considerably less than they would do on the good grade. It would make a greater reduction than really they should make.

Commissioner LENNON. I want to discover for myself and for the commission as to the difference in wages paid for the same amount of work, and its effect upon the content and discontent of the workers. That is what I am after. Now, I want to ascertain what the best wages are that are paid in some of the best mills; and then, if you can tell us, what the wages are in mills that pay the lowest prices?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, in the best mills, I will cite one mill as the best, and that is Johnson & Colvin. A man can probably make from \$30 to \$45 in two weeks; but then, of course, there is always to be considered the loafing time after a man has woven out a set of warps until he gets another set in. Sometimes they have to wait a week, two weeks; sometimes three weeks before they are again to start at work.

Commissioner LENNON. How about the poorest place?

Mr. ZUERSHER. In the poorest place a man would probably receive from \$18 to \$25 in two weeks.

Commissioner LENNON. Does the difference in wages, as applied to weavers, apply to the other departments of the mills as well? That is, in the best mill, do they pay everybody the same?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Not the poorer mills; everybody lower; the employees in the other branches of a mill receive about the same in all the mills.

Commissioner LENNON. About the same.

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. And they work by the week, then, I presume?

Mr. ZUERSHER. They work by the week.

Commissioner LENNON. What proportion of women are employed in the industry in this city, do you think?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, it is my opinion, about half.

Commissioner LENNON. About half?

Mr. ZUERSHER. About half are women.

Commissioner LENNON. Are there any girls employed under 16 years of age?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, there have been until this present new law. I don't know whether they have been discharged since or not, but I know there are any number of them who are below 16 years of age.

Commissioner LENNON. Is there any arrangement made whereby the young people who are in the mills are given opportunity for education in night schools or vocational schools by the school system of this city?

Mr. ZUERSHER. There is a system of night schools, but it is not compulsory. They do not have to go if they don't feel like it.

Commissioner LENNON. Do they teach anything in that night school that has to do peculiarly with the trade of making silk?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. Simply the ordinary——

Mr. ZUERSHER (interrupting). The ordinary teaching that they have in the ordinary schools.

Commissioner LENNON. You have nothing in the way of vocational schools in this city?

Mr. ZUERSHER. They have a school that teaches warping and weaving, but the rank and file of the silk workers do not look with favor upon this school.

Commissioner LENNON. I want to ask something about it. Who runs this school?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I don't know who runs it.

Commissioner LENNON. Is it a private institution?

Mr. ZUERSHER. A private affair.

Commissioner LENNON. Is it not under the public-school system?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No, sir; it is a private affair.

Commissioner LENNON. In the I. W. W. do you organize local unions of weavers, entirely weavers?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Oh, no. We organize our workers into one union. We have no branches. That is, we do not organize in branches.

Commissioner LENNON. You have no weavers' union?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. You have no dyers' union?

Mr. ZUERSHER. No, sir.

Commissioner LENNON. All the people in one mill are in one union?

Mr. ZUERSHER. In one union. Of course, they decide their own affairs separately; that is, if they have any grievances, the dyers among themselves, they decide what shall be done in regard to the grievance.

Commissioner LENNON. Would the I. W. W. approve of a law by the State of New Jersey or by the United States looking toward intervention by conciliation or mediation or possibly arbitration of trade disputes?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I don't think they would.

Commissioner LENNON. Has the matter ever been discussed in your meeting that you recall?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I believe arbitration has been discussed and it has been rejected.

Commissioner LENNON. You spoke of one mill where contract child labor was in existence. Is there but one of those mills so far as you know, just one?

Mr. ZUERSHER. So far as I know that is the only mill. That came to our notice during the big strike.

Commissioner LENNON. I wish you would, when you are in your office and have the time, send to this commission a real comparison of wages paid to the different classes of employees in the best mills in this city and in the mills that pay the lowest price in this city.

Mr. ZUERSHER. All right.

Commissioner LENNON. And if you would, I would like to have you have it verified by some other officers in your organization.

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would like to ask you, are you a member of the Socialist Party?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes, I am.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, in your view, you believe in political action in attaining economic ends?

Mr. ZUERSHER. I do.

Mr. THOMPSON. You do?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And in that respect at least, you——

Mr. ZUERSHER (interrupting). I differ with the constitution of the organization.

Mr. THOMPSON. And with respect to the question Mr. Lennon asked you when you said the organization would probably not indorse a United States law dealing with the economic questions or conditions, you are referring to your organization and not to your own views?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Well, partly. I myself don't believe in arbitration.

Mr. THOMPSON. I mean in regard to the United States laws. As a Socialist, you believe in law?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. You believe in an eight-hour law, for instance?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And, personally, when you answer these questions you simply spoke from the standpoint of the organization?

Mr. ZUERSHER. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are there any other members of your organization Socialists, if you know?

Mr. ZUERSHER. There are quite a few.

Mr. THOMPSON. In Paterson?

Mr. ZUERSHER. In Paterson.

Mr. THOMPSON. And so far as they are, of course, they adopt the philosophy of Socialism as a means of political action?

Mr. ZUERSHER. During our recent election for mayor, Robert H. Fordyce, Robert Rowe, and Gordon Demarest ran. Fordyce on the Republican ticket, Robert Rowe on the Democratic ticket, and Demarest on the Socialist ticket. Previous to this election our vote in the city of Paterson was probably 1,500. This election took place after the big strike. The Socialist vote climbed to the figure of 5,200, showing you that a great many of the members of the I. W. W. believe in political action.

As a matter of fact, I wish to state that one of the reasons why the I. W. W. does not believe in political action is due to the fact that the workers in general throughout the country have never received any benefits from laws made by either the national body or the State legislature. I remember that last year in the legislature of New Jersey there was a bill introduced for a nine-hour day. It passed one house and went to sleep in the Senate. I spoke to Senator McGinnis, of this county, in regards to a law by Congress for an eight-hour day, and I believe it was his opinion that if such a law was passed by Congress it would be declared unconstitutional by the Supreme Court.

I also wish to cite a case to you in regards to the United Mine Workers, which Haywood was the head of at the time. They tried to have a State law passed for an eight-hour day. I believe there was one passed, and the courts declared it unconstitutional. Later on they tried again and I believe the second law was passed, and it was also declared unconstitutional. Then the miners decided that the only possible way that they could get an eight-hour day was to make a law themselves and live up to it themselves. And they did in their meeting pass a motion that from a certain date they would work no longer than eight hours. And they put that into effect, and I believe they gained an eight-hour day through that method.

That is one of the reasons why the I. W. W. does not believe in political action, and has no feeling of assurance that any political party will ever help them to gain a better condition.

Commissioner LENNON. May I correct you so that you won't make that mistake again. Mr. Haywood was never at the head and never was a member even of the United Mine Workers.

Mr. ZUERSHER. It may be the Western Federation of Miners. That is what I meant.

Commissioner LENNON. Yes.

Chairman WALSH. That is all. Thank you.

Mr. ZUERSHER. I wish to extend an invitation to the commissioners, if they should be in the city to-night. Mr. Dunn has spoken of Carlo Tresca as one of the most notorious crooks in the country to-day. This evening Carlo Tresca will address a meeting, a protest meeting for Pat Quinlan, to be held at 90 Market Street, Institute Hall, at our headquarters, where the commissioners themselves can see this notorious crook, so claimed by Mr. Dunn, in action. I extend that invitation to the commission.

Chairman WALSH. That is all for you.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Cooke take the stand.

TESTIMONY OF MR. JAMES W. COOKE.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will you give us your name and your address?

Mr. COOKE. James W. Cooke, 152 Market Street.

Mr. THOMPSON. And your business, Mr. Cooke?

Mr. COOKE. Treasurer of the John W. Ferguson Co., building construction.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you been in Paterson several years residing?

Mr. COOKE. About 40.

Mr. THOMPSON. Both residing here—

Mr. COOKE (interrupting). Sir?

Mr. THOMPSON. Both residing here and having business here?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are you the former president of the Charity Organization Society of Paterson?

Mr. COOKE. I am one of the former presidents.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you the president at the time of the strike last year?

Mr. COOKE. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You were not?

Mr. COOKE. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You were here during the strike?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are you one of the active members of the association?

Mr. COOKE. I have been a director right along.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, Mr. Cooke, you may tell us in your own way, briefly your way, of the causes of the strike last year in Paterson, and your view also of the method that was carried on and conducted by the strikers and also the action of the police and other authorities.

Mr. COOKE. As to the causes, I believe it was principally due to the outside agitators coming here, which made it a notable strike. I think if it had been left to the settlement of the local parties interested it would not have lasted any such length of time, or produced any such bad results in the city in the way of business that the merchants lost and loss of wages by the employees.

Mr. THOMPSON. Just at this point, Mr. Cooke, if I may interrupt with a question. Mr. Zuersher who was just on the stand testified, if I remember it correctly, that they sent for Mr. Haywood and these other outside men, two or three of them, a week before the strike was announced, in order to lead it and conduct it. Would that fact, if it were a fact, change your view as to whether or not the strike was caused by the coming in of outside people?

Mr. COOKE. No; because I don't think it was necessary to send for those outside agitators. I think they had men here who could have conducted it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, assuming that the men here could not conduct the strike, do you still think there would have been a strike?

Mr. COOKE. I think there would have been a strike; yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, what do you think were the underlying causes of that strike, if you have an opinion on that subject?

Mr. COOKE. I don't think there was any special condition of dissatisfaction or unrest. Of course I am not personally familiar with the conditions in the silk business, but, taking the conditions of the city generally, the silk business had been—it was a matter of general knowledge that the silk business had been in poor shape for a number of years. It was slack and prices were poor, but I don't think that the fact that the savings banks had large deposits and a large number of accounts, the fact that for 10 years since the fire here, or 12 years, for instance, the number of theaters had increased from about 3 to 13 theaters and moving-picture places, those are largely supported by operatives in the mills, and I can not see that there was any special reason for dissatisfaction among the silk workers as a whole. There were undoubtedly conditions in some few of the mills which were unfair, but I can not see why they could not have adjusted those among themselves.

Mr. THOMPSON. There were about 20,000 or 25,000 people out on strike, I understand?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And they stayed out for many weeks—from along in February until along in July. Is that correct, Mr. Cooke?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, you say the savings banks have a lot of money on deposit for the workers?

Mr. COOKE. Why, the savings banks here have about \$24,000,000 of savings-bank deposits. They have about 80,000 individual accounts. In talks with the officers of the banks I am told that while there were considerable drafts during the strike, that there were comparatively few accounts closed out—mostly those that were closed were depositors who left the city, and since the strike was closed, since the strike has been over, they have practically regained all that they lost during the strike. That seems to me to show that they have resources and could not have been in a tremendously impoverished condition.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, how do you account, if you have that view, that these workers stayed out of work so many weeks if the conditions generally were good?

Mr. COOKE. Why, I think it was mental or social intimidation.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, who would there be, in your opinion, or who was there at that time to exercise that intimidation over so many thousands of workers?

Mr. COOKE. Those who belonged principally to this organization who were being urged on by the agitators.

Mr. THOMPSON. You think that was sufficient to keep these people out of work?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir; I think it was.

Mr. THOMPSON. Generally speaking, it has been testified here both by the mill owners and by the laboring people that the wages ran from \$9 to, say, \$20 a week for weavers. Do you believe that those men and women who had been earning not much less wages, or as much in some cases, would stay out of work for some time just on the leadership of the few men? I just want to get your views. [Question not fully audible.]

Mr. COOKE. Yes; I do; under the pressure that was brought to bear I think they would do that. Of course they had considerable help while they were out.

Mr. THOMPSON. It has been stated here by Dr. McBride, who was then mayor of the city, that in many mills the hours were long, and the work was hard, and the pay was small; and that, in his opinion, that furnished a sufficient number of people who felt that conditions were wrong—right down in them—and that when these agitators came along they naturally looked to them as the leaders—he did not say so—but who, in effect, would lead them out of the wilderness. You would not concur in that?

Mr. COOKE. No; I would not quite concur with that. I think there were cases where that was true, but not generally. I do not think in general that that was the condition.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, what percentage would you say of the workers were in that condition?

Mr. COOKE. Well, perhaps 15 or 20 per cent of the workers might be.

Mr. THOMPSON. And the other 85 or 90 per cent might have stayed on, but their basis for helping them along was a psychological feeling—

Mr. COOKE (interrupting). Well, it is human nature to be dissatisfied and to think they might get something better, and they went after it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, some of these 85 per cent, then, might have been dissatisfied with their conditions?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. But, in your opinion, the dissatisfaction was a surface dissatisfaction rather than deep down, is that it?

Mr. COOKE. Yes; I think that is fair—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). That is not really a cause for the dissatisfaction, but just a notion that they should be dissatisfied?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the action taken by the strikers? Was it an orderly strike, considering that there were 25,000 men out, or was it disorderly as compared with other strikes?

Mr. COOKE. Well, I think the fact that we got along without bringing the militia here is an indication, where a strike is of such magnitude and lasted such a length of time—I think that is an indication that it was not an unusually disorderly strike. At the same time, anyone here in the city knows that the police ambulance, or patrol wagon, was on the street at all hours and at all times during the daytime and probably at night—and you could see evidences of crowds collecting around the mills, particularly at quitting time. I have noticed it at night when I was on the way home—anywhere in the neighborhood of a silk mill there would be a crowd.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, if I understand you correctly, Mr. Cooke, as compared with times when there was no strike, it was of a disorderly nature?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. But compared with other strikes you have heard of or read about or seen where 25,000 people have been out on a strike for three or four months, it was an orderly strike?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And that is the opinion you want to give to the commission?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What would you say with reference to the action of the authorities as you saw it and as you heard of it?

Mr. COOKE. I think the police handled the strike splendidly in the preservation of order.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, with reference to the closing of the halls for a couple of months, which Capt. McBride spoke about yesterday, how did you view that action, or did you take any interest in that at all?

Mr. COOKE. I viewed that as justifiable action under the circumstances.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you view it, however, as a legal or illegal action?

Mr. COOKE. Why, strictly speaking, it would be considered a denial of liberty.

Mr. THOMPSON. And of the right of free speech?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And you thought that it was justifiable to close the halls, nevertheless?

Mr. COOKE. I did; yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. From your point of view, what was the justice, or the cause, which made it seem justifiable?

Mr. COOKE. Why, I think the good that was to be gained to the community by stopping this disorder and instigation to trouble and stoppage of work and all the mills which followed it justified the restriction at that time.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then looking at it from the ends that should be attained, social peace and quiet, you felt that this slight infraction of free speech and liberty was justified?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. I don't wish to characterize that action, but just to show the comparison between what has been said here by yourself and others, that it would be a sort of mild political sabotage justified by the ends to be attained?

Mr. COOKE. I think there is all the difference in the distinction as to whether it is for a beneficent end or an evil end.

Chairman WALSH. I didn't quite catch that.

Mr. COOKE. I think the difference is, in one case it is for a beneficent end and in the other case it is for an evil end.

Chairman WALSH. Yes; that is, you consider it would be all right for the individual to pass upon the question of violating the law, with reverence to the end to be attained?

Mr. COOKE. Not an individual, no; the community.

Chairman WALSH. Well, then, the community; do you distinguish them from the men that were working in the mills; that is, others than the strikers, you mean?

Mr. COOKE. Why, I distinguish the city or the community from the individual strikers.

Chairman WALSH. Well, now, somebody has to act, of course, for the community; is that correct?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And in this case it would be the police officers?

Mr. COOKE. And the authorities over them.

Chairman WALSH. And the authorities over them; and you think, then, that it would be justifiable for them to set aside a law or to disregard or to violate a law, having in consideration the end to be attained, and that you would say that they could violate it, if the end was beneficial?

Mr. COOKE. I think there are such cases; yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. Well, then, do you think that this man who testified here or any of these men who testified that they would disturb property or destroy it are acting with any other attitude toward the law than what you ask these officials to act?

Mr. COOKE. I think there is a difference; yes, sir. I think the difference is that in one case they are working for an end to benefit the community, and in the other case they are working for an end to harm the community.

Chairman WALSH. But suppose the man thinks he is acting for the end of benefiting the community and he violates a law by blowing up a building. Do you think it should be submitted then to the arbitrament of the courts or to a jury as to whether or not the end was beneficial?

Mr. COOKE. I think you have got to be guided in that by the enlightened conscience of the majority.

Chairman WALSH. The enlightened conscience of the majority? Do you believe, Mr. Cooke—of course, every officer takes an oath to uphold the Constitution and laws as they are written, does he not?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. If he does not do that, do you believe that he commits a crime?

Mr. COOKE. Technically, yes; morally, probably there would be exceptions?

Chairman WALSH. Morally, there would be exceptions; but if he violates his oath of office, he commits a crime?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. And are there circumstances under which you would excuse the crime and allow the offender to go free?

Mr. COOKE. To my mind the American colonists in 1776 broke the laws of the country to which they were subjects, which was Great Britain; and among them there were men who held official positions and had sworn fealty to Great Britain. I think the event of that justified their rebellion. It seems to me that was a case where the end justified their overriding the law.

Chairman WALSH. Well, without going, of course, into the causes that lead up to the American Revolution, Mr. Cooke, I am going to ask you to specify, if possible, and answer my question directly. Do you believe that such a crime in certain instances should be excused and the offender allowed to go free; that is, where he has violated his oath of office by setting aside a written law of the State or Nation or failing to enforce it?

Mr. COOKE. I could imagine circumstances under which I would say that.

Chairman WALSH. In this day, to-day, in the State of New Jersey?

(No response.)

Chairman WALSH. Any other question?

Mr. THOMPSON. That is all.

Chairman WALSH. Just one other question: You say much assistance was given to the strikers. How much did the charity organization collect during the months of May, June, and July, if you can tell offhand?

Mr. COOKE. For the strikers?

Chairman WALSH. No; how much did it collect—your charity organization—

Mr. COOKE. Through May, June, and July?

Chairman WALSH. Through May, June, and July.

Mr. COOKE. I don't suppose it collected over \$400 or \$500.

Chairman WALSH. How much did it expend?

Mr. COOKE. Expended it all, but not for strikers.

Chairman WALSH. Were there calls from the strikers from the mills for assistance through your charity organization?

Mr. COOKE. Not collectively.

Chairman WALSH. Well, individually?

Mr. COOKE. Well, the charity organization society made no discrimination.

Chairman WALSH. Well, do you know whether any applied for it or not?

Mr. COOKE. I know that there was relief given to the children of the strikers.

Chairman WALSH. How much was expended in that way?

Mr. COOKE. Oh, probably not over \$100; but what I meant about the relief that they got was the relief that came from the outside through their own organization.

Chairman WALSH. Through their own organization?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir.

Chairman WALSH. From their fellow workers in other places?

Mr. COOKE. Yes, sir; and in that connection I would like to refer to the statement made here in regard to sending the children out of town, and that the matter fizzled out on the part of the authorities. The charity organization society was interested in that matter when it came up, and the superintendent thought that it would be a mistake to have them taken away, and that it was unnecessary; and he took the matter up with the mayor, Mayor McBride, and told him that any children that were in such condition—that is, where their parents were in such condition that they needed to send them away, that the charity organization society would see that they were taken care of here. And on the strength of that the mayor so notified them, and the leaders of the organization or the committee fixed a time when they would bring them down to the City Hall, and at that point of time the charity organization society had 20 workers here prepared to take the names and addresses and look up the cases and handle them in the regular way, and if we found relief was needed to give it. But they did not come around. There was nothing came of it at all. They did take some of the children out of town, but we did not consider it was necessary.

Chairman WALSH. That is all, thank you, Mr. Cooke.

TESTIMONY OF MR. JAMES STARR.

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Starr, will you give us your name?

Mr. STARR. James Starr.

Mr. THOMPSON. And your address?

Mr. STARR. 648 East Twenty-fifth Street.

Mr. THOMPSON. And your position?

Mr. STARR. Corresponding secretary of the Horizontal Warpers' Benevolent Association, and business agent also.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are located in Paterson, are you now?

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been located here, Mr. Starr?

Mr. STARR. About 23 years or 24.

Mr. THOMPSON. Were you associated with Mr. Morgan who was on the stand here?

Mr. STARR. Well, I know Mr. Morgan, and his organization and mine act sometimes in conjunction with one another.

Mr. THOMPSON. I did not get your last answer.

Mr. STARR. You asked me if I was associated with Mr. Morgan, I think, and I said, "Yes; in a way. But we have separate organizations."

Mr. THOMPSON. In what way are you connected? What organization do you say you are connected with here?

Mr. STARR. The Horizontal Warpers' Benevolent Association.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been connected with that association here?

Mr. STARR. Well, I was one of the starters of it over 20 years ago.

Mr. THOMPSON. You are pretty well acquainted, then, with the conditions in the silk mills around Paterson?

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You were here during the strike?

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. All the time?

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, you have heard the testimony given the last three days here?

Mr. STARR. Part of it.

Mr. THOMPSON. I would like you to tell us in your own words, as briefly as you can, the causes, in your opinion, that led to the strike—how you viewed the action of the strikers and the action of the police.

Mr. STARR. Well, in regard to the causes, I would state, first of all, that in my estimation the cause of most of the trouble was too many immigrants coming into the silk trade that did not thoroughly understand the workings of our organizations, or had not become Americanized, and the manufacturers hiring those foreigners at all kinds of wages; and after they had been here then for two or three or four or five years they become Americanized and want a little more than what they had been getting, what they had been hired for in the first place, and consequently they get discouraged and disheartened, and they get agitation going on for higher wages, and they want to come up to our American standard of living, and want to live better than they have been used to; and when the manufacturer finds out they are starting an agitation he tries to get rid of those men and supplant them with other foreigners, if he can do it, and in that way the agitation is kept going on. You might say, of course, why don't we try to organize them? Well, it is a hard proposition, in my estimation, to organize most of the foreigners that come over for several years. They are coming in so very fast that the manufacturers themselves can not find employment for them, even at the low wages. I would also state that I think they lack a great deal of education along industrial lines when they come to this country first. I was a foreigner myself—born on the other side. I had to learn a great deal when I came to America, and have learned a great deal; but some of those other people who come along here perhaps are not so adapted to learning as some others can do, and it takes them a long time to learn and get into American ways and ideas.

Now, in regards to the organization, we have tried a great many times since I have been in Paterson and have been connected with our organization to organize the foreigners as we find them and to make a good union man out of him, and also a good American citizen, if possible. In some cases it works and others it does not. The biggest majority, I should say, of the foreigners

can't see a form of organization whereby they won't be allowed to strike just as soon as they are organized. They have got some radical ideas in their heads, and until those radicals have been supplanted with others by some kind of organization that don't stand for such things as what they would like to have and like to have carried out we are going to have trouble going right on with those people. And I should say, if it was possible to organize the foreigners as they come into this country, I don't think we would have the amount of trouble or anywhere near the strikes that we have had or will have in the future.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you made any study, Mr. Starr, of the organization of foreigners in other places than Paterson?

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. In New York, for instance?

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. They are organized to a great extent in New York, are they not?

Mr. STARR. Well, partly. Well, of course, they organize—that is, in New York they have got mostly the clothing trade, the garment workers—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting.) Do you know that probably they have the same trouble with the influx of immigration there as you have here?

Mr. STARR. I would not say they have so much; no.

Mr. THOMPSON. As New York is the port of first entry?

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir; but the garment worker has generally worked at the trade on the other side, and they are good people anyhow, and most of these people that come here and go into the textile mills have not worked at the trade on the other side, so consequently I would say the garment workers get a great deal better general class of workers and people that come in into their trade than the textile workers into their trade.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then you believe that would be true of the Italians that come over here and go into the garment workers' trade in New York?

Mr. STARR. Well, I should say, generally speaking, yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You may go ahead, Mr. Starr.

Mr. STARR. Now, another thing that I have found in my experience in the silk industry in Paterson, and in dealing with the manufacturers, etc., we have got—of course some of the witnesses here on the stand I have heard testify would lead the commission to believe that a great number, in fact all the manufacturers, are not fit people to work for. I have not found it so. We have a large number of manufacturers in Paterson that I am doing business with, and have been doing business with a good many years in my official capacity, and I have found those men can be approached and that I can do business with them right along. But, on the other hand, I have found a number of others that can not be approached and who do not, in my estimation, treat their help with the consideration they ought to be treated with.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, would it be a fair deduction from what you have said, Mr. Starr, to say that certain classes of employees are more intelligent and can be organized, and that really there is no opposition on the part of a great many manufacturers to organizations; but that the lack of organization is due to the character of the employees?

Mr. STARR. Well, I would not say that it was due to the lack of character. I would say that it is due to the uneducated condition of the employees that have not been or have not had any drilling in organization work.

Mr. THOMPSON. I don't remember what you said about the exact part of the trade you were in—

Mr. STARR (interrupting). I said I would not say that it was because of lack of character—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). No, I don't mean that. But about what business you have—who are the people who work in your organization—your local?

Mr. STARR. The Horizontal Warpers' Benevolent Organization.

Mr. THOMPSON. And in dealing with them you have a great many bosses or employers who are very fair?

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. In those mills where your organization has its members are the weavers organized by your organization—I don't mean local, but general organization?

Mr. STARR. Not at present, so far as I know.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, where the bosses in those mills are disposed to be fair, as you say, what is the reason, specifically, that the weavers are not organized?

Mr. STARR. Well, that is something we have been trying to solve for the last 20 years and over; and I might say we have not solved the proposition yet as to why they are not organized.

Mr. THOMPSON. As a general proposition the weavers are relatively fairly intelligent, are they not?

Mr. STARR. Yes; fairly intelligent. Depends somewhat on the class of goods they are working on. Some weaves require a great deal of intelligence.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, Mr. Morgan stated the work of a weaver was rather trying work.

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes; it is.

Mr. THOMPSON. Requiring a great deal of attention?

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And a person of some intelligence?

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. And that he had to watch closely, and that to do that required attention and intelligence?

Mr. STARR. Yes, sir; I agree with him.

Mr. THOMPSON. And that his work was long, and so on. Now, taking the class of men, then, that do that class of work in these mills that you deal with, what, in your opinion, is the reason that your association or organization has not been able to organize them?

Mr. STARR. Well, they have been organized on several occasions. They have had maybe 20 or 25 organizations in the last 20 years, but the trouble has been to get them to see the necessity of organization. For instance, you get them organized and they get some better conditions than they have been having, and after you get them thoroughly organized and after you get a perfect union, then they begin to fall away in not paying dues, just as the gentleman here testified about the I. W. W., that they had about 9,000 and now they have about 1,300. They can not see the necessity of organization. They can see it just at the time, but to keep their dues up and paid and to keep up the organization to protect their trade they can not see it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now you may go ahead and state, Mr. Starr, what you consider were the causes of the strike.

Mr. STARR. Well, of course, I have stated some of the reasons, and will say this: I was talking about some of the manufacturers, and some of these manufacturers I know from my own experience that an organization can not approach them any more than the individual can. We have got manufacturers in town, and I know it—of course I don't know just for a positive fact at the present time, but there have been in the past—where they have got several price lists in their shop—that is, maybe they have got two or three prices in different parts of the shop on the same kind of a job—and as soon as these two or three men or women who are running these looms get together and they find out that one man is getting a cent or cent and a half a yard more for weaving the same goods than the other is getting, consequently there is going to be dissatisfaction, and they will get together and the first thing you know there is going to be trouble in that factory.

Mr. THOMPSON. How did the strikers conduct themselves during the strike?

Mr. STARR. Well, in my estimation I should say this, that owing to the large number of strikers out and most of them being of foreign birth—they were not really drilled into American ways, etc.—that they conducted themselves in a very good manner.

Mr. THOMPSON. What was the action of the police?

Mr. STARR. I consider the same thing applies to the police, considering what they had to contend with and that all these people were out on a strike and crowding on the street. I consider that the police behaved themselves admirably.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you know whether or not the strike resulted in any particular benefit either to groups of workers or to workers as a whole?

Mr. STARR. Well, I could not say so much on that, whether it done a great deal of good, on that.

Mr. THOMPSON. What sort of effect did it have on your organization?

Mr. STARR. On my organization I might state that while we were not on strike or interested in the strike, that as far as we are personally concerned we have had an advance in wages since the strike was settled; but that had nothing to do, so far as I know, with the I. W. W. strike.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. STARR. I would like to state also—I have heard the remarks of some of the different witnesses, if you will permit—

Chairman WALSH (interrupting). Yes; proceed, Mr. Starr.

Mr. STARR. Hearing the remarks of some of the different witnesses here in giving their testimony, I could not agree with them in a good many things they said. For instance, Mr. Katz, when he was on the stand here day before yesterday, he got to talking about the Henry Doherty Co., as Mr. Doherty seems to be the bone of contention in the four-loom question, etc. Now, I am not going to throw any bouquets at Mr. Doherty, but I will say this, that I have been dealing with him a great many years, and I have found out that he does recognize organizations and will deal with the union and union men on a fair and square basis. What I want to say is this: Mr. Katz made the remark that the A. F. of L. had stabbed them in the back, or something to that effect, in the strikes in the Henry Doherty shop. Now, I will take the commission back, if you will permit, to 1910, when we had a strike at that shop at that time and the United Textile Workers had a large number, perhaps half, of the weavers in the Henry Doherty shop organized and in their organization. There was some dispute arose in regard to wages and the weavers—the same as they generally do—took it in their own hands and walked out on a strike. The loom fixers and the twisters and warpers and the weavers at that time all belonged to the same organization and we had what is called a textile council, which is composed of five men from each organization. This textile council met and the matter was taken up of the Henry Doherty trouble with the weavers, and, because of the fact that the weavers had some kind of an agreement with the Henry Doherty factory at the time whereby they were supposed not to strike without they served notice on him before the strike, the council ordered them back to work. This was in 1910. But the council ordered them back to work and we took the matter up and got several price lists around the different parts of the country and in Paterson and on the outside, and succeeded in getting the weavers an advance in wages at that time. That settled that strike for the time.

In 1911—Mr. Katz spoke about that strike in the latter part of 1911 and the beginning of 1912. How that strike came about, if I remember right, was like this: The weavers in the Henry Doherty shop had still a grievance of the three and four loom question, and it was admitted that Mr. Doherty was paying more wages on the two-loom system than any other manufacturers, and I believe that is all right, because he was paying about 8½ cents for messaline when the others were paying about 7½ and 7. We took the matter up at that time. Of course, the organization of textile workers had dwindled somewhat, as I stated before. They would not pay their dues in the organization. Also the shop was not so strongly organized as in the previous strike of 1910. But we were strong enough to put a solid front up to Mr. Doherty; and Mr. Morgan and Mr. Doherty and myself went down there with the weavers and had several conferences, and after these conferences we agreed on an arbitration. Of course, the gentleman who preceded me did not believe in arbitration, and I do, when it comes to a question of that kind.

In the meantime Mr. Katz got in some of his henchmen or agitators in the Henry Doherty shop, and they went through the mill agitating for a strike, and telling them that the A. F. of L. and the United Textile Workers were too slow to belong to; and they wanted instant action. They wanted some union where they could go right out on a strike at any time; and nothing would do Mr. Katz but he must call a strike. And I might state that we had called a meeting and the matter was submitted to arbitration, and the arbitrators had had two meetings, I believe. Mr. Katz called a meeting on a Monday night, if I am not mistaken, and in that meeting they decided they would go on a strike on the following day, which, I believe, was Tuesday. I might be a little bit off on the dates, but I think I am right. Consequently they went down to the shop in the morning and struck the Henry Doherty shop, when the arbitrators in two days after, I believe, would have given their decision, and according to the case that we had—we had a very good case—and from the case that we had we thought we would get a decision in favor of the weavers. But no; they would not wait. They jumped out on a strike instead of waiting that two days. I don't think that Mr. Katz did right in that, because he knew he was going to divide that shop against itself, and he also knew, at the same time, when he was doing that that he could not do for these people what he promised them he was going to do. The strike went on afterwards for some

time. The loom fixers and the twisters, seeing Mr. Katz and this I. W. W. or Detroit organization had got the best of it and forced the strike in the Henry Doherty shop, and did away with this arbitration, we said our men should stay out of the work until such time as his came back. But they didn't all strike. And Mr. Doherty tried to get help from the outside, and succeeded to some extent.

We took the matter up with Mr. Doherty after that, and had several conferences, but we could not convince him on the four-loom proposition. He said he was satisfied to pay as much as anybody else, and give them the same conditions as anybody else, but no more. The strike went on for some time, and the weavers split amongst themselves. Then they came and made a Katz faction, and they made a U. T. W. faction, the United Textile Workers' faction, and when they came down here again in the hall at 184 Main Street, they had some pretty strong meetings amongst themselves, and could not agree. Consequently, there was a split amongst the weavers, and, I should say, about half of them went down to Henry Doherty and accepted his proposition that he made to them, and made terms with Mr. Doherty and went back to work. We told the weavers at that time that if they would stick together until the strike was either won or lost, we would hold our men out the same as they held out. But just as soon as the weavers went back to work we were at liberty to send our men back. And we met here the loom fixers' and twisters' organization, and our men sent word to meet him to have the same hours as the weavers, and they went back and the strike was settled. That is where Mr. Katz claimed we stabbed him in the back. Mr. Katz at that time, when he saw he could not get what he wanted, wanted to close the shop to organized labor, all kinds of labor, close the shop to the warpers and loom fixers and twisters, and all organized men in the shop, and because we would not let Katz get away with that idea, we are accused with stabbing him in the back.

When the strike of 1913, the Doherty shop, that was still the Doherty contention. The three and four looms were still on the carpet, and Mr. Doherty, if I remember right, had the two factions in his shop. Of course, it was then at that time, I think, that the U. T. W. went out of existence, and at that time Katz denied having the books, but there is no question in my mind that he has got the books, and he is welcome to have them.

But in regard to the 1913 strike in Doherty's shop there we had no weavers in that shop at that time who belonged to the United Textile Workers, because then the Chicago faction came in, and it was between the Chicago faction and the Detroit faction that the fight went on amongst the weavers, as to who was going to be supreme. Consequently, so far as we were concerned, we could not see where we could do anything or do any good by trying to keep them organized when they would not stand by an organization when they were organized, and we let the two factions fight it out. They called the strike in the Doherty shop, if I remember right, in 1913, and a good many of those people that Mr. Doherty got to come from other parts of the country, they were the Assyrians and so forth who took the place of the strikers in the first of the strikes, was some of the same who had started to agitate for the third strike in 1913, and those two factions, the I. W. W. got these men because they know they could use them, and they did use them to advantage in the ships, and in Doherty's in 1913, if I recall rightly, the strike was amongst the two-loom weavers. The four-loom weavers, if I recall, stayed in, and did not come out until afterwards. They were really—well, threatened or forced out. That is the history about the 1910. Of course, I want to clear that up in the minds of the commission.

In regard to these different factions we have no kicks against these I. W. W. or any organization if they want to carry on an organization along those lines; but we do claim the right to run our organization as we think is best, in an American way, and if they can't see our way of doing it they don't have to, but we can not see theirs.

In the big strike they demanded eight hours a day and 25 per cent increase in wages. Well, I want to state right now, and I want to go on record as being one of the men in favor of the eight-hour day. I think that is enough for any silk worker to have to work, because while it is not a laborious job at the best, working in a silk mill, at the same time it is tedious, and when a man or woman works eight hours continuously in a mill I think they are entitled to go home and enjoy themselves for two or three hours before they go to bed. They asked for 25 per cent increase. Well, at the time I could not see the logic—can't see it yet—of asking for an eight-hour day and the 25 per cent increase in Paterson, with our competitors in the States of Pennsylvania, New

York, Connecticut, and Massachusetts working longer hours and working for a much less wage than we are getting here in Paterson. I would be in favor at any time of an eight-hour day and increase of wages, of course, providing they could get the silk manufacturers in different parts of the country to accept a proposition along that line. But the Paterson manufacturers have to bear the brunt of that alone, and we would simply be put out of business or we would have to go to Pennsylvania or some other place where they can employ the cheap labor, after they gained the eight-hour day and 25 per cent. But I think that thing might be brought about.

I might state that during the time that the strike was going on in 1913 that the Trades and Labor Council of Paterson, which is composed of A. F. of L. unions in this city, took the matter up, and we were anxious at that time to help these people out of the trouble they got into. We were not looking for any glory out of the matter; did not care whether they organized in the A. F. of L. or not, but wanted to help them out. We volunteered our willingness to have a committee appointed. In fact, there was a committee appointed from the trades and labor council to confer with the like committee from the strikers, and tried to bring about a settlement between the manufacturers and the workers. That matter has been acted on according to information that I got from the inside from a man that sat on the committee at that time. It had been acted on and a committee appointed to confer with the trades and labor council, A. F. of L. men as they call them, when Mrs. Gurley Flynn Jones came into the meeting and knocked the whole thing into a cocked hat. She said they would have nothing to do with the A. F. of L. people, and that for us to show that we were in earnest about this matter that we had to call a 24-hour strike. It didn't make any difference whether you had an agreement with your foremen or boss, or what you had, but call your strike and let's see whether you are in earnest; then we will deal with you. Of course, that we turned down. We could not go along on that. So we did try then to bring about an adjustment, but failed in that respect.

I may state another thing. I have heard a whole lot said on the stand in regard to free speech, etc. I believe in free speech, no question about it, but not free speech for a few. I believe it should be general. We held two meetings here in this city. One was held up in the high school building, on Colt Street, and the other in the armory. The meeting in the high school building was the first to be held, so I will speak about it.

We had a large number of clergymen. It was not an I. W. W. meeting, and it was not an A. F. of L. meeting. It was simply a citizens' committee. The aldermen, I believe, called the meeting. There was a large number of ministers, and there was men from the different organizations, and the business men, etc. They attended that meeting. They tried to have a hearing. And poor Father Stein, who sat in this chair yesterday, tried to speak to the people in the high school building, but Father Stein's voice was drowned. He could not be heard saying anything because of the I. W. W. He could not be heard. Dr. Hamilton, another of the speakers, a little bit stronger physically than Father Stein, stood the test and made a speech after quite some interruptions. The meeting at the high school was not any success of any kind outside of giving these people that were hollering so much a chance to howl a little bit louder.

The next meeting that was called was called by the Trades and Labor Council of Paterson, inviting John Golden, the man whose name had been up before all the people here and all the meetings as a man that was prostituting labor, and doing all things against the labor man, and so forth. We gave Mr. Golden and the A. F. of L. people a chance to put their position right in the eyes of the public, and called the meeting in the armory, paid for the armory out of our own money, some sixty-odd dollars it cost us, and, of course, the meeting was open to everyone who wanted to come there and be heard and listen to what he said.

James Matthews, the secretary of the trades and labor council, was chairman of that meeting. When coming up Park Avenue, that is, this street out here, the continuation of Market, coming up Park Avenue, we heard an awful howling coming up, and when we got there to the hall, before the speakers got there, before anybody was on the platform. We wondered what it was all about. When we got to the hall we found big Bill Haywood walking around the hall, with his hat in his hand, making all kinds of a demonstration, and the rest of the leaders following after him. They were not there to listen, but when they could not get a chance to be heard they told their men to walk out of the hall, which they did. They did walk out—but after some time. That howl was kept

up for over two hours, and I don't think I could describe it to anybody else but this commission. They would not let us start our meeting, and the police were there, about 15 or 20 in numbers, and seeing that they were not fit to cope with the situation, somebody telephoned to the police station for more. They came up and they came right into the armory door, lined up alongside of each other, came right along the platform, same as this platform is here, and about 20 men abreast, I reckon it was, if I remember right, 20 men abreast, and these men began to shove, and about fifteen or twenty thousand—15,000, I should say—left the hall, but did not walk out. Most of them was carried out on the shoulders of the others. And after they had left the hall, then it was that those that wanted to hear Mr. Golden and the A. F. of L. speakers came back into the hall and behaved themselves and listened to what was said.

This was the meeting at the armory you have heard so much about as being such a peaceful meeting, and they were simply there to hear only him, only they could not be heard. Free speech, as I said, is all right for some people, but not for A. F. of L. men at that time. It is not all right to-day. These Socialists, and I have voted on the Socialist ticket myself sometimes, and not ashamed of it—if I find a good man I will vote for him whether Socialist or not—which claims the right of free speech, denies us the same right, and we could not get the right of free speech at the time of these meetings to put our case before the public.

There was something else said about the Pompton strikes. Mr. Lessig, when he was on the stand, included that in the strike that was won by the I. W. W. I might state that this was an A. F. of L. strike, or United Textile strike there. It started on the 20th day of June, in 1913, and it ended up on the 20th day of February, 1914, after nine months of fighting, and they got their nine hours and their 10 per cent.

Now, in order to find a remedy or to remedy the evil that we have had to contend with in Paterson for all times, it seems to me there should be some way out of it, to try to get the manufacturer and the working people together on a common level, and get away from this agitation and these disturbances periodically. I have had several suggestions made, and, of course, I agree with some of them, and I will state myself that if it was possible to have a national eight-hour law passed, whereby the States of Pennsylvania and New Jersey and all these others, could only work women and children eight hours, the same as they have in some of the State laws passed, that it might be one remedy for the evil.

Another thing I would suggest, in view of the fact that we have got so many different prices in the city right here in Paterson.

Chairman WALSH. So many different what?

Mr. STARR. In view of the fact we have so many different price lists covering the weaving in the city of Paterson, two or three in the same shop on the same kind of jobs, I would suggest a standard price list, drawn up by the manufacturers and by the weavers. They ought to get together and agree on some kind of standard price list for weaving, and I think if we got that we would not have any more strikes in Paterson, or would not have any more quarrels for some time.

Chairman WALSH. Is there anything else? Commissioner Lennon would like to ask you a few questions.

Commissioner LENNON. Will you furnish us with a statement of prices paid in the mills, showing the variations between the different mills, and furnish it to us within a few days?

Mr. STARR. No; I could not do that, Mr. Commissioner, for this reason, that that is not in my line; that is, weaving is entirely out of my line of business.

Commissioner LENNON. You are on the stand now, and Mr. Morgan is not. Will you ask Mr. Morgan to do it?

Mr. STARR. I will ask him; yes. In regard to my own organization I could do it, but not the weavers, because I am not so familiar with their work.

Chairman WALSH. Prof. Commons would like to ask you some questions.

Commissioner COMMONS. How many warpers are there in Paterson altogether?

Mr. STARR. Well, that is a question.

Commissioner COMMONS. Is there a difference between horizontal warpers—

Mr. STARR. Yes; there is the horizontal and the Swiss warpers and the hand warpers.

Commissioner COMMONS. Where is the horizontal, in a shop like broad silk?

Mr. STARR. In the broad and ribbon both, but the horizontal is generally used by the broad-silk manufacturers.

Commissioner COMMONS. There is the horizontal, then the Swiss.

Mr. STARR. And the hand warper.

Commissioner COMMONS. How do the wages differ for the different ones?

Mr. STARR. Well, of course, the wages, there is quite some difference. Our wages are quite some higher, because there is no man, so far as I know, working on the Swiss; so far as I know there is no man working on the hand warper. The only men that are working at the warping business, so far as I know, are on the horizontal, consequently the wages of the women are on the Swill warpers. If they get paid piecework, some of them can make as high as \$15, \$16, and \$18 a week. It depends a good deal on the class of work they get and the conditions.

Commissioner COMMONS. Your work is piecework, your horizontal work?

Mr. STARR. Yes; and part of it daywork, also. If the manufacturer prefers piecework and we can strike an agreement with him, we give piecework; if he wants the daywork, we give daywork.

Commissioner COMMONS. What is the number of people in a shop, the number of warpers in a shop, of, say, 100 employees? How many would be warpers?

Mr. STARR. Well, you can figure them, one warper to 20 weavers, and get an approximation.

Commissioner COMMONS. Is there a uniform piece rate throughout all the shops?

Mr. STARR. No; because—it is something the commission would have to understand the technicalities of the business.

Commissioner COMMONS. I don't want to go into that; we haven't time.

What is the highest the warper can make on piecework?

Mr. STARR. Well, say, about from \$20 to \$22 a week.

Commissioner COMMONS. At the piece rates that is what you would make?

Mr. STARR. Yes.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you figure the rates so he can make just about that much?

Mr. STARR. Well, we figure the rates—that is, the manufacturer does most of the figuring there, you know—but we have got the thing figured out so a man can make \$20 to \$22 or \$23 a week.

Commissioner COMMONS. When you work by the week what do you get?

Mr. STARR. We get from \$18 to \$22. Of course, we have got classified men. We have got men that are good and men that are not so good.

Commissioner COMMONS. Working on the same class of work does he get about \$20 for piecework and for week work?

Mr. STARR. Well, so far as I am personally concerned, the men I have known make more on the piecework basis than on the daywork basis, providing they get decent conditions.

Commissioner COMMONS. Well, you figure it so that a man does make more on piecework than on daywork?

Mr. STARR. Well, yes; he would make more.

Commissioner COMMONS. About how much more is he expected to make?

Mr. STARR. Well, we will say a couple of dollars a week, something like that. He works harder, I suppose, when working for himself.

Commissioner COMMONS. So you figure it out so that he makes a little bit more?

Mr. STARR. Yes.

Commissioner COMMONS. Now, then, the man that is working on piecework will regulate the amount of his work, won't he, so that he will make a little bit more than he would on daywork?

Mr. STARR. Sometimes he can not do it. It depends a great deal on the kind of work he gets. There is some kinds of work he gets he can not get anywhere near \$22 or \$23 a week.

Commissioner COMMONS. He might not?

Mr. STARR. No, sir; other conditions he might get more.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do they ever get more than \$22?

Mr. STARR. Well, yes; there are occasions when they do get a little more.

Commissioner COMMONS. On what occasion would that be?

Mr. STARR. When they do an extra good run of work.

Commissioner COMMONS. What is the highest one man gets on a good run of work, or has earned?

Mr. STARR. Well, I should say \$24 a week, or something like that.

Commissioner COMMONS. Twenty-four dollars a week?

Mr. STARR. Yes; some of them can't make that.

Commissioner COMMONS. Do you have any rule or regulation that a man is not allowed to earn more than \$24?

Mr. STARR. Well, of course, we have got rules and regulations, but they are not compulsory rules. In order to make a man do the work right, or the weaver that comes after the warper, he has got to spend a certain time on a certain kind of job for to make a decent job of that for the weaver. For instance, the work is done in a few hours—a warper can run a warp off in an hour's time or he can take the same warp off in 10 hours' time, but the warp that is run off in 1 hour the weaver has got to do the work the warper should have done when it comes to the loom, and if the warper picks the warp before it leaves him it is so much easier for the weaver.

Commissioner COMMONS. What is the limit he is allowed to earn?

Mr. STARR. Something around \$24, I guess.

Commissioner COMMONS. He is not allowed to make more?

Mr. STARR. No.

Commissioner COMMONS. Is that part of the agreement or business?

Mr. STARR. The bosses, most of them, know we have a schedule of that kind in the shop. Doherty knows about it. We have 41 or 42 men working for Doherty.

Commissioner COMMONS. Is that a written contract?

Mr. STARR. No, sir; simply a verbal contract.

Commissioner COMMONS. A verbal agreement with them that on piecework they shall not be permitted to earn more than \$24?

Mr. STARR. We don't agree with the manufacturers, we simply tell our men.

Commissioner COMMONS. Simply make that a union rule?

Mr. STARR. Yes.

Commissioner COMMONS. So that the employer is not consulted on that question?

Mr. STARR. No, sir.

(Witness excused.)

Chairman WALSH. Call your next.

TESTIMONY OF MR. RALPH ROSENHEIM.

Mr. THOMPSON. Give us your name, address, and occupation.

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Ralph Rosenheim; 660 Fourteenth Avenue; silk manufacturer.

Mr. THOMPSON. Silk manufacturer?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. What is the name of your firm?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Augusta Silk Works.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been in that business?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Individually?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. ROSENHEIM. And as a manufacturer?

Mr. THOMPSON. Yes.

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Twenty-five years.

Mr. THOMPSON. Are you the present secretary of the Silk Association of Paterson?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been secretary?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Since its formation.

Mr. THOMPSON. When was that?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. About six months.

Mr. THOMPSON. About six months?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And it was organized after the strike; is that correct?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. Does it include both broad silk and ribbon?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Includes the entire trade—ribbons and broad silks and allied trades.

Mr. THOMPSON. And dyeing?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. And allied trades.

Mr. THOMPSON. What percentage, in a general way, if you know approximately, what percentage of the broad-silk manufacturers are members of your association?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. I have no means of knowing.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Do you think it is 75 per cent?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. I don't know.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Is it 100 per cent?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Oh, no.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Is it 50 per cent?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. I should say 60, if I have to say.
 Mr. THOMPSON. I am not asking for an accurate figure.
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes; I don't know.
 Mr. THOMPSON. I want to get your ideas.
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.
 Mr. THOMPSON. What per cent of the ribbon manufacturers in this city are members of your association?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Probably 70.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Now, these 65 per cent of the broad silk and 70 per cent of the ribbon, do they include the larger concerns?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Practically all.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Practically all the larger concerns?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.
 Mr. THOMPSON. What percentage of the amount of broad silks woven in this city is manufactured by those 65 per cent, if you know? If not, say so.
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Seventy-five per cent.
 Mr. THOMPSON. And of the ribbons?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Likewise.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Now, the silk-dyeing houses, what percentage of those houses are members of your association?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. I think they all are.
 Mr. THOMPSON. They all are?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.
 Mr. THOMPSON. I think there is about 20, or so it was said on the stand?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Well, I never heard that there were that many.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Well, how many?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. I didn't know there were over a dozen.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Over a dozen?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Well, so far as you know, they all belong?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. All the large ones belong.
 Mr. THOMPSON. What are the allied businesses which are in your association?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Well, the reed and harness business is a very large business here.
 Mr. THOMPSON. What?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. The reed and harness.
 Mr. THOMPSON. The reed and harness?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Have you got a printed constitution and by-laws?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. I have never seen any.
 Mr. THOMPSON. You have never seen any?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. No.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Have you got a written constitution and by-laws of your association?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. I think we have.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Would you be willing to furnish the commission with a copy of it?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Certainly.
 Mr. THOMPSON. Will you please do so?
 Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.

(The following communication was subsequently received from Mr. Rosenheim:)

THE AUGUSTA SILK WORKS,
 Paterson, N. J., October 20, 1914.

UNITED STATES COMMISSION ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS.

GENTLEMEN: Your favor of 13th instant duly received.

I instantly communicated with our assistant secretary, Mr. Matthews, who has charge of all our books and papers, and have ascertained that the local Ribbon Manufacturers' Association has no such a thing as a printed copy of its constitution and by-laws.

If I can be of assistance to you in other ways I should be pleased to have you call on me.

Very truly, yours,

RALPH ROSENHEIM.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, you might carry on the business—continue the list of businesses in your association? Reed and harness?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes; reed and harness.

Mr. THOMPSON. What else?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Well, there are all sorts of supply men, men that supply various things to the various mills, where they are concerned in anything that might be of an educational nature in connection with the whole trade.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, this is a sort of general employers' association?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Rather than purely a silk association?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is it allied with any other national employers' association?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No; none.

Mr. THOMPSON. National Association of Manufacturers?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Not at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. What are the purposes of your organization?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Why, the principal purpose is to be of an educational nature. To get together. Anything that would interest one branch would be of interest to all. As, for instance, one of our members proposes to give us a lecture shortly on raw silk, an illustrated lecture on raw silk. Then we have a legislative committee to watch legislation—the tariff, anything in that line that might be of interest to the trade at large.

Mr. THOMPSON. What other questions do you consider and take up in these educational meetings?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Well, we have no stated program.

Mr. THOMPSON. How many meetings have you held since your organization was formed six months ago?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. There is a meeting every other month.

Mr. THOMPSON. A meeting every other month?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Do you mean to say there has been about three or four meetings altogether in your association?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. In what respect have you taken up the question of labor?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Why, there has been no—

Mr. THOMPSON (interrupting). Let me lead up to that; that is what I want to arrive at. The question of the relationship between the manufacturers in this city and the people who work in the mills and factories is one of the most important things that concerns Paterson, is it not?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. In such cases as the big strike that grew out of that relationship?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. And other things?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, probably, that is the most important single question that is before the manufacturer as a manufacturer, is it not?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. It seems so.

Mr. THOMPSON. One that has the largest interests financially, perhaps, and not only that, but it is one of the questions that requires the thought and study of the manufacturers, is it not?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, when your association was called together of these men engaged in business and employing people, didn't they take up this all-important and principal question?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. On the subject of the good and welfare of the whole trade, but nothing special has been accomplished yet, but that will be part of the program.

Mr. THOMPSON. But this predominating question of employer and employee came up naturally, did it not?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Why, I can't say that it has yet. I simply say that the good and welfare will be part of our program in the future, but nothing has been done, nothing has been discussed in particular.

Mr. THOMPSON. Have you discussed the good and welfare of the employee—that is what you mean?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No particular way yet.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then what you want the commission to understand is, that when the association met at these times it has met, that it did not take up this question that you say is the predominant question, the relation of the manufacturer and workingman?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Not yet.

Mr. THOMPSON. Didn't take that up as yet?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, you think they are going to take up the question of the good and welfare of the employee, as a matter of fact, even though that has not been touched on yet?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Not yet.

Mr. THOMPSON. What question did they take up at these meetings? What was the character and nature of them?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Well, so far as I can recall, the principal object was to secure a large membership.

Mr. THOMPSON. That has been the principal idea so far?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. That has been the principal idea so far.

Mr. THOMPSON. And when you seek to engage a manufacturer as a member of your organization, what do you say to him are the purposes and objects of your organization?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Well, since I am not on the membership committee, I don't know.

Mr. THOMPSON. And the purposes and objects as they should be stated to a prospective member who has come up before you as secretary of this association?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. What would you think that they would say to new members or to anticipated members or prospective members?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. I would say this, that the object is largely educational; and to prove that the dues are very low, the fees are merely nominal, \$5 a year.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, if this manufacturer should say to you, "I am willing to join the association of manufacturers, the working people are organizing, some of them into the A. F. of L. and others into the I. W. W., we ought to have an organization, but I want to know what your association is going to do with reference to that all-important question, the most important question that confronts him as the owner of this mill," then what would you say to him in regard to that question?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. I don't know.

Mr. THOMPSON. You could not satisfy him at all on that matter?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Not at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. You have a strike on at your mill, haven't you?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. I had one.

Mr. THOMPSON. You had one?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Had one on May 23?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did not?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. On May 23, did the reporter of the Paterson Evening News see you with reference to the labor proposition?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. He did.

Mr. THOMPSON. At that time did you say to him, "Not until this strike has been officially declared off will I consider taking back any of my ribbon weavers?"

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No. I told him that not until this strike is officially declared off will I consider talking to them.

Mr. THOMPSON. But why talking to them?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. I would not, let alone take them back; I would not consider even talking to them.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you also give this language, which is quoted in the paper of that day: "Nor," continued Mr. Rosenheim, "will they be given any work in any mill in Paterson belonging to the Paterson Ribbon Manufacturers' Association?" By the way, is that a different association?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. That is a different association.

Mr. THOMPSON. There is a ribbon manufacturers' association?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. There are various associations here.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, let me ask about the ribbon manufacturers' association, then. How many members are there in that association?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Thirty-four.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thirty-four?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. What per cent of the ribbon manufacturers does that comprise?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Probably nine-tenths.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long has that association been in existence?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Twelve years.

Mr. THOMPSON. Twelve years?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes.

Mr. THOMPSON. Has it got a printed constitution and by-laws?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. I think so.

Mr. THOMPSON. Would you be willing to furnish this commission with a copy?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. I will.

Mr. THOMPSON. Will you please do that?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. I will.

(Mr. Rosenheim subsequently communicated with the commission, stating that the Paterson Ribbon Manufacturers' Association has no printed copy of its constitution and by-laws.)

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, what are the purposes and objects of that association, the Paterson Ribbon Manufacturers' Association?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. It is simply an organization the manufacturers got together; a trade organization, where they can come together and get information regarding anything pertaining to the manufacturing or selling end of the trade.

Mr. THOMPSON. During the 12 years of existence of that association have they taken up this question of the relationship of the manufacturers to the people in the mill?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Not to my knowledge.

Mr. THOMPSON. Not to your knowledge?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. The same answer that you gave with reference to the silk association is true of this association?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Well, I have not been a member during the 12 years.

Mr. THOMPSON. How long have you been a member?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. About six years.

Mr. THOMPSON. During the six years you have been a member?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No recollection.

Mr. THOMPSON. In other words, the answer you gave in regard to the other association is true of this one in regard to this labor proposition?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Just the same.

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, then, I will ask you this question [reading]: "Nor," continued Mr. Rosenheim, "will they be given any work in Paterson in any mill belonging to the Paterson Ribbon Manufacturers' Association."

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. You did not say that?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. That is an important statement, is it not, if true?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Yes; very.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you write to the paper correcting that statement?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Not at all.

Mr. THOMPSON. It appears in big letters here.

Mr. ROSENHEIM. So it is; but the original copy is in my pocket. That was largely the figment of the reporter's imagination.

(Rosenheim Exhibits Nos. 1 and 2, article from the Paterson Evening News of May 23, 1914, entitled "'An active blacklist is in operation here,' says Mr. Rosenheim," were submitted in printed form.)

Mr. THOMPSON. Well, you did not take that up with them?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. The exact paper is in my pocket, which was taken down to the News office, and they promised it there that they would copy it word for word, but they made an entirely different story.

Mr. THOMPSON. Is the reporter down here?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. I think he is sitting right there [indicating].

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you at that time say this, or did the reporter ask you this question: "Do you mean to say, Mr. Rosenheim, that there is a blacklist in operation in this city?"

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Never asked me that.

Mr. THOMPSON. Never asked you that?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Never.

Mr. THOMPSON. And if that appears in this article it is not true?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. It is very untrue.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did you correct that statement in the paper?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No, sir.

Mr. THOMPSON. You did not?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No use correcting it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, did you say to him this [reading]: "Most emphatically came the answer. A blacklist so thoroughly operated that not one of the Augusta weavers will ever be given a loom in a ribbon plant in this city until this strike is officially declared off."

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No; not true.

Mr. THOMPSON. You did not state that?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Did he ask you this question: "How do you maintain this blacklist?"

Mr. ROSENHEIM. No.

Mr. THOMPSON. Then, did you say this: "It is very simple. When a weaver applies for work at my mill or any other ribbon plant in the city, he is asked where he worked last; when he answered, he is told to wait for a few minutes and his place of last employment is communicated with by telephone. If he is a striker or disturber or is not entirely free from vicious influences of the I. W. W., he is told that he is not wanted. So, you see, that it is absolutely impossible for any weavers or those of any other mill in which a strike exists to obtain work in Paterson?"

Mr. ROSENHEIM. All that appeared in the previous issue of the paper and was probably copied word for word; no truth in it.

Mr. THOMPSON. That was not true either?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. Not true.

Mr. THOMPSON. Now, I would like you to tell or read from that paper the truth in regard to that statement. Is that paper which you hold the paper made at that time?

Mr. ROSENHEIM. This paper was written for Mr. Haines, the proprietor of the News. It came about in this way: We had a strike on us at the mill, and Mr. Haines had been misinformed continually, as he told me, by a committee of weavers that appeared before him, telling him that there were only six or eight weavers at work, and he asked me if I would give him the real facts. I said, "Certainly; come down to the mill; go through it. You can see whatever is going on." So, he promised to come down. Now, meantime, I prepared this paper for him; but instead of him coming, he sent a representative. He sent a representative.

This representative read this paper, and I took him through the mill so that he could see exactly what was going on and just how many weavers were at work. When he was through, he said to me, "May I have that paper?" I said, "Certainly; I want you to print it word for word." He said, "Will you object if I put it in the shape of an interview?" I said, "No; not if you confine yourself to the exact wording." With that, he left me. This is the way it reads. Supposing that Mr. Haines was coming, of course, I have taken his name, knowing that this man was to take his place.

"The strike had then been in progress in our mill—strike for a nine-hour day—for 16 weeks," and Mr. Haines was to come "in order to ascertain for himself the real situation." And that he "found all departments running practically full handed. Warping, winding, quilling, doubling, picking, blocking, all were running full blast, and as for the weaving, Mr. Haines, going from loom to loom," he himself "counted 60 weavers at work. In answer to a question, Mr. Rosenheim stated that with the exception of 5 weavers, all were new employees, quite hard-working people, entirely free from the vicious influence of the I. W. W. In other words, it was strictly a fight for the principles of an open shop, where every man should have a right to labor when, for whom, and at what wages he pleases, without interference, and the right of every employer

to employ whomsoever he will at such wages as are mutually agreeable, without regard to whether or not the workman belongs to any organization.

"Asked whether any of the old weavers would ever be taken back, Mr. Rosenheim stated that the strike would have to be declared off before he would ever consent to talk to any of the old weavers about coming back. Moreover, that is precisely the stand taken by other ribbon manufacturers. They will not employ people who are out on strike."

In other words, to strike and work at the same time would be a very easy way to win a strike. They will strike in my place for nine hours a day and then go about town and find work wherever they can at 10 hours a day. That they call fair fighting. Those are the orders they got from the I. W. W. headquarters, in order to reduce the number of weavers out, so that they would have to support a lesser number of weavers. So they consider that fair fighting, to strike for me nine hours and go about town. Naturally, the other manufacturers do not want to employ people who are out on strike. It is no collusion, nothing of that kind. When a woman comes to the door and says, "I come from the Augusta," that is sufficient. We do not employ people who are out on strike. You can not work for me 10 hours when you are striking there for nine. I will not employ people who are out on strike, "and our people will be considered on strike and can not apparently get work here or elsewhere until they have declared the strike off."

That was the paper delivered to the news reporter, out of which he made an entirely different story, to suit his own purpose.

MR. THOMPSON. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WALSH. That is all. Thank you, Mr. Rosenheim.

TESTIMONY OF MR. LEON F. BANIGAN.

MR. THOMPSON. Will you give your name and address, please?

MR. BANIGAN. Leon F. Banigan, 575 Market Street, Paterson; reporter.

MR. THOMPSON. On what paper?

MR. BANIGAN. Paterson Evening News.

MR. THOMPSON. How long have you been a reporter on that paper?

MR. BANIGAN. Two years.

MR. THOMPSON. Are you the reporter who took this interview from Mr. Rosenheim?

MR. BANIGAN. I am.

MR. THOMPSON. You may state what occurred?

MR. BANIGAN. I visited Mr. Rosenheim's mill on the day previous to the day on which this article appeared in the paper. I was sent there by my editor, and when I arrived at the mill Mr. Rosenheim told me that he wished to show me through the mill, in order that he might satisfy the public that there was not a strike in progress at his mill. He said that there had been a strike, but that the strike was lost, as far as he was concerned, and that he never expected to hire any of those strikers until he had received official notification from the I. W. W. that the strike had been abandoned. I asked him if the strike had been officially declared. He said that it had not, and showed me a paper bearing the seal of the I. W. W.

Then he took me through the mill and he counted all of the workers in the mill, with the exception of perhaps a few quill winders, and said they were weavers. I took his word for that and wrote the story that there were 60 weavers at work in his mill.

After we had gone back to his private office we had quite a lengthy conversation about the general affairs in the silk trade, and particularly about his experiences with his help; and it was then that he told me of the pitiful scenes that were enacted in his office almost every morning when the strikers came there asking to be taken back; but said he would not take them back until they had officially declared that strike off. He then told me that neither would they be taken into any other mill in Paterson belonging to the—I think he called it—Paterson Ribbon Manufacturers' Association. I said then, "Do you mean to tell me, Mr. Rosenheim, that there is an active blacklist in Paterson, operative at the present time?" He said, "There is," and from memory, he said—I now quote—he said a blacklist—I am afraid I can not give the exact words, but the gist of it was this—I would rather state from memory now: A blacklist is thoroughly operative, and not one of my workers will be given a position in any other mill in Paterson until this strike is officially declared off. He went

further than that and explained to me the method they have of finding out whether or not a man is on strike and whether he is one of those included in that blacklist, and he told me that when his weavers or any other weavers apply at any other mill in Paterson they are asked where they worked last. They tell. Then they are told to wait a minute. He said, then the manufacturer goes inside to his private office, calls up that mill, and asks for the record of that man. If he is a striker or if he belongs to the I. W. W., or if he is not entirely free from the vicious contamination of the I. W. W., he will not be given a position.

That is the sum and substance of my interview with Mr. Rosenheim on the afternoon before the day on which this article appeared in the Paterson Evening News.

I think that is all I have to say.

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you.

Chairman WALSH. Thank you.

TESTIMONY OF MR. HENRY MARELLI—Recalled.

Mr. MARELLI. I wish to correct some of the statements made by the prosecutor and others. It was stated by the prosecutor that convictions before the recorder were had under ordinances of the city of Paterson. Not a single conviction was obtained under an ordinance. Not a single complaint was made under an ordinance. All complaints were made under the State law concerning disorderly conduct.

The prosecutor said that there were some convictions that were sustained. Not a single conviction for disorderly conduct was sustained. In fact, of all the convictions carried up, either before the recorder or the county courts, only one has been sustained, and that is the conviction of Quinlan.

The prosecutor said every person charged with unlawful assembly and tried was convicted. That is not so. There were less than 100 convicted on the charge of unlawful assembly before the upper court, and in every case the convictions were by a jury.

And right here I wish to say in answer to Capt. McBride, when he said the juries were in sympathy with the strikers: Not a single case tried before a local jury resulted in an acquittal; not a single case against the strikers.

After one or two convictions for unlawful assembly with a jury we waived trial by jury. And on June 24—June 25, 1913, 53 were tried by the court without a jury, and the record of that trial will be found on page 190 of the minutes of the court of special sessions. All of them were acquitted.

After that acquittal there was what I might term another bunch that was to be tried on the same day, but after that acquittal the prosecutor decided he would not try them—a batch of perhaps 40 who had all been indicted for unlawful assembly. None of those 40 have ever been tried.

On March 27, 1914, page 117 of the minutes of the court, 34 indictments for unlawful assembly were nolle-prossed on motion of the prosecutor.

The prosecutor said that 40 persons had been assaulted during the strike with bludgeons. There is not a single instance, or there was not a single instance, of a man or woman being attacked with a bludgeon during the strike.

Chairman WALSH. I didn't so understand it, Mr. Marelli.

Mr. MARELLI. That is what I understood him to say.

Mr. THOMPSON. I understood him to say that 40 people were injured.

Chairman WALSH. Injured. He did not say they were assaulted with a bludgeon, as I remember it.

Mr. MARELLI. In answer to that I wish to say that there were no cases of assault with a bludgeon. There was one man arrested with a bludgeon on him, and that man was drunk.

Mr. THOMPSON. What do you say about there having been 40 assaults?

Chairman WALSH. Forty assaults of all kinds.

Mr. MARELLI. Forty assaults?

Chairman WALSH. That is the way I understood it.

Mr. MARELLI. I understood him that way, and the newspapers so published it.

Mr. THOMPSON. Irrespective of that, the question is, How many were there—assaults of all kinds—40?

Mr. MARELLI. Less than 40.

Mr. THOMPSON. Less than 40?

Mr. MARELLI. Less than 40 assaults of all kinds. There were perhaps 40 mentioned in the newspapers; I will admit that.

Chairman WALSH. I really think you are mistaken. I am going to look at the record and see about the use of the word bludgeon. I think he said 40 assaults of all kinds. The paper may be misquoting it.

Mr. MARELLI. There was not a single instance of a striker being found with a concealed weapon in his pocket in all the arrests that were made by the police for picketing. The prosecutor said there were three cases of attempts by the strikers to wreck trains. I deny that. No striker has been indicted for attempt to wreck a train. There are two under indictment, I believe, for that, but they are not strikers, or were not engaged in the strike.

He referred to a statement that was made by Mrs. Valentino, the widow of Modestino Valentino, who was murdered during the strike, that she had been promised support by the I. W. W., and that she received no support from the I. W. W. Mrs. Valentino has since denied this newspaper story. No doubt the prosecutor related simply what he had read in the newspaper. Mrs. Valentino, furthermore, says she received help from the I. W. W., and, of course, I personally know that she has received help from them.

There is one other matter. In answer to the statement made by Mr. Matthews, the editor of the Press, I simply wish to refer to the articles that have been submitted here as having appeared in the Press as to whether or not my statement that he advocated violence is true. I can not verify my statement that I made yesterday that I had offered the prosecutor, in behalf of Mr. Haywood, to waive trial by jury, as only the prosecutor and myself were present at the time the interview took place; but as to whether or not I am telling the truth or the prosecutor telling the truth as regards to that I simply wish to refer to the reliability of his statements as compared to mine as to whether he is telling the truth or I am telling the truth.

I wish to say that every one of my statements may be verified by the records. I have been very careful in this investigation to state only that which I personally knew. There are many things which I could disclose which I have not disclosed, because they were simply matters of hearsay.

Chairman WALSH. The commission will now stand adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 1.30 o'clock p. m., June 18, 1914, the commission adjourned sine die.)

EXHIBITS.

SCOTT EXHIBIT NO. 1.

DIARY OF THE PATERSON SILK STRIKE, FEBRUARY 1 TO AUGUST 2, 1913.

[By Alexander Scott.]

February 1, 1913.—Before strike had spread police boasted of being ready to "nip in bud." Arrests made from very start of walkout of 500 Doherty weavers.

February 8.—General strike declared on Wednesday, February 19, at Turn Hall. (See issue Feb. 15.)

February 26.—Six thousand now out. Meeting in Turn Hall in afternoon. About 500 workers left after meeting and were proceeding in a peaceable manner, two abreast, along sidewalk on way to South Paterson, when they were attacked by the police in a brutal and cowardly manner without warning. Flynn, Tresca, Quinlan, and Kaplan were seized by police when they emerged from hall and asked to either get out of town or be locked up. They refused to leave town, maintaining that as citizens of the United States they had a perfect right to go where they pleased, so long as they violated no law. They were rushed to jail. All halls were ordered closed against strikers, and arrests were made on the slightest pretext. The Socialist Party held a special meeting on the evening of Tuesday, 26th, and decided to take up the fight for free speech. A meeting was arranged for the following Friday in the largest hall in town (Auditorium), and I arranged to get out a special issue of my paper, the Weekly Issue, for the same day (Friday).

February 26 or 27.—Killingbeck mounted the platform in strikers' headquarters, where a considerable number of strikers were congregated, and proceeded to read the New Jersey constitution relative to free speech, when he was ordered to desist by the police chief, who, with a squad of his men, had entered the hall. Killingbeck was placed under arrest, and the chief mounted the platform and proceeded to read the riot act in all its ancient glory. He read every word of it, even to last "God save the King." Arrived at the police station Chief Bimson asked Killingbeck what strange law he had been reading, to which Killingbeck replied, "Why, chief, that was the constitution of New Jersey. Never hear of it before? I thought not." Killingbeck was discharged by the chief, who evidently considered himself judge and jury as well as policeman.

February 28.—Weekly Issue off press. Five thousand taken to Paterson by myself and Dr. Korshet, of Passaic, in the doctor's auto. The papers were left in the headquarters of the Socialist Party, on Main Street, at about 10.45 a. m. A few minutes later four policemen entered the place and announced to the two or three members then present that they had orders to seize them. A protest was made and search warrant demanded, but none was produced. The papers were carted away to police headquarters—stolen. Later in the day, when the papers had been perused by the prosecutor and police, a warrant was issued for my arrest, and detectives were sent to Passaic and elsewhere in search of me. I managed to elude arrest until the evening, because the policemen did not know me from Adam. I saw them looking for me, and passed by them without being recognized.

A big free-speech meeting was arranged by the Socialist Party for that evening was held as scheduled. Several thousand people jammed the hall. I was the last speaker. I had walked into the hall unnoticed by the detectives, and when I go through was placed under arrest and marched through the streets to the police station with a jeering crowd of about 2,000 following. The jeers were directed at the police. I was placed in a cell and held incommunicado until morning, when I was released on bail of \$2,000 pending the action of the grand jury. Bail had originally been fixed at \$1,000, but Recorder Carroll took

it upon himself to increase it to \$2,000. The charge against me was "inciting hostility to the government of Paterson."

From this time on arrests were made by the wholesale. Four men were arrested on the same charge as myself for distributing my paper. Many were threatened for having it in their possession. Those who were fortunate enough to have secured a copy before they had been confiscated were forced to read it in cellars and such places. One man was arrested and later released for merely having a copy in his possession. Several peaceful people were thrown into jail on suspicion of being strikers. One man served 30 days who had no connection with the strike. He informed me that he was a tailor, lived in New York, and had visited Paterson to look up an old friend. The writer, Jack Reed, was sent to jail for being "sassy" to a policeman who had sworn at him, dug him in the ribs with his club, and ordered him to make himself scarce. A prominent artist's wife was arrested while standing on the sidewalk. She gave a fictitious name in order to avoid publicity. Innocent girls, just budding into womanhood, were thrown into the vile bastille, there to mingle with hardened criminals.

March 8.—Twenty thousand now on strike. Arrests daily. Local papers misrepresenting the strike. Strikers wonderfully peaceful. More detective agency gunmen in town.

March 10.—Police arrested, charged with grand larceny in seizing my paper without search warrant. Held in \$200 bail.

March 11.—Twelve policemen in private auto snatch handbills from three strikers who had gone to Passaic to distribute them to silk workers coming from Lodi mill. Informer in union, it developed later. (See Mar. 15.)

March 15.—Up until this time at least 40 people had been jailed (two weeks). Papers appealing to patriotism of strikers; still lying ferociously. Strikers accused of violence when only violence come from police and private detective plug-uglies, with which the town is now swarming.

March 20.—Mrs. Gallo beaten up by Policeman Duffy. (See Apr. 5.)

March 30.—Meeting in baseball grounds broken up. Haywood and Lessig arrested on charge of "unlawful assemblage." Given six months by Recorder Carroll. (See Apr. 5 and photos.) Conviction later reversed by Minturn.

April 19.—Modestino shot and killed by O'Brien detective; several wounded. O'Brien men hold up, beat, and take circulars announcing an athletic exhibition from young men belonging to a church athletic club, thinking them to be strikers announcing a meeting. Circulars thrown into river without being read. Garfield citizens sign resolutions of protest against gunmen swarming their town, threatening pedestrians, and insulting women. Officials of that town extend their vacation, no doubt in order to avoid responsibility.

April 26.—Tresca, Flynn, Quinlan, and Lessig indicted on charges preferred at first police outbreak. A. F. of L. meeting in armory. Golden and Conboy get a bad turndown. Modestino funeral; 15,000 in line; three bands; very impressive.

May 3.—Another holdup in Passaic. Three men with circulars announcing Socialist meeting held up at point of gun and circulars taken from them. One man badly beaten up; was attended by Dr. Korshet. Chief Hendry, of Passaic, pretends ignorance and fails to do anything. Number of auto proves it to belong to O'Briens, said Hendry, but he couldn't do anything unless specific charges were made against the individuals in the machine at the time of the holdup. Hendry and myself had a tilt, and I gave him "rats" in the Issue. Authorities threaten to prevent sending away of strikers' children. Mayor McBride says city can care for its own poor. When committee called on the mayor, taking a batch of children with them to the city hall, the mayor had left on a holiday or a visit to a sick friend, or something like that. (See photo.) May Day parade. Permit refused I. W. W.; granted Socialist Party.

May 10.—Quinlan on trial; seventh; guilty. Detective in union testified in Quinlan's favor and admitted his connection with O'Brien Agency. Murderer or Modestino not indicted.

May 24.—Wholesale arrests again. Halls ordered closed. Recorder Carroll railroading in record style. One girl gets 60 days for smiling in anticipation of being released. Another girl gets 30 days for gasping at this sentence. Horrible condition in the jail. Jack Reed describes it in Globe. Mayor Breuckman of Haledon, who invited strikers to exercise their right of free speech in his borough, ordered Paterson detectives to leave town as they only incited riot. He said the reason there was no disorder in Haledon was because of the

absence of police. Local papers venomous. Appeals to violence. "Drive I. W. W.'s out of town, organize citizen's leagues," etc. (See Issue.)

June 6.—Scott sentenced from 1 to 15 years.

June 14.—Federal probe being sought. Opinion growing that strike is being purposely prolonged by big bosses to freeze out little fellows. Several have already become bankrupt. Total arrests, up to date, about 2,000. Jail overflowing. Prof. Livingstone and others collect affidavits to present to Congress as reason for probe.

June 21.—Arrests continue. One man arrested for acting suspiciously—he whistled. Another police attack—50 arrested. Women clinging to skirts, etc. National Silk Dyeing Co.'s auto used for patrol. Morning Call describes attack as "like a thousand of bricks." Another time, "like Bulgars on Turkish frontier." Bosses break word with strikers to grant nine-hour day. Workers quit. Manufacturers refuse to meet strikers.

June 28.—Showing how fair Paterson juries are. Sixty strikers waived right of trial by jury and were discharged by the judge, who would have been ashamed to convict them on his own hook. Boyd arrested. Good bail refused.

July 5.—Quinlan suddenly arrested while sitting in court at Miss Flynn's trial, and sentenced without warning. Railroaded to Trenton before 48 hours were up. Scott pleaded to McCabe indictment. Released on \$1,000 bail.

July 13.—Vincenzo Madonna shot and killed by strike breaker. Murderer sent to jail. Later released. More false arrests. Ten discharged at once because of lack of evidence. Dunn stated he was reading Weekly Issue to see if he could not get another indictment against me. Disease rampant in dye shop that harbors strike breakers. Five hundred business men seek Federal investigation. Brutal Policeman Love arrested and held in bail for atrocious assault after commissioners had failed to act on charges of Dr. Cooper. Bosses again refuse to deal with strikers. It costs \$3,000 per week to run strikers' relief store. Thirty thousand loaves of bread given out every week.

July 19.—Police start riot in Haledon. Socialist alderman arrested for asking drunken silk boss to observe the borough ordinance relating to profanity. Bosses break word with strikers to grant nine-hour day. Workers quit.

July 26.—Mayor Breuckman indicted and held in \$2,000 bail, charged with "unlawful assemblage and malfeasance in office." Was asked to appear in court without being given reason. If a friend had not been in court at the time who could furnish bail, the Socialist mayor would have had to go to jail. Scott again arrested on charge of libel brought by Policeman Love. One thousand dollars bail. Had to stay in jail 24 hours waiting bail. Forced to take a bath in black tub a few minutes after it had been used by a young man afflicted with a virulent venereal disease. Alleged murderer of Modestino allowed privilege of means brought in from outside. Others denied this. Two strikers dragged from bed beside wives at midnight at point of gun and locked up on ridiculous charges of private detectives. Strike breaking.

August 2.—Quinlan arrested once more for referring to Sergt. Charles Ryan as "Bummy Ryan." The gentleman in question is better known by this name than any other. In fact, few people know that his name is Charles. Bimson says Socialist speeches are far too hot. If the Socialists do not speak a little more respectful of him and the administration, he says he will revoke their permit to speak.

May, 1914.—Scott again indicted for libel, based on the same editorial as the "hostility" charge. Spent half a day in jail awaiting bail.

MARELLI EXHIBIT NO. 1.

New Jersey Supreme Court.

WILLIAM D. HAYWOOD, PROSECUTOR, *v.* CHARLES H. RYAN, AND JAMES F. CARROLL, DEFENDANTS.

ON CERTIORARI.

1. The mere fact that a person walking along a public street in a peaceable and quiet manner, is followed by a crowd of people, is not sufficient to justify his conviction of being a disorderly person upon the ground that he obstructed and interfered with persons lawfully upon such street, as provided in section 3 of "An act concerning disorderly persons." (C. S., 1927.)

2. The statute mentioned applies only to such persons as shall by their acts intentionally obstruct or interfere with the movement of persons lawfully upon a street, and, therefore, when the proof is limited to the fact that a person, while quietly walking upon a street is followed by a crowd, it will not support his conviction of being a disorderly person under such statute.

Hunziker & Randall, and Henry Marelli, for prosecutor.

Randal B. Lewis and Edward F. Merrey, for defendants.

Argued June term, 1913, before Swayze, Bergen, and Vorhees, judges.

The opinion of the court was delivered by Bergen, judge.

The prosecutor in this proceeding was convicted in the recorder's court of the city of Paterson. The conviction recites that the court found the defendant guilty of being a disorderly person within the meaning and intent of section 3 of an act entitled "An act concerning disorderly persons, approved June 14, 1898" (C. S., 1927), in that the said defendant on the day and year last aforesaid, to wit, at the city of Paterson, in the county of Passaic aforesaid, did obstruct and interfere with persons, to wit, persons unknown, upon Haledon Avenue, a public street in the said city of Paterson, who were lawfully in and upon said street; I do, therefore, adjudge said defendant to be a disorderly person within the intent and meaning of section 3 of the aforesaid act. The judgment of the court was that defendant be committed to the common jail of the county of Passaic for the period of six months. It thus appears that the conviction was based upon the finding that the defendant obstructed and interfered with persons upon a public street of the city of Paterson.

Section 3 of the act above referred to declares that persons who shall loiter or assemble upon the streets or public places of any city, being under the influence of intoxicating liquor, or who not being under such influence, shall indulge in or utter loud or indecent language, or shall address or make audible offensive remarks or comment upon any person passing along such streets or public places, or shall obstruct or interfere with any person or persons lawfully being upon such streets or public places, shall be deemed and adjudged to be a disorderly person. This conviction by its terms is restricted to the latter paragraph of the section, and, therefore, to sustain this conviction there must be some evidence that this defendant did obstruct or interfere with persons lawfully upon a public street.

A very careful examination of the evidence in this case fails to disclose anything which would justify this conviction. The first witness called was Charles H. Ryan, a member of the police force of the city of Paterson, who testified that on the day in question he saw a large crowd of people on Haledon Avenue, and that he heard yelling and hollering and saw people coming out upon their porches and upon the streets and that they threw open their windows; that the defendant was leading the crowd upon the street, which was so large that people coming from the opposite direction had to go into the street in order to get by. On cross-examination he said that the crowd was marching upon the sidewalk in order, six or seven abreast, and that the defendant was leading the crowd when he arrested him.

Another officer, James Cassidy, a police officer, testified that he saw a large crowd going up the avenue, yelling, and that the sergeant instructed the witness and other officers to disperse the crowd, when the defendant was arrested; that at this time he was in front of the crowd.

Several other policemen were called; but their testimony was substantially the same as that given by the other officers. All that the evidence shows is that this defendant was walking upon the sidewalk of one of the streets of Paterson, and that following him was a large crowd, marching upon the sidewalk five or six abreast. There is not a particle of testimony showing that this defendant obstructed or interfered with any person or persons; on the contrary all that appears is that he was proceeding along the sidewalk of a public highway without obstructing or interfering with any person beyond the extent to which he occupied the sidewalk. Why the crowd followed him is not made to appear, and the mere fact that he or that any number of persons were walking upon the sidewalk, no other fact appearing, would not render him liable to the charge of obstructing or interfering with persons upon the street. The presence of a large crowd upon a public street may be accounted for in many ways, but if it can be said that whenever a person, who is walking along a public highway quietly and peaceably, shall be followed by a crowd, that he may be adjudged to be a disorderly person upon the ground that he is obstructing or interfering with other persons upon such street, then almost every person having something more than a local reputation sufficient to arouse

the curiosity of the public would be liable to be apprehended as a disorderly person.

No such construction has ever been given to this law, and, in my judgment, never should, for it is intended to apply only to such as shall, by their acts, intentionally obstruct or interfere with the movement of persons lawfully upon the street. This conviction has not the slightest evidence to support the judgment that this defendant was at the time complained of a disorderly person.

The conviction will therefore be set aside.

KATZ EXHIBIT NO. 21.

[The Issue, office 104 Jackson Street.]

Mr. ROBERT McLURE,
104 Washington Street, Paterson, N. J.

DEAR SIR: My attention has been just called to a letter of yours in the Daily People of September 1, 1912, wherein you make the specific charge that the Passaic issue collected money for the striking textile workers of this city and did not turn in a cent to the strike committee or the strikers.

This is an unfounded and libelous statement. It is true that a call for contributions to the strikers was issued in the April number of the issue, but not a penny was received in this office nor did any individual connected with the issue receive any contributions. Had you kept track of the issue, as you doubtless did not, you would have found an editorial item in the June number stating that no money had been received for the strikers. The books of the issue are open for inspection to anybody at any time.

Unless you make an immediate retraction of this statement in the People and the Issue, we will institute suits for libel against you and the publishers of the Daily People.

Very truly, yours,

D. S. WEBSTER, *Editor.*

P. S.—A copy of this letter is being sent to the editor of the Daily People.

D. S. W.

KATZ EXHIBIT NO. 22.

[Resolution adopted at a mass meeting of the weavers of the Henry Doherty Silk Co., held at Institute Hall, 90 Market Street, Paterson, N. J., Nov. 6, 1911.]

Whereas we, the weavers of the Henry Doherty Silk Co., were organized about three years ago into the United Textile Workers of America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, and were promised protection to our interests and improvement of our condition; and

Whereas, for the first time in the history of the silk industry of Paterson, there is an attempt made to introduce the four-loom system on a large scale, which would be even more detrimental to the interests of the weavers than a wage reduction; and

Whereas we have made many efforts to combat this dangerous innovation, but have been thwarted at every turn by the treacherous machinations of the officials of the United Textile Workers of America, who used every means at their command to mislead the weavers, such as arbitration and other fake schemes: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the weavers employed by the Henry Doherty Silk Co., in mass meeting assembled, repudiate the United Textile Workers of America; their national president, John Golden; their national organizer, Charles Miles; and his local understrapper, Frank Hubschmitt; and be it further

Resolved, That we pledge ourselves to take a united stand against the introduction of the four-loom system and the consequent lowering of our standard of living; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions be given to the public press with request for publication.

RUDOLPH KATZ.
JOHN PLAMONDON.
JOHN SWEENEY.
FRANCIS STERON.
ANDREW MCBRIDE.

ANDRE JNO. REED.
LEWIS BRARLNEY.
JOHN J. JOHN.
SWEENEY ESQUEDER.

KATZ EXHIBIT NO. 29.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT OF LOCAL NO. 25, INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD.

Income from shop collections.

Mar. 15. Passaic, shop collection	\$10. 75
Mar. 15. Washington, shop collection	2. 75
Mar. 15. Puritan, shop collection	4. 75
Mar. 15. Harris & Saltzberg, shop collection	3. 15
Mar. 16. Hembert, shop collection	18. 60
Mar. 16. Collins, shop collection	7. 00
Mar. 16. Main, shop collection	3. 50
Mar. 16. A. D. Cohen, shop collection	11. 50
Mar. 16. Keltz & Miller, shop collection	3. 90
Mar. 16. Fidelity, shop collection	3. 50
Mar. 16. Meyers & Meyers, shop collection	4. 00
Mar. 16. American Shawl, shop collection	16. 75
Mar. 16. Imperial, shop collection	12. 50
Mar. 16. Baker & Kaplan, shop collection	4. 85
Mar. 16. Lipman & Tondow, shop collection	2. 25
Mar. 16. Armour, shop collection	12. 35
Mar. 16. Zingler Bros., shop collection	1. 85
Mar. 16. Queen, shop collection	7. 75
Mar. 16. International, shop collection	6. 10
Mar. 16. J. Kremer, individual	. 50
Mar. 16. D. Starr, individual	. 50
Mar. 16. M. Bornstein, shop collection	1. 50
Mar. 16. Irving, shop collection	9. 75
Mar. 16. Robbins, shop collection	16. 50
Mar. 16. Popular, shop collection	1. 75
Mar. 16. B. Bornstein, shop collection	. 50
Mar. 16. Fitzgerald, individual	1. 00
Mar. 16. Isadore Reubens, individual	2. 00
Mar. 16. Peir & Bornstein, shop collection	9. 00
Mar. 19. P. Augustine, individual	1. 00
Mar. 19. Branch 278, W. C., donation	1. 00
Mar. 19. Local No. 3, I. W. W., donation	7. 00
Mar. 19. Grand, shop collection	3. 00
Mar. 19. Finkelstein & Diamond, shop collection	1. 25
Mar. 19. Ball's, shop collection	8. 50
Mar. 20. Standard, shop collection	12. 75
Mar. 21. Branch No. 300, W. C., donation	5. 43
Mar. 21. Columbia, shop collection	9. 90
Mar. 21. Fred Schofield, shop collection	6. 00
Mar. 21. Louisiana, shop collection	6. 15
Mar. 21. Mohilev, shop collection	3. 50
Mar. 23. J. Wolf, shop collection	7. 25
Mar. 23. Prudential, shop collection	6. 75
Mar. 23. Rosenblatt, shop collection	4. 00
Mar. 23. Barnet, shop collection	2. 20
Mar. 23. Lappin & Long, shop collection	9. 75
Mar. 23. S. K. S., shop collection	3. 50
Mar. 23. Belmont, shop collection	6. 75
<hr/>	
286. 48	
<hr/>	
Mar. 23. Commercial, shop collection	4. 50
Mar. 23. Medak, shop collection	3. 00
Mar. 23. S. Pollack, shop collection	6. 00
Mar. 23. J. Butterworth, individual	. 50
Mar. 23. S. Goldstein, individual	. 50
Mar. 23. J. Faust, shop collection	5. 00
Mar. 25. Fuchs & Sneider, shop collection	4. 00
Mar. 25. Luvan, shop collection	14. 60
Mar. 25. Irving (River Street), shop collection	1. 75
Mar. 26. Isidor Geller, shop collection	1. 15

Mar. 27. Bee Hive, shop collection	\$3. 50
Mar. 28. L. H. Spoer, shop collection	16. 00
Mar. 29. Passaic, shop collection	25. 25
Mar. 29. Washington, shop collection	3. 45
Mar. 29. Puritan, shop collection	10. 25
Mar. 29. Appell Bros., shop collection	8. 00
Mar. 29. Pilgrim & Meyers, shop collection	21. 30
Mar. 29. J. Pansy, shop collection	7. 00
Mar. 29. Harris & Saltzberg, shop collection	2. 80
Mar. 30. Hembert, shop collection	18. 20
Mar. 30. A. D. Cohen, shop collection	23. 75
Mar. 30. Amour, shop collection	10. 75
Mar. 30. Diamond, shop collection	20. 00
Mar. 30. Littman & Tondow, shop collection	3. 50
Mar. 30. Irving, shop collection	8. 60
Mar. 30. Kaplan & Baker, shop collection	7. 75
Mar. 30. Star, shop collection	3. 75
Mar. 30. Volken & Keller, shop collection	3. 00
Mar. 30. Zingler Bros., shop collection	2. 50
Mar. 30. Robbins, shop collection	16. 50
Mar. 30. Popular, shop collection	4. 25
Mar. 30. Peir & Bornstein, shop collection	12. 00
Mar. 30. Jackson Bros., shop collection	7. 00
Mar. 30. Collins, shop collection	6. 50
Mar. 30. American Shawl, shop collection	17. 50
Mar. 30. Meyers & Meyers, shop collection	5. 00
Mar. 30. Queen, shop collection	15. 50
Mar. 30. Roth & Butler, shop collection	8. 50
Mar. 30. M. Bornstein, shop collection	3. 00
Mar. 30. Baker & Schofield, shop collection	14. 70
Mar. 30. Fidelity, shop collection	3. 00
Mar. 30. Sovereign, shop collection	11. 00
Mar. 30. Keltz & Miller, shop collection	2. 65
Mar. 30. Imperial, shop collection	12. 75
Mar. 30. H. Bornstein, shop collection	1. 50
Mar. 30. Fashion, shop collection	2. 00
Apr. 1. Altshuler Bros., shop collection	19. 00
Apr. 1. S. J. Aronshon, shop collection	39. 00

441. 70

Apr. 2. Altshuler Bros., shop collection	1. 25
Apr. 4. International, shop collection	5. 25
Apr. 4. American, shop collection	17. 75
Apr. 4. Standard, shop collection	11. 55
Apr. 4. Columbia, shop collection	10. 50
Apr. 5. Imperial, shop collection	1. 25
Apr. 6. Fuchs & Sneider, shop collection	3. 00
Apr. 6. Commercial, shop collection	4. 50
Apr. 6. Ball's, shop collection	4. 25
Apr. 6. A. Rosenblatt, shop collection	3. 50
Apr. 6. Medal, shop collection	3. 00
Apr. 6. Sonnenberg & Goldberg, shop collection	1. 25
Apr. 6. Mohilev, shop collection	3. 50
Apr. 6. Lappin & Long, shop collection	9. 50
Apr. 6. Belmont, shop collection	6. 50
Apr. 6. S. K. S., shop collection	3. 50
Apr. 6. S. J. Simpson, shop collection	5. 50
Apr. 6. J. Ruttenberg, shop collection	2. 25
Apr. 8. Barnet, shop collection	2. 10
Apr. 8. S. Pollack, shop collection	5. 75
Apr. 8. Holbach's, shop collection	15. 25
Apr. 10. L. H. Spoer, shop collection	10. 75
Apr. 10. Bee Hive, shop collection	3. 50
Apr. 10. Ed Davis, shop collection	32. 25
Apr. 11. Passaic, shop collection	25. 00
Apr. 11. Puritan, shop collection	8. 75

2636 REPORT OF COMMISSION ON INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS.

Apr. 11. Hembert, shop collection_____	\$16. 00
Apr. 11. Luvan, shop collection_____	15. 25
Apr. 12. Pansy, shop collection_____	4. 00
Apr. 12. Acme, shop collection_____	6. 00
Apr. 12. Washington, shop collection_____	2. 00
Apr. 12. A. D. Cohen, shop collection_____	6. 75
Apr. 13. Keltz & Miller, shop collection_____	5. 50
Apr. 13. Appel Bros., shop collection_____	15. 95
Apr. 13. Lippman & Tondow, shop collection_____	3. 50
Apr. 13. Main, shop collection_____	2. 75
Apr. 13. Shue 7 Michels, shop collection_____	6. 50
Apr. 13. Amour, shop collection_____	9. 50
Apr. 13. Fidelity, shop collection_____	3. 00
Apr. 13. Robbins, shop collection_____	16. 50
Apr. 13. Collins, shop collection_____	6. 50
Apr. 13. Jackson, shop collection_____	9. 00
Apr. 13. Queen, shop collection_____	16. 00
Apr. 13. Star, shop collection_____	4. 75
Apr. 13. Zingler Bros., shop collection_____	2. 50
Apr. 13. Diamond, shop collection_____	20. 75
Apr. 13. Harris & Saltzberg, shop collection_____	4. 00
Apr. 13. B. Terner, individual_____	. 50
	<hr/>
	378. 35
	<hr/>
Apr. 13. Popular, shop collection_____	2. 75
Apr. 13. Roth & Butler, shop collection_____	8. 00
Apr. 13. Salzberg & Pantel, shop collection_____	4. 25
Apr. 13. Beir & Bornstein, shop collection_____	12. 50
Apr. 13. Yolkin & Keller, shop collection_____	2. 00
Apr. 13. Imperial, shop collection_____	11. 85
Apr. 13. Sovereign, shop collection_____	11. 00
Apr. 13. Kaplan & Becker, shop collection_____	7. 50
Apr. 13. Madison, shop collection_____	3. 25
Apr. 13. Grand, shop collection_____	2. 50
Apr. 13. Irving, shop collection_____	4. 00
Apr. 13. Meyers & Meyers, shop collection_____	5. 00
Apr. 13. Baker & Schofield, shop collection_____	11. 00
Apr. 15. H. Bornstein, shop collection_____	1. 50
Apr. 15. H. Shugar, individual_____	. 50
Apr. 15. Altshuler Bros., shop collection_____	24. 30
Apr. 15. Acme, shop collection_____	1. 00
Apr. 17. American, shop collection_____	18. 75
Apr. 18. Louisiana, shop collection_____	8. 50
Apr. 19. Fred Schofield, shop collection_____	3. 00
Apr. 19. Lappin & Long, shop collection_____	7. 50
Apr. 19. Mohilev, shop collection_____	3. 75
Apr. 19. Columbia, shop collection_____	9. 50
Apr. 19. J. Wolfe, shop collection_____	6. 25
Apr. 20. Hohmes, shop collection_____	23. 50
Apr. 20. Belmont, shop collection_____	3. 50
Apr. 20. J. Simpson, two shop collections_____	6. 00
Apr. 20. S. Pollack, shop collection_____	4. 50
Apr. 20. Commercial, shop collection_____	4. 50
Apr. 20. Medal, shop collection_____	3. 00
Apr. 20. S. K. S., shop collection_____	3. 50
Apr. 20. Rosenblatt, shop collection_____	3. 50
Apr. 20. Ball, shop collection_____	3. 90
Apr. 23. Sonnenberg & Goldberg, shop collection_____	. 75
Apr. 24. Ed. Davids, shop collection_____	7. 25
Apr. 24. Acme, shop collection_____	5. 25
Apr. 25. Pansy, shop collection_____	3. 50
Apr. 25. Passaic, shop collection_____	23. 25
Apr. 25. L. H. Spoer, shop collection_____	7. 10
Apr. 25. Liberty, shop collection_____	4. 00
Apr. 26. Hembert, shop collection_____	11. 45
Apr. 26. Bee Hive, shop collection_____	3. 50

Apr. 26. Lippman & Hoffman, shop collection	\$3. 25
Apr. 26. Harris & Saltzberg, shop collection	3. 50
Apr. 27. Brockman, shop collection	6. 00
Apr. 27. Queen, shop collection	14. 25
Apr. 27. Jackson Bros., shop collection	6.30
Apr. 27. Appel Bros., shop collection	13. 25

338. 65

Apr. 27. Diamond, shop collection	19. 50
Apr. 27. Kaplan & Baker, shop collection	6. 50
Apr. 27. S. Golstein, individual	. 50
Apr. 27. Yolkin & Keller, shop collection	3. 00
Apr. 27. Peir & Bornstein, shop collection	11. 75
Apr. 27. M. Bornstein, shop collection	2. 00
Apr. 27. Fidelity, shop collection	3. 00
Apr. 27. H. Bornstein, shop collection	1. 50
Apr. 29. Robbins, shop collection	16. 00
Apr. 29. Keltz & Miller, shop collection	6. 50
Apr. 30. Altshuler Bros., shop collection	22. 10
May 3. Mrs. R. Hammer, collection	5. 65
May 3. Chairman of Mohilev, shop collection	. 50
May 3. Columbia, shop collection	7. 50
May 4. Rosenblatt, shop collection	3. 50
May 4. Grand, shop collection	3. 00
May 4. S. Pollack, shop collection	2. 50
May 4. Siff & Cohen, shop collection	19. 75
May 4. S. J. Simpson, shop collection	5. 75
May 4. M. Goldhammer, shop collection	. 50
May 4. Belmont, S. C., shop collection	5. 75
May 4. Hohmes, shop collection	14. 25
May 4. Luvan, shop collection	13. 10
May 6. Ch. Silberstein, individual	. 50
May 6. S. K. S., shop collection	3. 00
May 9. Passaic, shop collection	24. 00
May 10. E. Farley and A. King (Brooklyn)	1. 00
May 11. Diamond, shop collection	16. 50
May 11. L. H. Spoer, shop collection	6. 75
May 11. Queen, shop collection	16. 00
May 11. L. Gelbard, individual	. 25
May 11. Kaplan & Baker, shop collection	5. 00
May 11. Peir & Bornstein, shop collection	1. 00
May 11. Robbins, shop collection	16. 00
May 11. Keltz & Miller, shop collection	8. 00
May 11. S. J. Kaplan, individual	. 50
May 14. Appel Bros., shop collection	9. 45
May 14. List No. 457, per Palmer	4. 75
May 18. Demarest, shop collection	22. 50
May 20. Hohmes, shop collection	15. 75
May 20. S. K. S., shop collection	3. 00
May 20. Belmont, shop collection	5. 75
May 20. Fabians (Taylor's shop)	3. 60
May 20. Ch. Silberstein, shop collection	1. 00
May 25. Queen, shop collection	15. 75
June 1. Hohmes, shop collection	14. 50
June 1. J. Schwartz, jr., shop collection	6. 50
June 1. S. J. Simpson, shop collection	5. 50
June 1. Appel Bros., shop collection	1. 00
June 1. Belmont, shop collection	3. 25
June 3. S. Russack, individual	. 75
June 7. Passaic, shop collection	9. 25
June 8. Queen, shop collection	14. 75
June 10. M. Newman, individual	. 50

410. 15

Total No. 1	\$286.48
Total No. 2	441.70
Total No. 3	378.35
Total No. 4	338.65
Total No. 5	410.15

Grand total of collections..... 1,855.33

Expenditure of Local No. 25, I. W. W., commencing Feb. 26, to July 1, 1912.

Feb. 26. Rent for Smith Premier typewriter (one month)	\$3.00
Feb. 26. Roll-top desk and table	20.00
Feb. 26. Max Shepps	1.25
Feb. 26. Deposit to Public Service Gas & Electric Co.	20.00
Feb. 26. Office supplies	1.82
Feb. 26. Stationery	1.49
Feb. 26. H. Bornstein (car fare)	.20
Feb. 27. Deposit to New York & New Jersey Telephone Co.	9.00
Feb. 27. H. Pachman, expenses for mass meetings	8.00
Feb. 27. Car fare and hammer	.76
Feb. 28. Stationery	.20
Feb. 28. Printing	25.95
Feb. 28. Stationery	.25
Feb. 29. Telegram to Detroit, Mich.	.90
Feb. 29. Stationery	1.38
Feb. 29. Deposit on Turn Hall for mass meetings	5.00
Feb. 29. Postal cards (200)	2.00
Feb. 29. Rudolph Katz, salary	10.00
Feb. 29. Balance on Turn Hall	10.00
Mar. 1. Car fare	.27
Mar. 1. H. Zahler, expenses for doing clerical work	1.35
Mar. 1. Jos. Titmas, car fare	.10
Mar. 1. Stationery	.20
Mar. 1. H. Pachman, meals, telephone, car-fare expenses, etc.	4.00
Mar. 2. Rudolph Katz, balance on salary	5.00
Mar. 2. Janitor service, No. 266 Main Street	.75
Mar. 2. J. & G. De Leon, expenses for clerical work	1.20
Mar. 2. A. G. Canary, expenses for clerical work	3.25
Mar. 2. Telegram, Detroit, Mich.	.91
Mar. 2. Stationery and office fixtures	1.51
Mar. 2. One lock	.15
Mar. 2. Salary of secretary for one week commencing Feb. 26	10.00
Mar. 2. Stationery	.30
Mar. 3. Telegram to Plainfield, N. J.	.27
Mar. 5. Two tables	7.00
Mar. 5. Car fare	.10
Mar. 5. Stationery	.57
Mar. 5. One barrel for rubbish	.10
Mar. 6. Stationery	.50
Mar. 6. Car fare	.25
Mar. 7. Expenses of committee of Cedar Cliff Co. to New York	3.00
Mar. 7. Telegrams	1.15
Mar. 7. Stationery	.25
Mar. 7. Printing	25.00
Mar. 7. Printing	16.25
Mar. 7. Rudolph Katz, salary	15.00
Mar. 7. Stationery	1.85
Mar. 8. H. Zahler, expenses for clerical work for four days	5.45
Mar. 9. Paul Augustine and J. Hunter, railroad fares and meals	6.15
Mar. 9. R. Markley, railroad fare from Pittsburgh, and meals	12.40
Mar. 9. A. Reimer, railroad fare to Boston	6.00
Mar. 9. Distribution of circulars	.90
Mar. 9. Deposit on Turn Hall	5.00
Mar. 9. Distribution of circulars	.70
Mar. 9. Hire of Feist Hall, 7 shop meetings	10.50
Mar. 9. Stationery	.25
Mar. 9. Envelopes	.30

Mar. 9. H. Rubinstein, expenses	\$3. 00
Mar. 9. Car fare	. 10
Mar. 9. Salary of secretary, one week from Mar. 2	10. 00
Mar. 10. Telegram to Philadelphia, Pa	. 55
Mar. 10. Telegram to Detroit, Mich	. 50
Mar. 10. Car fare	. 10
Mar. 11. Telegram to Philadelphia, Pa	. 40
Mar. 11. Printing	15. 00
Mar. 12. Car fare	. 20
Mar. 12. Rudolph Katz, salary	20. 00
Mar. 13. Cardboard	. 10
Mar. 13. Distribution of circulars	. 15
Mar. 13. Car fare	. 45
Mar. 14. Stationery	. 40
Mar. 14. Turn Hall	17. 00
Mar. 15. Hire of Feist Hall for 5 shop meetings	5. 50
Mar. 15. William Rippstein, return fare to New York	. 50
Mar. 15. Receipt book and committee expenses	. 45
Mar. 16. Shop chairman of Baker & Schofield, for lost time	7. 80
Mar. 16. Printing	24. 00
Mar. 16. Car fare	. 20
Mar. 16. Stamped envelopes	10. 20
Mar. 16. William Foster, expenses for clerical work	1. 00
Mar. 16. G. De Leon, expenses for clerical work	1. 25
Mar. 16. A. G. Canary, expenses for clerical work	1. 00
Mar. 16. Car fare	. 10
Mar. 16. A. G. Canary, expenses for clerical work	2. 10
Mar. 16. G. De Leon, expenses for clerical work	1. 20
Mar. 16. Stationery	. 25
Mar. 16. Car fare	. 20
Mar. 17. Voluntary clerical work expenses	. 60
Mar. 17. Joe Titmas, chairman Empire Silk Co., for time lost	5. 45
Mar. 17. Carpenter work	3. 50
Mar. 17. Salary of secretary for 1 week from Mar. 9	10. 00
Mar. 17. Tacks	. 18
Mar. 18. Janitor service, No. 266 Main Street	1. 00
Mar. 18. R. McClure and William Fennen, railroad fare	14. 02
Mar. 18. Stationery	1. 30
Mar. 19. Janitor service	2. 00
Mar. 19. Deposit on Turn Hall	5. 00
Mar. 19. Stationery	. 10
Mar. 20. Distribution of circulars	. 50
Mar. 20. Car fare	. 10
Mar. 20. Distribution of circulars	. 20
Mar. 20. Rent for Deiser Hall, No. 166 River Street, 3 shop meetings	3. 00
Mar. 20. H. Rubinstein, car fare, etc	. 80
Mar. 20. Stationery	. 30
Mar. 20. Balance on Turn Hall for Mar. 19	5. 00
Mar. 20. Hire of Feist Hall for 3 shop meetings	2. 50
Mar. 21. Deposit on Turn Hall	5. 00
Mar. 21. Committee to Workmen's Circle, New York	2. 40
Mar. 21. Herman Richter, for literature	25. 00
Mar. 21. Rubber type and stationery	1. 60
Mar. 21. Postage stamps (100) at 2 cents each	2. 00
Mar. 21. Augie Alpisa, to West Hoboken, N. J.	. 60
Mar. 22. Janitor service, No. 266 Main Street	3. 00
Mar. 23. Car fare	. 40
Mar. 25. Committee from Siff & Cohen's—expenses to New York	2. 00
Mar. 25. Distribution of circulars	1. 60
Mar. 25. Salary of secretary, 1 week, from Mar. 17	10. 00
Mar. 25. Office fixtures	. 60
Mar. 26. Printing	20. 00
Mar. 26. Postage stamps	2. 00
Mar. 28. Printing	25. 00
Mar. 28. Rudolph Katz, salary	30. 00
Mar. 28. Fine paid for Frank Young	3. 00
Mar. 28. Joe Titmas, chairman of Empire Silk Co., for time lost	3. 45

Mar. 28. Printing	\$1.00
Mar. 28. Stationery	.75
Mar. 28. Two ink bottles	.10
Mar. 28. Stationery	2.15
Mar. 28. Car fare	.30
Mar. 28. Rubber date stamp	.30
Mar. 28. First payment on furniture to independent union	125.00
Mar. 28. Jos. Titmas, expenses to Scranton, Pa	10.00
Mar. 28. Stationery	.90
Mar. 30. Stationery	1.14
Mar. 30. Salary of secretary for one week from March 25	10.00
Mar. 30. Committee from Siff & Cohen, expenses to Summit, N. J.	1.92
Total expenses from Feb. 26 to Mar. 31	740.94

APRIL EXPENDITURES.

Apr. 1. Stationery	2.75
Apr. 2. Chairman of Ball Silk Co., for lost time	1.80
Apr. 2. H. Stur, for removal of furniture, No. 266 Main Street	1.25
Apr. 3. Office fixtures	.30
Apr. 3. Postal cards	.52
Apr. 4. Stationery	.25
Apr. 4. Hire of auditorium, Ellison Street	25.00
Apr. 4. Printing	19.00
Apr. 4. B. Menkes, two weeks' salary, commencing Mar. 21	24.00
Apr. 5. Janitor service, 185 Main Street	2.50
Apr. 5. Two strike breakers from Elmira, N. Y.	1.75
Apr. 5. Rudolph Katz, salary	15.00
Apr. 6. Salary of secretary, one week, commencing Mar. 30	10.00
Apr. 8. Committee from Siff & Cohen, expenses	.75
Apr. 9. H. B. Kitay, rent for No. 266 Main Street for month of April	40.00
Apr. 9. Paid fine for Shevelenco, arrested for distributing circulars	5.00
Apr. 9. Rent for No. 184 Main Street in advance for April, May, and June	112.50
Apr. 9. Hire of band for auditorium (mass meeting Apr. 9)	15.00
Apr. 9. Car fare for girls from Bayonne, N. J. (mass meeting)	10.00
Apr. 9. J. Friedman, for siphon for mass meeting Apr. 9	.15
Apr. 9. Stationery	.75
Apr. 9. Stationery	.30
Apr. 10. Telephone bill	5.00
Apr. 10. Gas and electric-light bill	21.30
Apr. 10. Postage stamps	1.00
Apr. 10. Wm. Foster, expenses for arranging hall meeting	.35
Apr. 12. B. Menkes, treasurer one week from Apr. 4 (salary)	12.00
Apr. 12. J. Titmas, lunch	.15
Apr. 12. Committee expenses to Passaic	.50
Apr. 12. J. Friedman, expenses to New York	4.00
Apr. 12. Music expenses, brass band, auditorium, Apr. 9	37.50
Apr. 12. H. Pachman, for arranging a number of meetings	12.15
Apr. 12. Postage, for calling shop chairman's meetings	1.00
Apr. 12. L. Lazer, for printing	20.00
Apr. 12. Harry Rubinstein, one week's salary, commencing Apr. 1	6.00
Apr. 12. Car fare	.30
Apr. 12. Office supplies	1.50
Apr. 12. J. Friedman, expenses to West Hoboken, N. J.	1.00
Apr. 12. Rudolph Katz, salary	15.00
Apr. 15. H. Rubinstein, one week's salary, commencing Apr. 7	6.00
Apr. 15. Augie Alpisa, janitor service, one week	5.00
Apr. 16. Rudolph Katz, salary	10.00
Apr. 16. Printing	16.00
Apr. 16. Janitor service, No. 266 Main Street	3.00
Apr. 16. Stationery, postals, and stamps	2.35
Apr. 16. Balance on Turn Hall	10.00
Apr. 16. Telephone call	.05
Apr. 16. Stationery	.50
Apr. 17. Stationery	7.55
Apr. 17. Date stamp	.30

Apr. 17.	Stationery-----	\$0.95
Apr. 13.	Salary of secretary, one week, commencing from April 6-----	10. 00
Apr. 17.	B. Menkes, treasurer, one week, commencing from April 10-----	12. 00
Apr. 17.	Lunch and railroad fare to a strike breaker-----	1. 00
Apr. 17.	Printing-----	26. 50
Apr. 19.	Ribbon for typewriter-----	1. 00
Apr. 20.	Salary of secretary for one week, commencing Apr. 13-----	10. 00
Apr. 20.	Carpenter, for repairing door-----	. 75
Apr. 20.	Meyer Paris, for two muslin signs (painting)-----	2. 00
Apr. 20.	Advance salary to J. McLean, for janitor work-----	2. 00
Apr. 20.	Augie Alpisa, janitor service, commencing Apr. 13-----	6. 00
Apr. 20.	H. Rubinstein, salary, commencing Apr. 13-----	6. 00
Apr. 20.	Stationery and stamps-----	1. 60
Apr. 22.	Postals-----	. 50
Apr. 22.	J. Freidman, car fare to New York-----	1. 40
Apr. 22.	B. Menkes, car fare and other expenses-----	. 90
Apr. 22.	D. Millstein, car fare-----	1. 20
Apr. 25.	E. Korman and F. Campbell, food for commissary department-----	5. 15
Apr. 25.	Mrs. Johnson, for signs for parade-----	3. 00
Apr. 25.	Tacks and stationery-----	. 75
Apr. 25.	B. Menkes, treasurer, for one week, commencing Apr. 18-----	12. 00
Apr. 25.	H. Pachman and H. Rubinstein, car fare to West Hoboken, Rutherford, New York, for distributing circulars-----	2. 45
Apr. 26.	Mrs. Robbins, for commissary department-----	3. 00
Apr. 27.	Deposit on Belmont Park for picnic-----	10. 00
Apr. 27.	Fine for a picket from the Armour Silk Co.-----	5. 00
Apr. 27.	H. Rubinstein, salary for one week, commencing Apr. 20-----	8. 00
Apr. 27.	Balance to J. McLean, for one week, janitor service-----	4. 00
Apr. 27.	Salary of secretary for one week, commencing Apr. 20-----	10. 00
Apr. 28.	Rent for shop meetings in the Workingmen's Institute, for 10 meetings, at \$1 per meeting-----	10. 00
Apr. 29.	Kitchen supplies-----	1. 68
Apr. 30.	Tags and ribbon for the parade-----	1. 40
Apr. 30.	F. Campbell, for commissary department-----	8. 50
Total expenses for April, 1912-----		656. 80

MAY EXPENSES.

May	1.	Commissary department-----	6. 50
May	1.	Frank Young, for parade expenses-----	5. 00
May	1.	Balance on Belmont Park-----	25. 00
May	1.	Ice for general use at picnic-----	2. 00
May	1.	Meyer Paris, for painting two muslin signs for picnic-----	1. 25
May	1.	For corn beef for use at picnic-----	13. 76
May	1.	Rolls, bread, and charcoal for the picnic-----	3. 15
May	1.	H. Pachman, for flags and banners for parade-----	5. 96
May	1.	Brass band for parade-----	40. 00
May	1.	Printing-----	2. 50
May	1.	Car fare and other expenses for demonstration and picnic-----	3. 06
May	1.	Expense for calling a meeting of delegates-----	2. 00
May	2.	Commissary department, per F. Campbell-----	2. 00
May	2.	B. Menkes, treasurer, salary for one week commencing from Apr. 25-----	12. 00
May	2.	Fine for 4 pickets from the Armour Silk Co. and Finkelstein & Diamond Silk Co., at \$3 each-----	12. 00
May	2.	For commissary department-----	6. 00
May	3.	For commissary department-----	1. 00
May	3.	Car fare to a strike breaker-----	1. 00
May	3.	Envelopes and stamps-----	3. 00
May	3.	Rudolph Katz, salary-----	18. 00
May	3.	Postals-----	. 50
May	3.	Chairman of Demarest Silk Co., for lost time-----	. 60
May	4.	Commission department, provisions for strikers-----	2. 80
May	4.	Turn Hall for general meeting-----	12. 00
May	4.	Index-----	. 25

May	4.	Joe McLean, salary for one week for janitor service commencing from Apr. 27	\$6. 00
May	4.	Salary of secretary, one week from Apr. 27	10. 00
May	4.	H. Rubinstein, salary for one week commencing Apr. 27	8. 00
May	5.	Commissary department	6. 00
May	5.	Lager beer for picnic	30. 00
May	7.	Rudolph Katz, on account	5. 00
May	7.	Fine paid for Rosenberg	10. 00
May	9.	Ward & McGinnis, lawyers	50. 00
May	9.	Car fare, stationery, and stamps	1. 25
May	9.	B. Menkes, treasurer, salary one week from May 2	12. 00
May	9.	Keys for front door, No. 266 Main Street	.30
May	10.	Volksfreund, for literature	15. 00
May	11.	Kitchen supplies	28. 90
May	11.	H. Rubinstein, salary for one week commencing May 4	8. 00
May	11.	J. McLean, salary, janitor service, one week from May 4	6. 00
May	11.	Rudolph Katz, on account	2. 00
May	11.	Ice cream for picnic	17. 75
May	11.	Rent for No. 266 Main Street, one month, for May	40. 00
May	11.	D. Millstein, car fare	.80
May	11.	Stationery	1. 40
May	13.	Expenses for sending children away	2. 80
May	13.	Broom	.50
May	13.	Gas, electric light, and telephone bills	26. 38
May	13.	Salary of secretary for one week commencing May 4	10. 00
May	14.	Rudolph Katz, salary	20. 00
May	14.	Fine paid for Charles Silver	10. 00
May	15.	Stationery	2. 00
May	15.	Car fare to Elizabeth, N. J.	.20
May	15.	Harry Rubinstein, car fare	.25
May	15.	Filing cabinet	2. 50
May	15.	Printing	20. 00
May	16.	B. Menkes, salary for one week commencing May 9	12. 00
May	16.	Steel tacks	.20
May	16.	Harry Rubinstein, car fare	.20
May	18.	Hire of Turn Hall	15. 00
May	18.	Rudolph Katz, salary	20. 00
May	18.	H. Rubinstein, salary for one week commencing May 11	8. 00
May	18.	J. McLean, salary, janitor service, one week from May 11	6. 00
May	18.	H. Rubinstein and B. Menkes, car fare to New York	2. 40
May	21.	Stationery	4. 00
May	21.	H. Rubinstein, car fare to New York	1. 25
May	21.	Salary of secretary, one week commencing May 11	10. 00
May	21.	Stationery	2. 00
May	21.	H. Klavins, 2 days' wages	2. 00
May	22.	Ward & McGinnis, lawyers	50. 00
May	22.	Roll book	.25
May	22.	Telephone bill	11. 60
May	23.	B. Menkes, salary for one week commencing May 16	12. 00
May	23.	Herman Klavins, railroad to Bayonne and return	1. 00
May	24.	Printing	5. 25
May	24.	Postage and stationery	2. 50
May	24.	Stationery	.50
May	25.	Herman Klavins, salary for one week	8. 00
May	25.	Car fare	.50
May	25.	Rudolph Katz, salary	12. 00
May	25.	L. Lazer, for printing	20. 00
May	25.	J. McLean, salary, janitor service for one week from May 18	6. 00
May	25.	H. Rubinstein, salary, one week, commencing May 18	8. 00
May	25.	Mrs. O. M. Johnson, railroad fare	10. 00
May	27.	Herman Klavins, railroad fare to Bayonne and return	1. 00
May	27.	H. Gold, for children's car fare	5. 00
May	27.	Turn Hall, mass meeting	15. 00
May	28.	Herman Klavins, railroad fare to Bayonne and return	1. 00
May	28.	Herman Klavins, railroad fare to Bayonne and return	1. 00
May	28.	Stamps and postals	4. 00
May	28.	For cleaning hall and other expenses	1. 45

May 28.	Herman Klavins, railroad fare and return to Bayonne-----	\$1. 00
May 28.	B. Menkes, salary for one week commencing May 23-----	12. 00
May 28.	Cigars for picnic-----	7. 00
May 30.	Herman Klavins, railroad fare and return to Bayonne-----	1. 00
May 31.	Herman Klavins, railroad fare and return to Bayonne-----	1. 00

Total for May, 1912-----	815. 46
--------------------------	---------

JUNE EXPENDITURES.

June 1.	Mrs. Rudolph Katz, salary-----	20. 00
June 1.	John Murphy, for janitor service-----	3. 00
June 1.	Salary to secretary, two weeks, commencing May 18-----	20. 00
June 1.	Keys for the front door of 184 Main Street-----	1. 20
June 3.	Rent for Turn Hall, protest meeting-----	15. 00
June 3.	Printing, Italian circulars-----	2. 50
June 3.	Stationery-----	1. 53
June 3.	Rent for June for 266 Main Street for month of June-----	40. 00
June 4.	Ward & McGinnis, lawyers-----	25. 00
June 4.	Commissary department-----	2. 00
June 5.	Committee from Siff & Cohen's, expenses to New York-----	2. 00
June 5.	Postal cards-----	. 30
June 5.	Herman Klavins, railroad fare to Bayonne and return-----	1. 00
June 5.	McLure & Yannerelli, expenses to New York and Hoboken-----	3. 50
June 6.	Independent Silk Weavers' Union, on account-----	60. 00
June 6.	B. Menkes, salary, one week, commencing May 28-----	12. 00
June 7.	Telegram to Smilansky-----	. 45
June 7.	Herman Klavins, salary-----	7. 00
June 8.	Mrs. R. Katz, salary-----	15. 00
June 8.	H. Klavins, railroad fare to Bayonne and return, etc-----	1. 50
June 8.	Stationery-----	1. 40
June 8.	Janitor service-----	3. 00
June 10.	Carl Ball and N. Straub, expenses to Newark, N. J-----	1. 00
June 10.	Herman Klavins, railroad fare to Bayonne and return-----	1. 00
June 10.	Gas and electric bill-----	14. 10
June 10.	Commissary department-----	35. 00
June 10.	Stationery-----	2. 15
June 11.	Herman Klavins, car fare to Bayonne and return-----	1. 00
June 12.	L. Lazer, printing-----	20. 00
June 12.	Postage stamps-----	1. 50
June 12.	Janitor service-----	2. 00
June 12.	Goldhammer and McLure, expenses to New York-----	2. 50
June 12.	Herman Klavins, car fare to Bayonne and return-----	1. 00
June 12.	J. Smilansky, railroad fare to Philadelphia, etc-----	4. 50
June 14.	Telephone bill-----	19. 45
June 15.	Herman Klavins, two weeks' salary-----	15. 00
June 15.	Printing-----	20. 00
June 17.	Commissary department-----	40. 00
June 17.	B. Menkes, salary for one week commencing June 6-----	12. 00
June 17.	Car fare and other expenses-----	. 65
June 17.	Postage stamps-----	1. 00
June 17.	Ward & McGinnis, lawyers-----	50. 00
June 17.	Miss N. Hillard, railroad expenses-----	1. 50
June 17.	Herman Klavins, railroad fare to Bayonne and return-----	1. 00
June 18.	Salary of secretary, two weeks, commencing June 3-----	20. 00
June 18.	Ward & McGinnis, lawyers (special case)-----	1. 00
June 19.	Italian meeting, hall and printing expenses-----	7. 15
June 19.	Rudolph Katz, salary-----	15. 00
June 19.	Stationery and mop-----	. 54
June 19.	B. Menkes, four trips to New York and other expenses-----	4. 50
June 19.	Janitor service for one week-----	5. 00
June 19.	Postage stamps and postal cards-----	. 65
June 19.	Herman Klavins, railroad fare to Bayonne and return-----	1. 00
June 20.	Herman Klavins, railroad fare to Bayonne and return-----	1. 00
June 20.	B. Menkes, salary for one week-----	12. 00
June 20.	Deposit on Turn Hall-----	5. 00
June 20.	For distributing circulars-----	. 75

June 21. Herman Klavins, railroad fare to Bayonne and return.....	\$1. 00
June 21. Balance to janitor for services rendered.....	1. 00
June 22. J. Iamrucci, one week's salary for janitor services.....	6. 00
June 22. Stationery.....	. 83
June 22. Commissary department, provisions for strikers.....	25. 00
June 22. B. Menkes, expenses to New York and return.....	1. 50
June 24. Stamps, envelopes, and papers.....	. 68
June 24. Klavins, Walters, and Yager, speakers' expenses.....	3. 00
June 25. Balance on Turn Hall.....	10. 00
June 25. L. Lazer, for printing.....	25. 00
June 25. H. Klavins, car fare to Bayonne and return.....	1. 00
June 26. Rudolph Katz, salary.....	15. 00
June 26. Deposit on Turn Hall.....	5. 00
June 26. B. Menkes, railroad fare to New York.....	1. 00
June 26. Registered letters and other expenses.....	. 78
June 27. H. Klavins, railroad fare and other expenses.....	2. 25
June 27. B. Menkes, treasurer, salary for one week.....	12. 00
June 28. Commissary department, provisions for strikers.....	50. 00
June 28. Distributing circulars.....	1. 00
June 28. Balance on Turn Hall.....	10. 00
June 29. H. Klavins, railroad fare and expenses.....	1. 75
June 29. J. Iamrucci, for janitor service, one week's salary, \$3, in advance.....	9. 00
June 29. Salary of secretary, two weeks.....	20. 00
June 29. Stationery.....	. 45
Total expenditure for June.....	755. 56
Total expenditure for May.....	815. 46
Total expenditure for April.....	656. 80
Total expenditure from Feb. 26 to Mar. 1.....	740. 94
Total from Feb. 26 to July 1.....	2, 968. 76

STRIKE BENEFITS.

Mar. 1. H. Doherty S. Co., employees.....	75. 00
Mar. 14. Jansen & Pretzfeld, striker.....	5. 00
Mar. 15. H. Doherty S. Co., employees.....	150. 00
Mar. 16. Morton Mills S. Co., one striker.....	1. 00
Mar. 20. H. Doherty S. Co., employees.....	75. 00
Mar. 20. Strike benefits paid to 65 persons.....	112. 00
Mar. 23. Strike benefits paid to 49 persons.....	73. 50
Mar. 25. H. Doherty S. Co., employees.....	79. 00
Mar. 27. Strike benefits paid to 11 persons.....	22. 00
Mar. 29. Strike benefits paid to 5 persons.....	12. 50
Mar. 30. Strike benefits paid to 7 persons.....	15. 00
Apr. 1. H. Doherty S. Co., employees.....	96. 00
Apr. 1 to Apr. 7. Strike benefits paid to 99 persons.....	200. 00
Apr. 9 to Apr. 14. H. Doherty S. Co., employees.....	75. 00
Apr. 9 to Apr. 14. Strike benefits paid to 98 persons.....	211. 00
Apr. 15 to Apr. 21. H. Doherty S. Co., employees.....	85. 00
Apr. 15 to Apr. 21. Strike benefits paid to 60 persons.....	120. 00
Apr. 22 to Apr. 28. H. Doherty S. Co., employees.....	60. 00
Apr. 22 to Apr. 28. Strike benefits paid to 82 persons.....	167. 50
Apr. 28 to May 5. H. Doherty S. Co., employees.....	64. 00
Apr. 28 to May 5. Strike benefits paid to 39 persons.....	97. 00
May 6 to May 13. H. Doherty S. Co., employees.....	60. 00
May 6 to May 13. Strike benefits paid to 29 persons.....	59. 00
May 14 to May 20. Strike benefits paid to 8 persons.....	25. 00
May 21 to May 27. Strike benefits paid to 8 persons.....	35. 00
May 28 to June 3. Strike benefits paid to 109 persons.....	275. 95
May 30. Paid to the relief committee.....	246. 55
June 3 to June 10. Strike benefits paid to 149 persons.....	392. 50
June 11 to June 18. Strike benefits paid to 156 persons.....	325. 55
June 18 to June 29. Strike benefits paid to 262 persons.....	679. 20
Total strike benefits paid out.....	3, 894. 25

INDUSTRIAL CONDITIONS AND RELATIONS IN PATERSON. 2645

EXPENDITURES CLASSIFIED.

Trolley and railroad fares	\$183. 62
Independent Union on account for furniture	185. 00
Rent for No. 266 Main Street and No. 184 Main Street	232. 50
Gas and electric light bills	74. 18
Printing	348. 95
Commissary department	218. 53
Telephone and telegram bills	57. 83
Legal expenses (lawyers and fines)	221. 00
Salaries	771. 00
Shop and mass meeting expenses	212. 65
Stationery and postage	95. 72
Miscellaneous expenses	367. 78
Expenses to general executive board	268. 63
Prisoners' meals, cigars and tobacco, stationery, etc	290. 13
Strike benefits paid out to strikers	3, 894. 25
Total expenditures	7, 421. 77

TOTAL INCOMES.

Initiation fees and dues received for—	
February and March	\$1, 177. 80
April	474. 35
May	249. 10
June	164. 30
Total initiation fees and dues	2, 065. 55
Total received for buttons and telephone calls	22. 50
Income from shop collections	1, 855. 33
Received from Robert McLure from general fund	2, 704. 74
Received from the Jewish Forward, newspaper	508. 75
Miscellaneous	179. 45
Received from Fred Ball as a loan on furniture	100. 00
Total income	7, 436. 32
Total expenditures	7, 421. 77
Balance on hand July 1, 1912	14. 55

NOTICE.—The expenses of the general executive board, \$268.63, is not included in the itemized account of expenditures; neither are the prisoners' expenses, \$290.13, nor the strike benefits, \$3,894.25.

B. MENKES.
CARL BALL, *Organizer*.
WM. LANDGRAF.

Books open for inspection at all times.

KATZ EXHIBIT NO. 34.

PATERSON, N. J., May 24, 1910.

Mr. Frank Bohn, to Fidelity Storage & Furniture Co., Dr.

18 months' storage, Dec. 21, 1908, to June 21, 1910, at \$6.50----- \$117
On about 400 chairs, desks, tables, etc.