

The committee met at 2.30 p. m., pursuant to recess.

**STATEMENT OF WILLIAM Z. FOSTER, ORGANIZER, BROTHERHOOD
OF RAILWAY CARMEN.**

The CHAIRMAN. We will go ahead with Mr. Foster now.

Mr. Foster, will you state to the reporter, please, your name and residence and business?

Mr. FOSTER. William Z. Foster, 1412 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh; International organizer, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen.

The CHAIRMAN. How long have you held that position, Mr. Foster?

- Mr. FOSTER. About three years.

The CHAIRMAN. Is that one of the organizations in this strike?

Mr. FOSTER. It is.

The CHAIRMAN. Engaged in this strike?

Mr. FOSTER. It is.

The CHAIRMAN. There are some 24 different organizations?

Mr. FOSTER. There are.

The CHAIRMAN. What is the work of an organizer?

Mr. FOSTER. The work of an organizer is to assemble the men in such fashion that they may be able to present their grievances collectively.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, to procure members for the union?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, I wish you would go ahead in your own way and tell us the causes of this strike from your standpoint and your relationship to the strike. What are the reasons for this strike? Why is this strike now?

Mr. FOSTER. This movement of the steel workers at this time relates to movements that have gone on in the past among them. It was the policy of the organizations and of the men themselves, who dictate the policy of these organizations, to restrict the organizations to a great extent to the more skilled men in the industry. If they did not deliberately restrict it, at least they did not make an effort to get the unskilled so much. But that policy proved to be ineffective. The steel companies were strong enough to defeat the skilled men, and it became necessary, in order for the unskilled men to protect themselves at all, that the organization be extended to them.

That led up to the present campaign. The men in all these mills—not all, possibly, but in most of the mills—for years have tried to organize and in many ways have demanded the assistance of the organizations to help them from existing conditions; and as the result of that general demand, the movement sprang up, bearing in mind the experiences of past years and the interests of the international unions in the industry, so that there might be a concerted effort made all along the line and in all branches of the industry and in all trades in the industry to secure better conditions for the men. That took shape—a resolution was introduced in the Chicago Federation of Labor about a year and a half ago requesting the American Federation of Labor to undertake a campaign of that character.

The CHAIRMAN. What relation was that convention to the St. Paul convention?

Mr. FOSTER. It was the St. Paul convention. This resolution was adopted by the American Federation of Labor at St. Paul, and provision was made to call a meeting of the 24 international presidents to start this campaign. That meeting was held the 1st of August, last year, in Chicago, and this campaign was started.

Now, you ask that I state my connection with that campaign. I want to say that I am the secretary of the committee that came out of that first meeting of the presidents on August 1, 1918.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, is that committee managing this strike?

Mr. FOSTER. That committee is managing this strike.

The CHAIRMAN. You are secretary, then, of the committee that is managing the strike?

Mr. FOSTER. I am. That committee consists of the presidents of all of these international unions, numbering over 2,000,000 men, and in the event, or in case, any of the international presidents are not able to attend then they delegate somebody to act in their stead.

Now, in the work of this committee it has fallen upon me to take care of the office and attend to that part of it.

The CHAIRMAN. You have active charge of the strike?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not.

The CHAIRMAN. Who has?

Mr. FOSTER. The committee superintends this strike.

The CHAIRMAN. That committee superintends the strike?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And if the committee themselves are not there, they have a representative—

Mr. FOSTER (interrupting). In Pittsburgh at the present time we have several members of that committee, and they act in the absence of the whole committee. I have absolutely no authority of any kind whatsoever to adopt any policies in regard to the strike. Any matter

that comes up must be referred to that committee that is in Pittsburgh.

The CHAIRMAN. What are your duties?

Mr. FOSTER. My duties are to act as secretary of the strike and look after the organizing work. I handle the finances, of course, in connection with the office work.

If I may be permitted, I would like to state that there has been a great deal of misstatement appearing in the press about my connection and powers and so forth in this strike. I want to say that this strike is conducted by these international unions, and I have no authority whatsoever in the matter. Everything, however small, except possibly detailing organizers here and there, must be referred to that committee, and that committee consists of men representing more than 2,000,000 men, including such men as the president of the United Mine Workers, President Tighe, President Valentine, President Johnson, of the Machinists, and all the rest of them. Every move that has been made, every policy that has been adopted, has been with the full knowledge and consent of that whole committee.

At times we find ourselves—we call meetings on a certain day and we find important questions pop up in the course of that meeting, and it might be that, instead of 24 members, we will only have 10 or a dozen represented, and all of that 10 or 12 international unions would proceed to take action, but we always call a special meeting of our whole committee, so that every organization would thoroughly understand what was going on and be in a position to assume responsibility. The reason for that is this, that this is a federated proposition, and it is a free-will organization.

It is not bound together by any constitution or law or anything, except just common interest. The only way we can maintain that committee together is to have a thorough understanding and agreement among the organizations taking part in it, and in order to preserve that agreement we find it necessary to continually refer back to these international heads.

For example, when the question of a strike vote was proposed, there were several trades absent from our meeting. We had a great majority of the trades present, and they were unanimously in favor of putting out a strike vote; but we took this position: That the only way this committee could function was to have unanimous action, and therefore it was necessary to call a special meeting to consider the proposition of a strike. That special meeting was called, all the organizations were notified, and they went on record for a strike at that time.

The CHAIRMAN. When was that?

Mr. FOSTER. The second meeting was July 20, the meeting at which they voted for a strike—voted to put out a strike vote, in fact.

The CHAIRMAN. I want you to go back to the St. Paul convention. That resolution was adopted—

Mr. FOSTER. It was adopted there by the American Federation of Labor. That came from the Chicago Federation of Labor.

The CHAIRMAN. It came from the Chicago Federation of Labor? Who introduced the resolution to do that?

Mr. FOSTER. The Chicago Federation of Labor introduced it.

The CHAIRMAN. They introduced it?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, they introduced it.

The CHAIRMAN. Then you come down to this meeting in July at which it was voted to put out a strike vote. Was the vote then taken?

Mr. FOSTER. The vote was ordered taken and ordered returned in a month.

The CHAIRMAN. Tell us just how that would be done.

Mr. FOSTER. How the vote was taken?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. This committee itself has no power to take a vote. This committee has no power to order a strike. All this committee serves to do is to bring the responsible men together so that they can express themselves.

Senator STERLING. By "this committee" you mean the 24 heads of the 24 international unions?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir; what we call the national committee for organizing iron and steel workers.

The CHAIRMAN. And they really submit the question of a strike to the men?

Mr. FOSTER. To the international unions, and they do as they please with it, according to their desires.

The CHAIRMAN. Now trace that along, Mr. Foster.

Mr. FOSTER. The way we took the vote was this. The committee went on record in favor of it. We know that each man on that committee is speaking with the full authority of his organization, and if he agrees to have that strike vote taken for his organization, that settles it so far as his organization is concerned. We let them take the vote in accordance with their own laws. We do not superintend it in any way, shape or form. All we got from that vote was the report from the trades, the organized trades, as to the percentage of men in their organizations that voted for this strike, with this exception: that in some places the men had not yet been placed in the proper organizations to which they belonged under our scheme of things in the American Federation of Labor, and it was necessary for the committee itself to take the vote of those men. We also took the vote of unorganized men as far as we were able to do so in the unorganized districts; but the men in these international unions, the committees, take the vote according to their own laws, and we have no control over them. All we can do is to take their reports, which we did at the Youngstown meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. What were those reports?

Mr. FOSTER. Those reports showed the vote, as we calculated it, to be 98 per cent. I want to be frank about it and say it was a conservative estimate.

Senator WALSH. Ninety-eight per cent of what?

Mr. FOSTER. Of the total number of men voting.

Senator WALSH. What was that number, do you know?

Mr. FOSTER. We have no way of telling that. We can only tell the votes we took ourselves, because each international union takes its own vote. Of course the national committee is able to tabulate all the votes it took itself.

Senator STERLING. Now, the members of this committee, who represented the several international unions, the 24 men, had previously declared for a strike?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. I thought I understood you to say a while ago that before you submitted it these 24 men had declared in favor of a strike?

Mr. FOSTER. No; they declared in favor of putting out a strike vote. After a vote is taken a conference may be had, which would do away with the necessity for a strike.

Senator STERLING. In declaring in favor of putting out a strike vote, did the committee express the opinions of the committee at all in regard to it?

Mr. FOSTER. They never do. They just submit the proposition: "Are you willing to support the committee to the extent of ceasing work in the event the demands of the men are not met?" a proposition along that line, and the men vote yes or no. That is the usual way of taking a strike vote.

Senator STERLING. Are there any cases where any propaganda is put out by the members of the committee when they call a strike vote?

Mr. FOSTER. You mean in this campaign?

Senator STERLING. No; in any cases.

Mr. FOSTER. I can not say about any case, but in this campaign I would say more emphatically, no, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Did that question of submitting it to a vote come up? What discussion had there been about a strike?

Mr. FOSTER. The discussion had been this: A general conference was held in Pittsburgh, on May 25, of representatives of this council formed from unions all over the United States, and that conference was called to ascertain the opinions of the steel workers, and in response to a large number of demands from the men to have something done to better their condition. That conference was held and at it a large number of resolutions were submitted requesting the national committee to seek a conference with the steel companies for the purpose—then they would recite the things they figured they ought to have.

The CHAIRMAN. How were the men represented in that conference?

Mr. FOSTER. The local unions sent two or three delegates.

The CHAIRMAN. Did those delegates complain of conditions?

Mr. FOSTER. Indeed they did.

The CHAIRMAN. What were their complaints, in a general way?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that possibly the greatest complaint that was made was the complaint of a lack of industrial democracy in the steel industry. There is a strong feeling on the part of the men that they should be given consideration.

If I may be permitted to state it as I get it, it amounts to simply this: In the make up of an industry there are two great factors, without which it can not operate. One is the capital or the property itself and the other is the men, those who work at the mills. Now the way things operate in the steel industry at the present time is that property has all rights and the men have none—property rights are 100 per cent in the steel industry and human rights are no per cent.

Senator BOEHL. Mr. Foster, you say that property rights are 100 per cent and human rights are no per cent. Will you give us an illustration of what you mean by that?

Mr. FOSTER. I am speaking from this standpoint: When it comes to regulation of the conditions under which the men shall work, the hours of labor, the working conditions and wages, the men have absolutely nothing to say about it. That is a matter that is ruled upon by these men who represent the property interest in the industry.

Senator WALSH. You mean that their power of influence is zero?

Mr. FOSTER. That is the idea.

Senator WALSH. Not that their conditions are zero?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no; I do not say that; but their representation in the establishment of conditions is absolutely nil. These men have objected to that. They believe that in those matters fundamentally affecting them that they are entitled to a voice. They realize that capital is a great factor in the industry, but they also believe that labor is a great factor in the industry, and that it is impossible to operate the plants without labor. They say that the employer makes a heavy investment in the industry, but that so do they. They put their whole life in there. Their whole life and the life of their family is put in there, and that they are entitled to representation, and if I might say, that that representation is what is known as the right of collective bargaining, and I think that is the fundamental proposition at stake in this controversy. It has been placed No. 1 in the list of demands, and I think it belongs there.

I might say further that the steel workers are making a great effort to secure that fundamental right of collective bargaining. If they do not succeed in securing it at this time, the fight must go on. They have rigged up a great combination in themselves, a big organization, but if that is not big enough and not strong enough, they will organize a bigger one and a stronger one, and fight will go on until they acquire that right of collective bargaining in the steel industry.

The CHAIRMAN. Was that discussed at the meeting?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Were the wages themselves discussed, or merely the fact that they had never had anything to do with the fixing of wages? Was the complaint about wages made?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir; there were many scales submitted. Every local union submitted its idea of what it thought the wages ought to be, all making demands for this, that, or the other, and those things were all referred to a committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The strike really was not because of low wages, was it?

Mr. FOSTER. Partially so; yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Was there complaint of hours of service?

Mr. FOSTER. A very strong complaint on that score. I might say further, if I might, in connection with that first proposition, that these men feel this way about it. They see the United States Government dealing with its employees, and they know this much, that the United States Government is sovereign in this country. There is absolutely no power that it yields to, except, of course, the suffrage of the people. If there is anything sovereign in the country that represents the sovereignty of the country, it is the United States Government; and yet the United States Government does not balk at

dealing with its employees and haggling with them over clauses and agreements, and quibbling and working the thing out on a bona fide system of collective bargaining, and the feeling is general among these men that if the United States Government will do that, if the Government itself will recognize the right of collective bargaining, Judge Gary and the steel magnates, who have a much weaker title to their properties than the Government has to its, they have no right to withhold that.

Senator STERLING. Would you have the Government adopt the system of collective bargaining with its employees?

Mr. FOSTER. The Government is using that system.

Senator STERLING. It is using that system?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. With its employees now?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator STERLING. What classes of employees?

Mr. FOSTER. The railroad employees.

Senator STERLING. It is collectively bargaining with them?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Is it using that system anywhere else?

Mr. FOSTER. It is using it in the shipyards.

Senator BORAH. As I understand, Mr. Foster, the primary achievement, in order to democratize the industry, is to have collective bargaining, in your mind?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator BORAH. You place that first?

Mr. FOSTER. First.

Senator BORAH. Then you would say, from your standpoint, that the primary basis of this strike is the right to establish or the desire to establish the principle of collective bargaining?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course, the men—that is only part of it, but that is the big part, in my estimation.

Senator BORAH. And I ask you if you think that is the primary principle?

Mr. FOSTER. I honestly believe that if the right of collective bargaining had been recognized that this strike would not have occurred.

Senator MCKELLAR. Mr. Foster, are you in favor of organized Government?

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Chairman, I see the Senator is reading from the red book.

Senator MCKELLAR. Yes, sir; and I want to read you from it. Will you look at this book and say whether that book —

Mr. TIGHE (interposing). It is not necessary.

Senator MCKELLAR (continuing). Was written by you, in whole or in part? Just look at it, please.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I would have to read it through before I could say.

Senator MCKELLAR. Well, it is a book on Syndicalism, by Francis C. Ford and William Z. Foster. Are you that William Z. Foster that is referred to on the title page of the book?

Mr. FOSTER. I guess I am.

Senator MCKELLAR. Now, you say you would have to read it through. I am going to read you a paragraph from it and ask you

if you wrote the paragraph, or subscribed to the paragraph. It is entitled, on page 3, "The revolution":

The wages system is the most brazen and gigantic robbery ever perpetrated since the world began. So disastrous are its consequences on the vast armies of slaves within its toils that it is threatening the very existence of society. If society is even to be perpetuated—to say nothing of being organized upon an equitable basis—the wages system must be abolished. The thieves at present in control of the industries must be stripped of their booty and society so reorganized that every individual shall have free access to the social means of production. This social reorganization will be a revolution. Only after such a revolution will the great inequalities of modern society disappear.

And under the title of "The Means to the Revolution":

The class struggle. For years progressive workers have realized the necessity for this revolution. They have also realized that it must be brought about by the workers themselves.

Is that your composition?

Mr. FOSTER. That sounds like it.

Senator MCKELLAR. You know whether it is, do you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I have not read it for a good many years.

Senator MCKELLAR. Will you look at the part I have read and state whether or not it is your composition?

Mr. FOSTER. The chairman asked me a question. If I might be permitted to continue that and then—

The CHAIRMAN. Is there any objection to that, Senator?

Senator MCKELLAR. I think he might answer this question first, because it is directly in line with something he has already said, and I would like to know whether it is your composition or not, and whether that is your belief or not.

Mr. FOSTER. I will say that that is probably my composition. I won't dispute it.

Senator MCKELLAR. Is it your belief, the doctrine of revolution, as there enunciated? Is that your honest belief now?

Mr. FOSTER. The chairman has requested me to tell what this strike is about; and if I may be permitted to do that, then I will answer all of these questions later.

Senator MCKELLAR. Now, Mr. Chairman, I think I have a right to have an answer to my question now.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you insist upon it?

Senator MCKELLAR. I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Of course, if the Senator insists upon it, of course, I take it that Senators will go into this matter very fully.

Senator MCKELLAR. Let us have an answer to that question and then go ahead.

Senator WALSH. I imagine that the witness wants to go into that matter at some length.

Senator MCKELLAR. I will be very glad for him to do so.

Senator WALSH. I imagine that he does not object to a discussion of the question. Am I right?

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to take it up in some sort of order, if I could.

The CHAIRMAN. I have no doubt that the witness will be questioned very fully about that book.

Senator MCKELLAR. Of course. I am still waiting for an answer, Mr. Foster.

The CHAIRMAN. Read the question.
(The reporter read as follows:)

Is it your belief, the doctrine of revolution as there enunciated? Is that your honest belief now?

Mr. FOSTER. I should answer that question.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I will say this. I will say not only with regard to that, but to everything that is in there, that it was written some eight or nine years ago; I do not know exactly when, and at that time—well, I might state this, that I am one who was raised in the slums. I am one who has had a hard experience in life. I have probably seen some of the worst sides of it, and I have knocked around in the industries, and I have seen many things that I did not agree with in the industries, and at the time that that was written, I want to say that I was a follower and an advocate of the Spanish, French, and Italian system of unionism, and since then I have become possibly a little less impatient, a little less extreme, possibly, in my views, considerably so, in fact; and to-day I will state that I am an advocate of the system of unionism as we find it in America and England. Now, I will say that not only for that statement, but for everything that is in that book.

Senator MCKELLAR. You have not answered my question, which is: Do you honestly and sincerely believe in the statement that is made on page 3 of this book on the subject of "revolution," which I have read to you?

Mr. FOSTER. I will say that if I were writing that again, or if I were writing a book, I would not include any of that that is in that book.

Senator MCKELLAR. But my question is, which I will repeat: Do you honestly and sincerely believe in the doctrine of revolution as stated on page 3 of this book, as read to you?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe I have answered you as well as I could. I stated that I would not write it.

Senator MCKELLAR. It is a question now that is perfectly susceptible of being answered "yes" or "no," and then you can make any explanation that you like, because I want to be entirely fair with you. I would not be unfair for anything in the world. It is just a question of do you still believe in it?

Mr. FOSTER. I just want to say this, Mr. Chairman. In this campaign there has been a great deal of newspaper publicity, and the newspapers have treated the men in charge of the campaign most unfairly, most unfairly, and I say that advisedly. President Gompers, who gained such a splendid reputation during the war, has been lambasted all over the country for the part that he has played in this work. The papers have made, as a rule—

Senator MCKELLAR (after a pause). I am listening, sir.

Senator BORAH. Mr. Foster, will you permit me to make a suggestion?

Senator MCKELLAR. I would like very much for him to answer that question.

Senator BORAH. This is in connection with it, but I will not break into it.

Senator MCKELLAR. I hope the Senator will wait just a moment until he answers the question.

(The witness made no response.)

Senator McKELLAR. Mr. Chairman, I still want to know whether the witness is willing to answer the question yes or no, whether he now believes in the doctrine of revolution as stated on page 3 of this pamphlet which was read to him.

Mr. FOSTER. I would like to state again, Mr. Chairman, that in this campaign the organizers and the officers of the American Federation of Labor have been entirely misrepresented. They have tried to becloud the issue and to defeat the hopes and aspirations of 400,000 striking steelworkers by making me the issue, and John Fitzpatrick; and I want to protect those men. I am not here to lie, I am not here to cavil, I am not here to apologize for myself; I am here to tell the truth as far as I can. But if I seem to hesitate about answering specific questions about what is in that book, it is with this distinct understanding—that I do not feel my answers will be properly handled by the press of this country. If the Senate Committee considers my personal opinions of any moment in this matter, I am perfectly willing to talk frank and openly, provided the press are excluded from the room.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, you know it has been charged here before this committee that instead of the American Federation of Labor really being behind this strike it has been incited by radical elements led by you, and that we are trying to get at what you know.

Senator McKELLAR. Then, I want to call attention to the fact that it was testified to by my good friend, Mr. Gompers—and I tried to find it, and we can refer to the record as to just what was said—that he understood that your views on the subject of anarchy and radicalism and so on had been changed.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Gompers was right.

Senator McKELLAR. Then do you believe in this doctrine?

Mr. FOSTER. How far they have been changed I am not going to make an issue in this campaign if I can help it.

Senator McKELLAR. Well, the thing I want to ask you is this—and I think it is but fair to have an answer yes or no to the question, which I have repeatedly asked you, and then you can make any explanation you wish. Just answer the question whether you now honestly and sincerely believe the doctrine of revolution just as you put it in this book, on page 3, which has been read to you?

Mr. FOSTER. I will try to make myself clear: That as far as this committee is concerned I have not the least objection in the world to answering any question you may desire to put in regard to that book or anything else I have written, and I am satisfied I would get a square deal from the committee; but I will not, or I do not believe I should in the interest of those men, make any statement here that is going to be heralded around and misconstrued in the newspapers of this country.

The CHAIRMAN. Have not these statements in your book been heralded through the country?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not really think they have helped your cause, do you? Maybe that is not a fair question. But if your only objection is to heralding them around, they have been heralded around. If you have changed your mind about those things we would be glad to know it.

Senator MCKELLAR. And if you have not changed your mind we ought to know it.

Mr. FOSTER. I say I have, but I also say this: That the trade-unions movement is based on certain economic principles, the common economic interest of the workers, and I have strictly adhered to that proposition. I have never brought in any outside issues. The question of politics I never mention, the question of religion, the question of morality, the question of ethics, the question of new forms of organization I have not touched on. I have not in this work used my own opinions in any way, sense, or form; this campaign has been conducted strictly upon the principles laid down by the American Federation of Labor, and I say again that the attempts to make my personal opinions an issue are being made for the purpose of defeating the hopes of 350,000 steel workers, and I think they are entitled to some protection.

The CHAIRMAN. Even if that is true as you say, yet the issue is here, is it not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the issue is here.

The CHAIRMAN. It has been made?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; it has been made.

The CHAIRMAN. That instead of this being a strike to remedy conditions it is a strike to practically injure the institutions of the country, led by the I. W. W's. and radicals?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. That issue has been made, and that is why the committee is going into it. The committee did not make the issue, it has been made by witnesses here.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that. I do not object to the committee going into it; but I do object to a lot of biased newspapers lying about me and lying about our movement as they have done since the inception of this campaign. Now, it is my judgment that a repudiation of that pamphlet, as a whole, and a general statement that I do not subscribe to the doctrines in it is sufficient.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you make that statement?

Mr. FOSTER. I do.

Senator MCKELLAR. When did you change your mind about it?

Mr. FOSTER. I will state again that in my opinion the changes in my mind have nothing to do with this campaign here. I do not inject my personal opinion; my personal opinion is of no influence in this matter at all.

Senator MCKELLAR. You said the strike was being conducted according to direction from the American Federation of Labor, I understood you?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I did not say that. The strike is being conducted according to the principles of the American Federation of Labor.

Senator MCKELLAR. Did not the president of the American Federation of Labor advise you and others connected with the strike and organizing the strike to postpone it?

Mr. FOSTER. Provided that no injury would come to the cause of the steel workers.

Senator MCKELLAR. And so you concluded that injury would come to the cause of the steel workers?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not; the committee did.

Senator McKELLAR. The committee of which you are secretary?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir. I might say this further. I don't know whether I make it clear or not. I might have certain ideas—I dare say that President Gompers does not agree with the American Federation of Labor in all its details, because he is only one, although a very influential one, and there are features that I do not agree with; but in my work in the Federation I have religiously and scrupulously avoided presenting any ideas that departed in the remotest from the established customs and principles of the American Federation of Labor. For this reason: That I think the method and system being pursued by the American Federation of Labor are those best calculated to improve the lot of American workingmen. In this campaign I am willing to stand or fall on what I have done—not what I think but what I have done. In this campaign there has not been a line written, there has not been a word said, there has not been a thing done that could be objected to by any organization that I have any knowledge of—and I have been very careful to see that that should be the state of affairs.

I want to say, further, something in regard to another phase of the matter—a ground that somebody might be interested in saying, “Well, now, you are becoming an influence in this industry; if you are a dangerous man we ought to know what plan you have got in mind. Possibly up to this time you have not done any of these things, but probably way back in your head there is some plan in mind that you can hold in abeyance for years to come.”

Now, I think if that suspicion is lodged in anybody's mind, on that ground alone they would have a right to inquire into my personal opinions; but if that suspicion is not there I do not think they have that right.

I want to say this, that I am in the steel industry purely as an organizer, and when that phase work is passed, the organizing phase of the work is passed, I am out of it. I am not in it any longer.

Senator STERLING. Have you ever worked in the steel industry?

Mr. FOSTER. I am an organizer for my international unions.

Senator STERLING. But did you ever work in the steel industry?

Mr. FOSTER. Not in the steel industry, no.

Senator STERLING. What is your international?

Mr. FOSTER. The car men. We are the men who have jurisdiction over the steel car work, the men who make steel cars.

Senator WALSH. I was going to say, Mr. Foster, that your personal opinion and you, as to whether they are objectionable or un-American, can be of consequence to this committee to the extent to which you personally entertain objectionable views, and to the extent that they may have influenced other men or have been a factor in influencing the strikers, and that may be of consequence, and that is why the Senator has a right to ask you a question as to what extent they have been promulgated.

Senator BORAH. May I also say that there are some members of this committee who have deep sympathy with union labor and unionism, but who are utterly at war with any theory of their accomplishing their means through violence. I am one of them.

Senator McKELLAR (interposing). I am another.

Senator BORAH. And I understand quite well your views. Now, if you have changed your views radically from those expressed in

that pamphlet, you could not render any greater service to your fellow workmen to help the cause and to secure favorable consideration at the hands of the public generally than by stating just to what extent you have changed your views. These are times when men change their views very rapidly, and they are not blamed very much for it, either. But I will say that I would be deeply prejudiced against anything you say before this committee—in fact, I could not entertain it, if I thought you still entertained the views set forth in this pamphlet.

Mr. FOSTER. I have stated to you gentlemen that I do not.

Senator BORAH. I want you to be frank. The public will get it through the newspapers as you state it. The editorial comment may not be favorable, but the reporters will send it out as you state it. Now, if the facts go out, you ought to be content with the facts, and the facts will go out just as you state it to the committee.

Mr. FOSTER. I question it very much, Mr. Senator.

Senator MCKELLAR. I do not think you need to.

Senator BORAH. Some of us have been condemned for the last six months in the editorial pages, but in sending out the facts, those facts have generally gone out accurately.

Senator PHIPPS. I think, Mr. Foster, that the committee would like to know that they have the later issue of this book.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it was about 1911 or the early part of 1912; something like that.

Senator PHIPPS. It must have been later than that. I read the book and I know that there are at least two quotations made, one from the year 1912 and one quotation from the year 1914.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Senator MCKELLAR. These are some of the expressions that trouble the committee:

In his choice of weapons to fight his capitalist enemies the syndicalist is no more careful to select those that are "fair," "just," or "civilized" than is a householder attacked in the night by a burglar. He knows he is engaged in a life and death struggle with an absolutely lawless and unscrupulous enemy and considers his tactics only from the standpoint of their effectiveness. With him the end justifies the means. Whether his tactics be "legal" and "moral" or not does not concern him so long as they are effective. He knows that the laws, as well as the current code of morals, are made by his mortal enemy, and considers himself about as much bound by them as a householder would himself by regulations regarding burglary adopted by an association of house-breakers. Consequently, he ignores them in so far as he is able and it suits his purposes. He proposes to develop, regardless of capitalists' conceptions of "legality," "fairness," "right," etc., a greater power than his capitalist enemies have; and then to wrest from them by force the industries they have stolen from him by force and duplicity, and to put an end forever to the wages system. He proposes to bring about the revolution by the general strikes.

In view of that statement, I would like to have, if it was the truth that they were your views, whether in your part in conducting this strike you are still animated by the views expressed in the paragraph I have read to you, or do you no longer entertain those views?

Mr. FOSTER. I say that I do not.

Senator MCKELLAR. You do not.

Mr. FOSTER. I will state this, Mr. Chairman, if I may, in connection with this book, I was asked when was the date of the last issue. So far as I know, the date of the last issue was somewhere in 1911 or so, but within the last few weeks there have been thousands and thousands

of copies circulated all through the steel district—who by I do not know—everybody has received them. I see the one that the Senator has is one of those books with a white notice pasted on there, and the only—

Senator WALSH. What was the white notice?

Mr. FOSTER. There it is, you can see it.

Senator PHIPPS. I got mine from the Library. I sent to the Library for it. I suppose it came from there.

Mr. FOSTER. One page I notice, the original book sold for 10 cents, and it shows the cheapness of the tactics of the men we are opposed to. They have raised the price to 25 cents to try to put me in the light of being a grafter or making money out of the sale of the book.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you mean to intimate by that that some of the mill owners have secured copies of the book and had them republished for distribution.

Mr. FOSTER. I can not prove it.

Senator PHIPPS. But you give that intimation.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I would create that impression, most assuredly.

Mr. RUBIN. Gentlemen of the committee, I have a letter here from Judge Alschuler, of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals, Chicago, touching Mr. Foster and his views. It amounts to almost a judicial finding and I want to read the letter.

CHICAGO, ILL., March 28, 1919.

Mr. JOHN FITZPATRICK,

166 West Washington Street, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIR: I have your favor of yesterday stating that Mr. W. Z. Foster is engaged in organization work in the east for the American Federation of Labor, and that it is charged he is "an irresponsible, unreasonable and destructive agitator," and asking me to express such impression of him as came to me through coming into contact with him in various proceedings before me in my capacity of United States Administrator appointed by the Government for the period of the war to arbitrate labor differences in certain of the packing-house industries of the country.

In reply I will say that yours is not the first communication of this nature concerning Mr. Foster which has come to me, and I can answer you only to the same effect as I have others.

My acquaintance with Mr. Foster began in February, 1918, with the hearing of the first arbitration in which he seemed to act as an adviser to the representatives of the employees, and was apparently relied on for the production of documents, figures, and references as they were wanted in the hearing. After that award was made many questions arose, both as to interpretation and compliance, which necessitated many hearings of grievances, wherein Mr. Foster often represented the employees, until the middle or latter part of the summer when I was informed he left for the East, and since which time I have not met him.

In his representation of the employees in the various controversies before me in which he participated he impressed me as being particularly intelligent, honorable, moderate, tactful, and fair. His manner of presentation and his occasional apt literary references led me to inquire of others as to his early advantages, and I learned with some wonder that they were absolutely nil, and on the contrary all the very reverse of advantages. If in his earlier wanderings he imbibed for a time fantastic, extreme, and destructive social ideas, I am sure there was nothing developed in the many conferences and hearings in which he participated which would indicate that he still harbored them.

Respectfully, yours,

SAMUEL ALSCHULER.

Senator MCKELLAR. Mr. Foster, do you still feel that you are what you yourself call a syndicalist?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not.

Senator MCKELLAR. How was that?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not.

Senator MCKELLAR. I want to read to you this paragraph, and what I desire to read to you is on page 28 of the pamphlet:

The syndicalist, on the other hand, is strictly an antistatist. He considers the State a meddling capitalist institution. He resists its tyrannical interference in his affairs as much as possible, and proposes to exclude it from the future society. He is a radical opponent of "law and order," as he knows that for his unions to be "legal" in their tactics would be for them to become impotent. He recognizes no rights of the capitalists to their property, and is going to strip them of it, law or no law.

Now, as I understand you, you wrote that some years ago, but do not now believe in it.

Mr. FOSTER. No; I would have to condemn that. I say this much, that to try to enter into any explanation is futile. With this committee alone I will talk for a week, but I can not talk to the newspapers. I say that because I know I have been quoted at length things that I never said.

Senator MCKELLAR. You can not be misquoted here. There is not a member of this committee that would permit you to be misquoted.

Senator STERLING. When did you first repudiate the doctrine laid down in this book?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator STERLING. I asked when did you first repudiate the doctrine laid down in this book?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, that is a matter of growth.

Senator STERLING. Oh, a matter of growth. Well, can not you fix about the time when you underwent your change in views in regard to these questions, and in regard to the propositions involved in what the Senator just read you, radical as that is?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I could not say that. Some of that I would still believe. Some of it I would not.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Senator MCKELLAR. Which of it would you believe? I think it is very important for the committee to know which you believe and which you do not. I understood you to say that you did not believe in it, and if I am mistaken I would like to be corrected, and I think that the committee would like to know that.

Mr. FOSTER. I will have to read that. What page is that?

Senator MCKELLAR. The first is on page 3 and the last is on page 21.

The CHAIRMAN. What was the question before us?

Senator MCKELLAR. My question is how much of that do you still maintain and how much of it do you disagree with, of the part that I referred to?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not believe I could defend any of that. I would not defend any of that. [Referring to red pamphlet.]

Senator BORAH. You are no longer a believer in the principles of syndicalism?

Mr. FOSTER. As expressed in that I am not.

Senator STERLING. Are you a believer in syndicalism in any form?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that is the true expression.

Senator STERLING. You think that expresses the fundamentals of syndicalism, do you?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course the word syndicalism merely means unionism.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Senator BORAH. In popular parlance it has taken a well-defined meaning that we all understand, of course.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; that is the popular understanding.

Senator BORAH. You say in conducting this strike you have not advocated violence or bloodshed, or anything of that kind?

Mr. FOSTER. Most assuredly not.

Senator BORAH. And it is not your intention to do so?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course not.

Senator BORAH. If you are still a believer in the doctrines of that book there would be no reason why you should not resort to violence?

Mr. FOSTER. If I was still a believer in that book and tried to use it and put it into practice I would not be in the position I am in.

Senator BORAH. Is it your purpose to conduct this strike in good faith, according to the principles of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely.

Senator BORAH. Are you in consultation with, and acting under the advice and counsel of such men as Mr. Gompers, and the men who are at the head of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. I think my work has been subjected to the most careful scrutiny of the biggest men in the American Federation of Labor, and I am certain if there was anything about it that was off color that my activities would have suddenly come to an end. In fact I have told President Gompers himself that at any time he felt my conduct was such that it did not harmonize with the principles of the Federation that all he had to do was to merely drop a hint and I would be only too glad to retire.

Senator BORAH. In other words, if the time should ever come in the conduct of this strike when your views as to how it should be conducted might conflict with the views of Mr. Gompers, would you yield to his views?

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely.

Senator BORAH. Then, if there might by reason of your previous belief, be an unconscious adherence still to the doctrines as laid down in the red pamphlet, your association with Mr. Gompers and your dependence upon his advice has been such that it enables you to say that you propose to conduct this strike according to the principles of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not quite catch that, Senator.

Senator BORAH. You propose to follow, notwithstanding any previous opinions or beliefs, the principles and policies of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely. My personal opinions are not involved here at all.

Senator BORAH. Have you sought or are you seeking now in any way to inculcate in the minds of the laboring men in the steel industry the views which are contained in that red pamphlet?

Mr. FOSTER. Not a bit.

Senator BORAH. Have you at any time undertaken to do that?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir; positively not. To complete that answer, I might state that every line that has been sent out of my office has had to bear the scrutiny of all kinds of detectives and people of that

character; it has been scattered broadcast over the country, and they know very well what is coming out of my office.

Senator BORAH. How long have you been engaged in the present work of organizing the steel industry—the work in which you are now engaged?

Mr. FOSTER. A little over a year.

Senator BORAH. During that time have you advocated any of the doctrines that are found in this pamphlet among the men?

Mr. FOSTER. Not at all.

Senator BORAH. During that time has the American Federation of Labor found fault with your teachings or principles in any way?

Mr. FOSTER. I have no teachings or principles. I apply the principles of the American Federation of Labor as best I understand them, with the censorship of 24 very intelligent, very alert, and responsible international presidents.

Senator BORAH. You say to this committee, then, that in performing your duty there as an organizer you are acting exclusively under the direction and under the principles of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely.

The CHAIRMAN. When was your book on trade-unionism published?

Mr. FOSTER. That was three or four years ago.

The CHAIRMAN. Three or four years ago?

Mr. FOSTER. About that.

The CHAIRMAN. Has there been any reprint of it in the last few years?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know; I do not think so.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you announce any of the same doctrines in your book on trade-unionism that you announced in your red pamphlet?

Mr. FOSTER. There may be a remnant of it left; I don't know.

The CHAIRMAN. But you think it is not as radical?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Whatever views you expressed in that book on trade-unionism you still hold, do you not?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not read it for a couple of years. I am one who changes his mind once in a while. I might say that other people do, too. I shook hands with Gustave Herve in La Sante Prison. At that time he was in there for antimilitarism and for preaching sabotage, and to-day I think Gustave Herve is one of the biggest men in France. I would like to say this: It isn't that I care, but I know that no matter what I say it will be misconstrued. It is bound to be misconstrued.

Mr. GOMPERS. They can not say anything worse of you than they have said.

Senator BORAH. Misconstruction is not a bad thing sometimes, if you can just keep being construed and not lose your identity. You will find that out, that all you have got to do is to state your views, and you will finally get them before the public.

The CHAIRMAN. It was stated here by a witness, I think by Mr. Gompers, that you were a delegate to the convention at Budapest of the I. W. W.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And that you had some controversy there with a Mr. Duncan, which matter afterwards came up in the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You were the representative of the I. W. W. at that time?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What year was that?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it was 1910 or 1911.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you not go to Paris at that time as a representative of the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir. I went there as an individual.

Senator MCKELLAR. Are you still a member of the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. How long since did you cease to be a member of the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. About nine years; eight or nine years.

Senator STERLING. You were representing the I. W. W. at Budapest in 1911, were you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you immediately sever your connections with the I. W. W. after the Budapest convention?

Mr. FOSTER. I did.

Senator STERLING. You did?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. You represented them there, however, did you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. That was eight years ago.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. When did you first become a member of the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. Two or three years before that.

Senator STERLING. Two or three years before?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, a couple of years.

Senator STERLING. Do you know an I. W. W. publication called The Labor Defender?

Mr. FOSTER. I never heard of it.

Senator STERLING. Do you know of an I. W. W. publication called The Rebel Worker?

Mr. FOSTER. I think I have heard of that.

Senator STERLING. Did you ever contribute anything to The Rebel Worker, any articles or anything?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know an I. W. W. publication called Solidarity?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. You have contributed to that, have you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. How recently?

Mr. FOSTER. About 8 or 9 years ago.

Senator STERLING. Now, Mr. Foster, you say that you organized the car men's union?

Mr. FOSTER. No, I belong to it.

Senator STERLING. You belong to it but did not organize it?

Mr. FOSTER. That is right.

Senator STERLING. Then you have been a worker, have you, among the car men?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator STERLING. How long have you been engaged in that employment?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, several years.

Senator STERLING. What is your particular work with the car men?

Mr. FOSTER. I am a car inspector.

Senator STERLING. Did you ever work in the steel industry?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. Are you a machinist by trade?

Mr. FOSTER. No, a car inspector.

Senator MCKELLAR. A car inspector?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator MCKELLAR. Is that regarded as skilled employment?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. They get the highest rate paid the mechanics on the railroads; the highest standard rate.

Senator MCKELLAR. How long have you worked at that trade?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, I would say probably five years.

Senator MCKELLAR. And for what railroads?

Mr. FOSTER. The Chicago North Western.

Senator MCKELLAR. When was that?

Mr. FOSTER. That was about from 1911 on.

Senator MCKELLAR. 1911 to 1916?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not work entirely for the Chicago North Western Railroad. I worked in the stockyards and for the Soo Line.

Senator MCKELLAR. For what other line?

Mr. FOSTER. The Soo Line.

Senator STERLING. You organized the stockyards union at Chicago, did you?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you have any work to do in connection with the organizing of that union?

Mr. FOSTER. I worked with them?

Senator STERLING. Oh, you worked with them?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator STERLING. Were you a member of that union?

Mr. FOSTER. I was.

Senator STERLING. Were you associated with a man by the name of Hanson in organizing the stockyards union?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know the name.

Senator STERLING. You do not know him?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know him.

Senator STERLING. You do not recall such a person interested with you?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Were there some people assisting in that organization whose names you did not know?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes. They all help, you know.

Senator WALSH. What was your attitude toward this country during the war? I would just like to ask that question for the

record. I assume, of course, that every American citizen has been loyal.

Mr. FOSTER. My attitude toward the war was that it must be won at all costs.

Senator WALSH. Some reference was made by Mr. Fitzpatrick about your purchasing bonds or your subscribing to some campaign fund. Do you mind telling the committee just what you did personally in that direction.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I did the same as everyone else.

Senator WALSH. What was that?

Mr. FOSTER. I bought my share, what I figured I was able to afford, and in our union we did our best to help make the loans a success.

Senator WALSH. Did you make speeches?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator WALSH. How many?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, dozens of them.

Senator WALSH. This is important. Judge Gary said here, and he has a lot of sympathy in this country with his statement, that he did not propose to sit down and discuss the labor strike with a man who entertained the views that your red book contains. He has a lot of sympathy for that. A lot of people agree with him. Probably members of this committee agree with him. Now if you have changed your views, if you are a loyal American and you do not believe in these isms, I think the quicker you can get that before us, the quicker you can show us that you are a loyal American, the better it will be and the more it will help, not yourself, but the workmen who may be injured by your radicalism.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not object to answering any question about the war at all, but when I am asked "What is your attitude toward the State; what is your attitude toward religion; what is your attitude toward ethics," and questions of that character, I do not think I should be required to answer them. What was your last question?

Senator WALSH. This relates to your attitude toward American institutions, and that is why this question may be proper where the questions you spoke of may not be. I would like to have you, for the sake of the record, tell us how many speeches you made, what time you devoted, and what money you expended for bonds, for the Red Cross or for any other purpose?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I think I bought either \$450 or \$500 worth of bonds during the war. I can not say exactly.

Senator WALSH. You made speeches for the sale of bonds?

Mr. FOSTER. We carried on a regular campaign in our organization in the stock yards.

Senator WALSH. And your attitude was the same as the attitude of all the other members of your organization?

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely.

Senator MCKELLAR. Have you at any time, publicly or privately, prior to this date repudiated the doctrines contained in this red book?

Mr. FOSTER. I want to say my work has been such for the last couple of years that nobody has even questioned me about it.

Senator MCKELLAR. So that up to date, up to the time that I asked you the question a while ago, you had never either publicly

or privately repudiated the doctrines in this book, so far as you know?

Mr. FOSTER. Only through my activities. I may have at times said probably the same thing, but as to going into any extended repudiation of it, I have never done that.

Senator McKELLAR. You never have? Speaking of the war, what is your age?

Mr. FOSTER. Thirty-nine.

Senator McKELLAR. Were you drafted?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir. That is, I was in the last draft. I was not drafted.

Senator McKELLAR. Were you mustered into the service?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. Why not?

Mr. FOSTER. Because I was married.

Senator McKELLAR. You claimed exemption on the ground that you were married?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know, Mr. Foster, one Jake Margolas, a representative of the I. W. W. in this country, and here from abroad?

Mr. FOSTER. I know James Margolas, attorney for the metals union in Pittsburgh.

Senator STERLING. He has been the legal representative, has he not, of the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know.

Senator STERLING. You do not know. Have you had occasion to have conferences with Mr. Margolas recently, at or about the time of the beginning of this strike?

Mr. FOSTER. He came into my office once, yes.

Senator STERLING. He came into your office last August?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; the same as he goes into every labor office in Pittsburgh.

Senator STERLING. He was in your office last August, August of 1919?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know. August? No, sir.

Senator STERLING. How recently was he there?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, three or four months ago, I guess.

Senator STERLING. You do not know anything about his connection with the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. Only what I read in the newspapers about it.

Senator STERLING. Well, you do know from reading in the newspapers that he is the legal representative of the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I do not know that he is.

Senator STERLING. Have you heard it said that he was? Have you ever heard it stated that he was?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I can not say I have. I know he acts in most cases of that character, but I will say I do not know whether he has ever acted for any of them.

Mr. LUPIN. May I make a statement in this connection? Mr. Margolas was an attorney in Pittsburgh; when I came in the Pittsburgh field I thought of employing him, because he did effective work for the molder strikers in 1916. Mr. Foster objected to my employing Mr. Margolas because of his views.

Senator STERLING. Yes. Mr. Foster evidently knew something about Mr. Margolas at that time.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Foster, I think it would be well to have you give the committee a little idea as to the present working and living conditions that have been complained of and that are stated to be the basis and cause of this strike.

Mr. FOSTER. As far as I am concerned, I do not know that I could qualify as an expert in that matter. I do know this: That in the steel districts in Pennsylvania, the cities of Homestead and Braddock and Rankin and McKeesport, where the steel workers live, they are little better than collections of hovels, as they could hardly else be on the wages the men are receiving.

Senator PHIPPS. How do the wages the men are receiving compare with the wages in other industries in that manufacturing center?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that depends. The organized workers, of course, receive better money. In McKeesport, for example, the laborers in the building trades, who are identically the same class of men, get 80 cents an hour. The laborers in the mill get 40 cents an hour—one-half as much.

Senator PHIPPS. You are in charge of the organizing of the men in all of these districts for the purpose of this contest. How many organizers report to you, as secretary of the committee?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, in order to understand that, you have got to know that each of these international unions send their own organizers in there, and these organizers are hired by them, paid by them, and controlled by them, and they do not report to me. There are many of that type of organizer. Each international union has its quota.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know approximately how many organizers have been engaged?

Mr. FOSTER. In this work?

Senator PHIPPS. In this work, during the past few months.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, there are quite a number. Mr. Tighe says his organization has 20.

Mr. TIGHE. Nearly that, I guess.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not know there were that many.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, as to their compensation compared to what the workers in the mills receive, how are they paid?

Mr. FOSTER. Each union pays a different rate. Some pay \$7 a day and expenses; some \$6; some \$8 and expenses.

Senator PHIPPS. Have you any objection to stating what your own salary is?

Mr. FOSTER. My salary is \$8 a day and expenses, exactly the same as paid to American Federation of Labor organizers.

Senator PHIPPS. When a strike is on and the men are out on strike and draw strike benefits, how is that based, what do they receive?

Mr. FOSTER. That is according to the laws of the respective organizations. Some have some regulations and others have other regulations.

Senator PHIPPS. As a rule, is it less than the amount the man would be receiving in his daily work?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, far less.

Senator PHIPPS. Far less?

Mr. FOSTER. Much less. Not over 25 per cent, as a rule, I should imagine.

Senator PHIPPS. About 25 per cent, you think, of what they would receive?

Mr. FOSTER. I could not estimate it, but offhand I would say that.

Senator PHIPPS. When a strike is on, is there any reduction in the wages paid the organizers, or do they draw the same rates that they do when there is no strike on?

Mr. FOSTER. When a strike is on I believe that more times than not the organizer will go short. Of all the strikes that have been had in America, I believe more times than not the organizers have not been paid. I know that our officials for many years often went without any salaries whatever.

Senator PHIPPS. Under the present situation, you have stated that there are about 2,000,000 members of the 24 international associations. Those members have paid an initiation of \$3 per head, have they not?

Mr. FOSTER. No; these 2,000,000 men are members affiliated with these. That is not counting those in the steel industry. Those in the steel industry have paid the \$3 per head.

Senator PHIPPS. But these 24 international unions have recognized the strike, have they not—they are standing behind the men who are out on strike?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, those members paid dues of \$2.75 per quarter?

Mr. FOSTER. They vary. Every union is different.

Senator PHIPPS. To what extent would there be a variation in the dues?

Mr. FOSTER. They run from 50 cents a month to three or four dollars a month.

Senator PHIPPS. If we were to take an average of a dollar a month, would that be about fair?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose that would be all right.

Senator PHIPPS. Suppose we put it even a little lower than that. With 2,000,000 members, figuring at \$10 a year, you would have in the course of a year \$20,000,000 for the purposes of conducting the operations of these organizations, would you not?

Mr. FOSTER. You would; but you have got to understand how that money is applied. Probably 75 per cent of those dues would never get beyond the local unions. They are used for local purposes of the men themselves; only a small percentage goes to the international for their general expenses. So it would not be anywhere near \$20,000,000.

Senator PHIPPS. But say it was \$20,000,000. Three-quarters of that would be \$15,000,000 to use among the locals. That would be more than could possibly be required for the payment of the organizers and the expenses of secretaries and other headquarters upkeep?

Mr. FOSTER. When you consider that there are 40,000 local unions or more in this country, a few million dollars does not spread very thick over it, especially as they have paid secretaries and business agents and heavy expenses of all sorts.

Senator PHIPPS. In a statement made this morning, I believe by Mr. Tighe, which is confirmatory of one made the other day by

Mr. Gompers, they expressed themselves as being opposed to a bonus system. I believe Judge Gary in his testimony yesterday referred to that as a special compensation, where the Steel Corporation recognizes superior ability or superior service on the part of an employee. What is your view on that subject, as to that special compensation?

Mr. FOSTER. My experience with the bonus system is that it is very unsatisfactory to the worker. It is a system of speeding them up. It is a system of speeding them up to reduce to final terms of piece-work system.

Senator PHIPPS. In fixing the compensation of the organizers, it has been stated that the organizers—not stated in this testimony here, but the statement has been made outside—that the organizers are paid \$1 per head for every new member they secure for an organization. What is your answer to that?

Mr. FOSTER. That is not true. The organization committee, the organizing fund, receives a dollar for each member that is organized.

Senator PHIPPS. The organizing fund receives it?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And the organizers are paid out of that fund rather than out of local dues, are they?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir; the organizers themselves are paid by the international unions. The use of the local funds is for business agents and local men.

Senator PHIPPS. At the time this present strike was under consideration and a date was agreed upon, providing the men decided that they desired the strike, were the different locals presented with copies of the demands that were to be made upon the employers?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And that formed the basis of their ballot, did it, whether or not they favored the strike?

Mr. FOSTER. I suppose so. They were all furnished copies. They understood what they were voting on.

Senator PHIPPS. Your reports on the strike vote came in the form of communications from the different international organizations to the effect that a certain percentage of their men had voted for a strike?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. And in making that report we are told that the number of men who had voted was not stated.

Mr. FOSTER. Sometimes it was, and other times not; but, as a rule, it was not.

Senator PHIPPS. I believe we have been promised, for the purpose of our report here, the actual vote report from each of the organizations. As secretary of the committee, will you see that this committee is furnished with that information, please?

Mr. FOSTER. The report of the vote from each organization? I do not know whether I can get it. I can ask for it.

Senator PHIPPS. It must be in the records of the local organizations if the vote were taken.

Mr. FOSTER. I personally have no authority over such matters as that. I could ask for it, and if they could compile it—

Mr. LUPIN. We have heeded your request; we are trying to get it for you.

Senator PHIPPS. All right. Now, in calling this strike, we are told that there was no distinction made between plants of the steel corporation and plants not affiliated with the steel corporation, not owned by them; that it was a steel strike; that all of the workers were requested to go out on September 22. Is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. No; that is not right.

Senator PHIPPS. What is your understanding of the situation as to calling the strike?

Mr. FOSTER. The strike was called on all steel mills in America not working under union agreements.

Senator PHIPPS. That is just stating the same thing in a little different form. That is the question I really meant to ask. Then, what plan of placing before these independent companies the demands of the men for recognition was followed?

Mr. FOSTER. There were two plans followed. One was the individual organizations approached them in many instances, and then the committee as a whole sent them a request for a conference, each and every independent one. There may be some that were affected that we did not get to hear of, but all the large independents, at least.

Senator PHIPPS. Are we to understand from that that none of these independents complied with your request for a conference?

Mr. FOSTER. There were some that did.

Senator PHIPPS. What happened in sequence?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not take part in those conferences and could not say. Representatives of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin Workers met with officials of various companies, I understand.

Senator PHIPPS. You do not know whether those companies acceded to the 12 demands presented to them?

Mr. FOSTER. I am pretty sure they did not.

Senator PHIPPS. You are sure they did not?

Mr. FOSTER. I know in one or two cases they did—small concerns.

Senator PHIPPS. But in the larger cases, the majority of the cases, perhaps, the 12 demands were not acceded to?

Mr. FOSTER. That is true.

Senator PHIPPS. And the result was a strike in those plants?

Mr. FOSTER. The result was a strike.

Senator PHIPPS. So that even where you had a conference with these independent steel producers, the net result was the same—the strike was called?

Mr. FOSTER. The situation in that regard is this: From the information I have got, these were very small concerns, and they felt that they had to go along and do what the big fellow did anyhow, and they simply said, "Well, we will have to let the strike affect us the same as him, because he dominates the industry, and whatever he does we will have to do."

Senator PHIPPS. How about the Colorado Fuel & Iron plant in my State of Colorado, where checking by the 12 demands with information that was read into the Congressional Record the other day revealed that the company was already conceding practically all that the men were asking for under these 12 demands?

Mr. FOSTER. All except the first one. I did not say all, either, but they did not concede the first demand, the right of collective bargaining.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you mean by collective bargaining that the men in a plant in Colorado, which is the only steel plant—you may say, the only one you would class as a big steel plant in Colorado, at least, although they are permitted to, and do, as a matter of fact, bargain with their employers over the wage scales, labor conditions and other things, that because the company would not agree that they should bargain in connection with steel plants in New Jersey and Pennsylvania, that therefore collective bargaining was not permissible?

Mr. FOSTER. I mean they were dissatisfied with that system they had there for many reasons. I do not know, that might be one of them that you state, but they are thoroughly dissatisfied with it, and they make that as one of their demands, the abolition of these company unions.

Senator PHIPPS. The abolition of the company unions?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. They had a company union at Pueblo?

Mr. FOSTER. That is what we call a company union.

Senator PHIPPS. How about the Bethlehem Steel Co. plants? They were not called out on September 22, I believe?

Mr. FOSTER. They were called out, but there was a misunderstanding.

Senator PHIPPS. Then a new and later date was agreed upon and the men were called out a week later, I believe. Monday of this week, to be exact?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. That is correct?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Previous to that calling out, was there a request for a conference with the officials of the Bethlehem Co.?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Was that refused?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. They declined to confer with representatives of the A. F. of L., did they?

Mr. FOSTER. Representatives of these international unions—yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. How was the ballot taken in the Bethlehem Steel Co. plant?

Mr. FOSTER. They all voted according to their laws. I do not know how they voted. They reported a vote was taken, and that is all the information I get on it.

Senator PHIPPS. You do not send out the ballots from the Pittsburgh headquarters?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You do send out from Pittsburgh headquarters to the plants in that district, do you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Send out what?

Senator PHIPPS. The ballots for voting?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. You send out circulars over the Pittsburgh district from the headquarters in the city, do you?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; we sent our circulars.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know about how many circulars of the issue known as Circular No. 2 were sent out to the men?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know it by the number.

Senator PHIPPS. It would be a large number, would it?

Mr. FOSTER. It probably would. I do not recognize the circular by the number. If you could tell me what was in it—

Senator PHIPPS. No; I have never seen the circular. I merely heard that the circular No. 2 was sent out rather generally. You do not know in what manner the workmen at the Bethlehem plant were polled?

Mr. FOSTER. I do know this, that at the meeting of the national committee, where the strike was decided upon in the Bethlehem plants, that the representatives of the different organizations stated that the matter had been handled in accordance with their laws. Outside of that I had no right to any information.

Senator PHIPPS. And the strike call was made locally then by the union, was it, their local union?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir; the strike was issued from Pittsburgh on behalf of these international representatives.

Senator PHIPPS. Was that based on their report to you that the men had voted in favor of the strike?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir; they do not report to me. They report to themselves, to each other, and the matter is thrashed out and action decided upon.

Senator PHIPPS. What I am trying to get at, Mr. Foster, is the method.

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, I understand.

Senator PHIPPS. You stated the call was issued from Pittsburgh. Now, what did you base your action on when they sent that call out?

Mr. FOSTER. They instructed me to send it out.

Senator PHIPPS. I hold in my hand a circular headed "Iron and Steel Workers," on which appears the name of your chairman, Mr. Fitzpatrick, and your own name as secretary-treasurer, addressed to the Bethlehem steel workers, and ask you if that is a copy of the strike order that you referred to?

Mr. FOSTER. No; this is not the strike order. The official strike order was sent by our committee to the local representatives in Bethlehem.

Senator PHIPPS. But this was printed by your Pittsburgh office, was it not, Mr. Foster?

Mr. FOSTER. It was printed by the local men in Bethlehem.

Senator PHIPPS. I think you said it was sent out from Pittsburgh?

Mr. FOSTER. No; this is not sent out from Pittsburgh. The strike call was a telegram sent to the different points, and this was printed in Bethlehem—that is, they had charge of that. We did not send this out ourselves. I will state, though, that these circulars got into the hands of the men before the strike order was sent out, and the reason for that was this, they expected—the men were in such a frame of mind that they expected they would strike, and they had these printed in anticipation of that. Of course, if there had been no strike these would all have been destroyed, but it seems that some one leaked and it got out; and the company got hold of a number of them in some way.

Senator PHIPPS. Will you identify that for us, if you please, Mr. Foster? I submit this for the record.

(The document referred to is here printed in full, as follows:)

IRON AND STEEL WORKERS.

(John Fitzpatrick, chairman, Chicago, Ill.; William Z. Foster, secretary-treasurer, Pittsburgh, Pa.)

PITTSBURGH, PA., September 25, 1919.

BETHLEHEM STEEL WORKERS—STRIKE CALLED SEPTEMBER 29, 1919.

All men employed by the Bethlehem Steel Corporation are requested to lay down their tools beginning at 6 o'clock on the morning of Monday, September 29, and refuse to resume their employment until such time as the Steel Corporation concedes the demands of the organizations.

For months the employees of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation in the shipyards of this company have enjoyed a solid union agreement, signed by President E. G. Grace, of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, with the Metal Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor. Wage rate guaranteed and paid easily average 60 per cent higher than is paid by the same company in the steel mills. The shipyard employees secured these concessions by organizing and making a stand. We believe the employees of the steel mills are entitled to the same conditions and wages.

The Bethlehem Steel Co. has absolutely refused to meet the conference committee of the national committee to take up the grievances of the employees of the five plants located at Sparrows Point, Md., Steelton, Lebanon, Reading, and Bethlehem, Pa.

The time has come to bring about the same working conditions in the steel mills as are granted to the employees of the ship yards, railroads, and navy yards.

Stay away from all of the Bethlehem Steel Corporation plants on Monday, September 29.

Protect your organizations against any violence being used, and see that the strike is carried on in a peaceful manner.

The American Federation of Labor has won all its great progress by peaceful and legal means. Stop work September 29.

National Committee for Organizing Iron and Steel Workers.

Senator PHIPPS. When did your national committee in Pittsburgh receive advice from Bethlehem that the men favored a strike, on what date?

Mr. FOSTER. I should imagine it was at least a month before the strike was declared.

Senator PHIPPS. Yes; but I am trying now to locate the time when the calling of the strike for September 29 was determined upon. You had a communication from Bethlehem, you tell us?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. That had to do with calling a strike?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator PHIPPS. And you responded to that by authorizing them to call a strike?

Mr. FOSTER. Our committee met and heard the reports from Bethlehem and canvassed the organizations as to what position they took on this, and the result was that they declared in favor of a strike.

Senator PHIPPS. On what date was that conference or meeting held?

Mr. FOSTER. I think that was about the 26th.

Senator PHIPPS. The 26th of September?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; either the 25th or the 26th.

Senator PHIPPS. And your communication then went back to them on what date?

Mr. FOSTER. About the same date. But I will say this in connection with that, we had several meetings on the Bethlehem situation. We realized the importance of the matter, and we had to discuss it at length. We had a meeting on the 24th, I believe it was, and took the matter up, but did not arrive at any definite conclusions in regard to it, and we took it up again on the 26th. The impression was that the Bethlehem strike order would be issued on the 25th; most of them expected that it would; but matters transpired that it was not issued at that time, and we held a further meeting on it—two further meetings, in fact—before the order was finally issued on or about the 27th, I think.

Senator PHIPPS. You think the 27th?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe it was Friday or Saturday.

Senator PHIPPS. The fact that this circular is dated Pittsburgh, Pa., September 25, with the address 303 Magee Building, was my reason for assuming this was printed in Pittsburgh.

Mr. FOSTER. This bears a union label of Reading, Pa. That is where it was printed.

Senator PHIPPS. No. 4 is Reading, Pa., is it?

Mr. FOSTER. It says that right in there.

Senator PHIPPS. But where is your printing done, I mean your general printing, these circulars I have referred to, one that was referred to as No. 2?

Mr. FOSTER. We get our printing done almost entirely at the S. & S. Printing Co., Fifth Avenue.

Senator PHIPPS. Stephenson's?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know; the name is just S. & S.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you know how many ballots were printed there for use in the Pittsburgh district?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I could not tell, because all the organizations have their own ballots, practically.

Senator PHIPPS. Mr. Tighe would know that, perhaps.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think so.

Mr. TIGHE. I could not tell. The way we sent out our ballots was we accompanied the ballots with a circular letter calling attention to certain provisions in our laws, then we got the number of members in the lodges and sent the number of ballots that we thought the lodge would use, but those ballots, I think, are all up in our office at the present time from those lodges that voted on it.

I want to say, Senator, in connection with this here, being as you asked the question, that the members of our organization, who at that time were in the organization, about 98 per cent of them voted for a strike. There was only one lodge in the whole list of them that voted against it. All the others voted for it.

Senator PHIPPS. That brings out a point that I had in mind, Mr. Tighe, if I may have your attention for just a moment. Then do we understand that in figuring percentages favoring the strike the vote is figured by lodges and not by ballots of the individual workmen?

Mr. TIGHE. Well, I want to say that as far as our organization was concerned, that while we give that as the average, the fact is the individual lodges voted that way. Some of them voted 100 per

cent; that is, the majority of them voted 100 per cent, and the 98 is just a variation.

Senator PHIPPS. Of course, the figures, when submitted, will disclose that. What the committee really is interested in was to learn how many men had voted to strike and how many had voted against going on a strike.

Mr. FOSTER, I want to ask you whether or not you know of any union organizations that are incorporated, so that they might sue or be sued in the courts of the country?

Mr. FOSTER. None affiliated with the American Federation of Labor that I know of.

Mr. RUBIN. That is not necessary, Senator, to make them a party. It is not necessary in law to make them party plaintiff or defendant.

Senator PHIPPS. Then why do they decline to incorporate?

Mr. RUBIN. That is for different reasons.

Senator PHIPPS. Can you state the reason, Mr. Rubin?

Mr. RUBIN. I think Mr. Gompers could answer that question better.

Mr. GOMPERS. I shall be very glad to state it if you will give me an opportunity.

Mr. RUBIN. I will refer it to Mr. Gompers.

Senator PHIPPS. I suppose there is no objection, is there, to have Mr. Gompers state why labor organizations do not incorporate?

Mr. GOMPERS. I would have to ask for a little time.

Mr. RUBIN. I should like to have you get through with Mr. Foster this afternoon, if possible, because he is going to get the witnesses that will come before this committee in Pittsburgh if you come there.

Senator PHIPPS. I think we understand what company unions are, Mr. Foster, if you agree with what has been stated with regard to company unions.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not hear that.

Senator PHIPPS. Company unions; that is, organizations near any particular place. You have nothing new to offer on that point, have you?

Mr. FOSTER. I had something to do with the company unions in the Cambria Steel Plant. I know that up there at Johnstown when they established the company unions there the men took an active interest in it and proceeded to elect live wires, men that they had confidence in, on the committee, and I know that every man that carried a union card and had independence enough to stand up and speak in behalf of the men was discharged, every man of this company union.

Senator PHIPPS. Was it the plan of that company union to affiliate with men in other plants, or to keep to themselves?

Mr. FOSTER. It was the Midvale-Cambria plant.

Senator PHIPPS. Now the Midvale Steel & Ordnance Co., whatever they call it now, has had a union of its own, has it not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, and 100 per cent affiliation with the American Federation of Labor.

Senator PHIPPS. They have 100 per cent affiliation now with the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. Their workers were called out on September 22?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. The same day as the others, although Bethlehem did not?

Mr. FOSTER. They did not have to be called out. They just rushed out. They were so thoroughly disgusted with the treatment they received from the Cambria Steel Co. that they could not be held any longer on the job.

Senator PHIPPS. Does this statement apply to the Johnstown plant, which is the Cambria, or also to the Coatesville?

Mr. FOSTER. The Johnstown plant is the big one, and it applies principally to that, although in both of those plants the men had grievous complaints. They discharged all of the live-wire men off of the company union, and reduced the committee to a body that they could manipulate the way they pleased, and then when they got it reduced to that state they took the committee down to Atlantic City and adopted a whole set of resolutions condemning this movement and condemning all wage movement or hour movement at this time and generally taking the company's position in the matter.

Senator STERLING. Have you a copy of those resolutions?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I have not. They appeared in the daily press at the time. I could get a copy.

Senator PHIPPS. I may have them here.

Mr. FOSTER. But the consequence of it was that the following week the men joined our organization to the extent of 2,500 men in one week in Johnstown as a protest against the action of the company union in stating that they did not want better conditions in the Johnstown plant.

Senator STERLING. What companies were represented at this meeting, do you know?

Mr. FOSTER. What companies?

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. Just the Midvale-Cambria chain of plants.

Senator STERLING. How many plants were involved?

Mr. FOSTER. Three.

Senator STERLING. You call it a chain of plants. How many plants were involved?

Mr. FOSTER. Three; that is all.

Senator STERLING. Just three plants?

Mr. FOSTER. Nicetown, Coatesville, and Johnstown.

Senator PHIPPS. I have here the resolutions and the report of what transpired at that meeting. It is very lengthy. I was going to submit it later for our information. I did not care to discuss it particularly.

Mr. FOSTER. In connection with that Cambria situation, I will state that we approached the Cambria Steel Co. asking for the reinstatement of the hundreds of men that were discharged there for belonging to the organization, and Mr. Corey, the president of the Cambria, gave us a written statement to the effect that the men could be represented either through the company plan of representation or through the committees elected, in any way that they saw fit. So we immediately took them up on that proposition, and the employees held open meetings in the city and elected a committee, and when that committee went in to see Mr. Corey they were flatly denied a conference. Mr. Corey stated that he had changed his mind and got to know the company plan of organization better, and then

to make the men thoroughly like it, members of the committee were discharged.

Senator PHIPPS. I would like to ask you, Mr. Foster, what is your personal attitude regarding sympathy strikes, so-called?

Mr. FOSTER. Sympathy strikes? We have consistently tried to make this an organized proposition. There has been no aim on the part of anyone, so far as I know, to stretch the thing over into other industries and create a general unorganized walkout. So far as agreements are concerned, we have been very careful to see that no trade should violate its agreement if we could stop it; that is, if the members of the committee could stop it. I can not see myself how sympathy strikes are going to help.

Senator PHIPPS. You have a situation to-day, I believe, in that the dock laborers and railway employees along the lake ports have gone out on strike in sympathy with this steel strike?

Mr. FOSTER. Any man who is working in the steel industry is not striking in sympathy. He is striking for his own benefit directly, and we consider those men as working in the steel industry absolutely.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, to your knowledge has this strike up to date extended outside of any of the branches of the steel industry, into other industries?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it has gone beyond rolling mills and blast furnaces. It has gone over to a small extent into foundries; men who have been attracted by the bigness of the movement have seized the occasion to present their own demands. But that is a very rare case. The strike is confined to the steel industry proper.

In connection with the figures that have been stated here, I want to say this that there are certain sections of the steel industry that are not affected by this strike, the iron mines and the coal mines, and then all the clerical forces are not even supposed to be affected in this strike. The United States Steel Corporation states that they have 262,000 men, and the probabilities are that half of them are not even affected by it. It is the strike in the rolling mills and blast furnaces, that section of the industry and that part of it. I think that an 80 per cent strike is a conservative estimate. I think there are more than 80 per cent of the men on strike.

Senator PHIPPS. Eighty per cent of about what number, in round figures? How many men do you estimate are employed in the steel industry who are directly affected at the present time by this strike movement?

Mr. FOSTER. Eighty per cent of what number—the total number of men?

Senator PHIPPS. Well, to start with, what is the total number in the steel industry, according to your estimation, which you attempted to organize?

Mr. FOSTER. That would be pretty hard to say, because there are so many independent companies. Do you refer just to the United States Steel Corporation?

Senator PHIPPS. I refer to the steel industry.

Mr. FOSTER. The United States Steel Corporation?

Senator PHIPPS. No; the steel industry as a whole.

Mr. FOSTER. I could not state. I would roughly state that there are 450,000 or 400,000, possibly 450,000, in this branch of the industry that are affected by the strike.

Senator PHIPPS. Of that number, whatever it may be—we will say 450,000 for round figures and for calculation—what percentage of that number are employees of the Steel Corporation's subsidiaries?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a pretty hard question for me to decide. My understanding is that they control about 50 per cent of the industry, possibly less if you want to extend the proposition and take in all of the independent companies.

Senator PHIPPS. And you think in round figures that something like 200,000 or 225,000 men of the Steel Corporation have been and are affected by this strike, and that perhaps 80 per cent of them are now out of employment?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I do not think there would be 200,000 employees of the Steel Corporation that are in the departments that are affected by this strike. I have heard it stated that they have 50 per cent of the industry, but I do not think there are that many men in the mills of the United States Steel Corporation that are affected by the strike, including the office workers and officials.

Senator PHIPPS. As you are in charge of organizing this steel industry, I thought you would be better posted on those figures than I would be expected to be. Therefore I was trying to get that information from you.

Mr. FOSTER. I would state that in a number of towns it is practically impossible for our men to go in there and get any information at all. If we stop on the street we are arrested. If we speak to a worker we are arrested. I do not know how we are going to get the information. We can approximate it; that is all. We have got no access to the officials, or any way that we could get it definitely.

Senator PHIPPS. There is another point I want to ask you about: What has your experience been with the check-off system, which is included in the 12 demands?

Mr. FOSTER. If I understand that, that applies only to the mining end of the industry.

Senator PHIPPS. It is not so stated in the 12 demands. It is stated definitely as to the collection of dues of employees, members of the union, to be turned over to the union.

Mr. FOSTER. Well, there are other demands here, although headed "General demands," that only apply in specific cases.

Senator PHIPPS. I do not want you to confuse that with the check-wing system.

Mr. FOSTER. No; my understanding is that that is a stock demand, a regular demand, of the miners, and that it is in force in most of the districts where they operate.

Senator PHIPPS. I think you are confusing the two systems.

Mr. FOSTER. No; the check-off system.

Senator PHIPPS. One of the 12 demands, as I read it here, is the collection of the dues assessed upon them by the organization—

Mr. FOSTER (interrupting). That is in effect among the miners.

Senator PHIPPS. Among the miners?

Mr. FOSTER. Among the miners; yes, sir. That is, as I understand it, that was not intended to apply to the rolling mills and the blast furnaces.

Senator PHIPPS. What is your experience in the matter of physical examination of workmen? Do you think that is necessary or do you class it as objectionable?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I did not formulate those demands, of course. I could give you my opinion of it, that in many cases where I have seen it in effect it has been used to discriminate against the union workmen, men that apparently they could trump up no case against.

Senator PHIPPS. You have only been with the American Federation of Labor, I believe, for two or three years. Is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. No; that is not correct.

Senator PHIPPS. Well, in your present position.

Mr. FOSTER. As an organizer. I am not employed by the American Federation of Labor. I am employed by my own international union.

Senator PHIPPS. The reason for my question was to ascertain whether or not there had been a change in the attitude regarding physical examinations; whether or not the benefits to be derived by physical examinations by protecting other workingmen were greater than the objectionable features.

Mr. FOSTER. I could not make an argument on it.

Senator PHIPPS. I do not want to ask you to testify to anything you are not competent to answer.

Mr. FOSTER. No, it is—I do not think I would call it one of the fundamental demands, such as the rate and the others.

Senator STERLING. Just a word, Mr. Foster—suggested by Senator Phipps—in regard to the matter of the physical examination of the men and your suspicion that that was used for the purpose of excluding union men—

Mr. FOSTER. Not as a suspicion, but a positive knowledge.

Senator STERLING. A positive knowledge?

Mr. FOSTER. Absolutely.

Senator STERLING. What proof have you of that—that they have had a man undergo a physical examination for the purpose of putting him to a test to give them an excuse for excluding him because he was a union man?

Mr. FOSTER. I never had any other than for them to tell me it has been done, and I know it where these practices are in effect, where this physical examination is in effect, that it is used for that purpose. I can even cite you proof positive if you want it.

Senator STERLING. Well, do you know of any man now who was physically fit and able to do the work of the mill who, on examination, was found physically unfit because he was a union man? Do you know of any such case?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I have a case in mind.

Senator STERLING. Have you?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. It is a chairman on the Soo Line in Chicago. He has got one eye and they have a rule there that men who are not physically fit should not be retained in the service. That is the substance of the rule, the exact wording I can not give; as far as this man was concerned, here was the effect it had. He was made to undergo a physical examination and he was pronounced unfit to work—he has got one eye—and the organization took the matter up. He is as competent a man in his line of work as there is in America. The organization took the matter up and fought the case through, and that man is still an employee of the Soo Line—no, I mean the Grand Trunk.

Senator STERLING. He is a railroad man?

Mr. FOSTER. He is.

Senator STERLING. He is not a steel worker at all?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. Do you know of any such case among the steel workers?

Mr. FOSTER. I can not say that I do, but at the steel works the doctors are the same as everywhere.

Senator STERLING. But this is a steel matter—

Mr. FOSTER. But we are dealing with human beings only in our industries, and they are just the same.

Senator STERLING. Did you strike, then, and is that one of the grounds for the strike, that in some other industry, the railroads, for example, men had to undergo this examination for the purpose of furnishing an excuse for letting them out, because they were union men?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, as I stated, I do not consider it a very fundamental question. I do not think that there would be a strike over it.

Senator STERLING. You never really knew, did you, Mr. Foster, of any great injury or prejudice to a workman arising out of that practice in the steel industry?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I think you could probably get more information on that subject from Mr. Tighe.

Senator STERLING. I am asking you if you yourself ever knew—

Mr. FOSTER (interrupting). No; I do not work in the steel industry. If I did I daresay I could have gotten plenty of instances.

Senator STERLING. Do you know, in the union of which you are a member, the carmen, do you know whether that practice of physical examination has resulted in the jury or prejudice of the men employed in that industry?

Mr. FOSTER. I have not been handling that personally. We have other organizers who handle that.

Senator STERLING. But if there had been any great complaint in regard to it, you would have known that?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; but, as I say, I do not think it is a fundamental proposition at all.

Senator STERLING. As a matter of fact, you have not heard very much complaint in regard to that practice among the carmen?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I have.

Senator STERLING. Have you?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I have.

Senator STERLING. Can you cite us particular instances among the car workers?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I have not got anything very definite on it. I will say that, but—

Senator STERLING. Now, in answer to Senator Phipps, you said that this strike order called for a strike in all mills where the men were not working under union agreements. Is that correct?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Then, of course, the strike was ordered, so far as the other works were concerned, without regard to the conditions of labor, of the pay received, or the hours per day of labor, and had no reference to the conditions prevailing in any particular plant or industry?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. They had not—

Mr. FOSTER (interrupting). The strike itself arose from a refusal of a conference from the different corporations.

Senator STERLING. Yes; that is what you said. I understand it. But the strike was ordered after it arose, in all mills where the men were not working under union agreements?

Mr. FOSTER. Because we knew in all those mills there was no system of collective bargaining in operation and our first demand, the fundamental demand, of the whole system of demands is the right of collective bargaining and that is what precipitated it.

Senator STERLING. And there was no collective bargaining in these mills when the strike was called. The strike was called without regard to the conditions of the men, without regard to their pay and the conditions under which they worked; was it not?

Mr. FOSTER. These men wanted to present their grievances. Some men had some grievances and others had others; and they were denied the opportunity to present their grievances, and the strike was called.

Senator STERLING. And, as to particular grievances in these particular industries, you did not know as to that, but the strike was general and the call for the strike was in all plants where the labor was not organized?

Mr. FOSTER. These men presented grievances, bushels of them.

Senator STERLING. How many?

Mr. FOSTER. Why, they were sent in. Their delegates presented them.

The CHAIRMAN. What were some of them?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, they wanted more money. Men had been discharged and they wanted them reinstated, and they wanted the eight-hour day and overtime rates and generally better conditions.

Senator STERLING. Was an increase in wages a part of the 12 demands?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator STERLING. Did you specify in your demands how much of an increase you wanted?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. You wanted a conference over that, did you?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir; we figured that was a matter to be worked out in conference.

The CHAIRMAN. Were the long hours of service one of the particular things you had complaints about?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, the long-hour day in the steel industry is one of the great drawbacks to the work as far as the vast majority of the men are concerned.

Senator PHIPPS. You know that you have the basic eight-hour day, of course, don't you?

Mr. FOSTER. In some of the plants, yes.

Senator PHIPPS. Don't you know when the order for the basic eight-hour day was made and put into effect in the steel mills?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; I know it was put into effect to stop the organization of the employees.

Senator STERLING. And that is why you complain of it?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I do not complain of it. It is a step in advance over the straight eight-hour day, but it is not what the workers in

the steel plants want. The workers in the steel plants want the actual eight-hour day, not the basing eight-hour day.

Senator PHIPPS. But the men would work if they got pay and a half for the overtime more than the eight hours, and frequently desire to do so.

Mr. FOSTER. They can not quit at the end of the eight hours anyway in the steel mills. If a man should quit at the end of eight hours he would be discharged.

Senator STERLING. Are you sure that is the general rule? Do you know that from your own knowledge?

Mr. FOSTER. I am so informed by the steel workers.

Senator STERLING. That the men are required to work continuously twelve hours per day in spite of the eight-hour-day order?

Mr. FOSTER. I am so informed; yes, sir. Of course, I do not mean to say that a man can not lay off a day or so if he has to, but, so far as the twelve-hour day is concerned, it is a twelve-hour proposition, and it is not up to the individuals or the crews to quit at the end of eight hours, but the shift works eight hours.

Senator STERLING. Your attention was called to one book, *The Syndicalist*, written, I believe, in 1911, or later—later, I see, according to the evidence shown by the book itself—and to which your attention was called, as late as 1913. When did you write the book *Trade Unionism the Road to Freedom*.

Mr. FOSTER. I could not say; I think it was about four years ago.

Senator STERLING. Was that written after *The Syndicalist* was written?

Mr. FOSTER. Afterwards.

Senator STERLING. How long afterwards?

Mr. FOSTER. About three or four years afterwards.

Senator STERLING. Then *Trade Unionism the Road to Freedom* is a comparatively late book?

Mr. FOSTER. As compared with the other.

Senator STERLING. I call your attention to two or three extracts from *Trade Unionism*. On page 24 you speak as follows:

Under the new order as pictured above, Government, such as we know it, would gradually disappear. In an era of science and justice, this makeshift institution, having lost its usefulness, would shrivel and die.

Now, that was written two or three years ago, I suppose.

Mr. FOSTER. Not two or three, but three or four.

Senator STERLING. Three or four years ago. Do you still entertain that belief concerning Government?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I have my own ideas about the functions of Government, of course.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that I would take that position now, though. I think I would take the same position on it, if my personal opinions are germane here at all, that Lester F. Ward takes.

Senator STERLING. That what?

Mr. FOSTER. That Lester F. Ward takes.

Senator STERLING. Well, I am not familiar with Lester F. Ward's opinions, but does he believe in doing away with government by peaceful revolution or otherwise?

Mr. FOSTER. Lester F. Ward in my estimation, and in the estimation of many others, was one of the greatest minds that America

ever produced and he is honored wherever science is known in this country.

Senator STERLING. Yes.

Mr. FOSTER. And Lester F. Ward states the opinion that government, that is, in many of its forms, is developing into a system of commissions.

Senator STERLING. Who is Lester F. Ward?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, he was employed by the United States Government in some of its work. He was a sociologist—

Senator STERLING. And socialist?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator STERLING. A sociologist and not a socialist?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir. He was the greatest writer on economics that this hemisphere ever produced, and I recommend that you read him.

Senator STERLING. According to your judgment.

Mr. FOSTER. No; not according to my judgment, but according to the judgment of many students.

Senator STERLING. I call attention to another paragraph in this book written three or four years ago according to your statement:

The industries now in the hands of National, State, and municipal government, would be given over completely into the care of the workers engaged in them. Unlike in our days of graft, these workers would then have every reason to give the public the best possible service.

Do you believe in that doctrine now, that the industries now in the hands of National, State, and municipal government should be given over completely into the care of the workers engaged in them?

Mr. FOSTER. That does not seem to be a very startling proposition nowadays.

Senator STERLING. It does not?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that I would state it in just exactly the same terms, but I believe that the men in the industries as far as possible should be given a right to operate those industries.

Senator STERLING. That is syndicalism, is it not, or one form of syndicalism?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not consider it so at all.

Senator STERLING. Have you not given utterance to practically the same thing, perhaps making a little more extreme statement, in your book called "Syndicalism"? I read a quotation at the end of this book by Emile Pouget—I do not know that I have pronounced his name correctly—as follows:

Besides its program of incessant skirmishes, the trade-union is engaged in the work of integral emancipation, of which it will be the efficacious agent. Its fundamental task is to take possession of the social wealth now in the hands of the bourgeois class, and to reorganize society on a communist basis, so that with a minimum of productive effort the maximum of well being will be obtained.

Do you indorse the sentiment and the principle stated there?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I would not state it that way now. I would much rather stand by the quotation in the previous paragraph.

Senator STERLING. You quoted this extract I was reading with approval at the time, did you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator STERLING. And as illustrative of the principles for which you stood in trade unionism and in syndicalism, too?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, a quotation is not—anything I write myself—

Senator STERLING. A man advocating a certain cause would not put as a final thing in the book he wrote advocating that cause something contradictory to his opinions as expressed in that book?

Mr. FOSTER. That is true enough.

Senator STERLING. I want to call your attention to another thing. Do you remember the date of your last communication with Solidarity, the I. W. W. organ?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, about eight or nine years ago.

Senator STERLING. Do you remember a letter that you wrote on November 4, 1914, to them?

Mr. FOSTER. What was it about?

Mr. STERLING. Well, it was about the organization of the steel workers and about the I. W. W. I will read an extract from it:

I am satisfied from my observation that the only way for the I. W. W. to have the workers adopt and practice the principles of revolutionary unionism—which I take is its mission—is to give up the attempt to create a new labor movement, turn itself into a propazanda league, get into the organized labor movement, and by building up better fighting machines within the old unions than those possessed by our reactionary enemies revolutionize these unions, even as our French syndicalist fellow workers have so successfully done with theirs.

This letter was signed by “Yours, for revolution, William Z. Foster.”

That was an expression of your sentiments at that time, I suppose?

Mr. FOSTER. It was. I try to be honest at all times.

Senator STERLING. In those days, when you wrote syndicalism and prayed unionism, and wrote this letter, you believed in the doctrines of syndicalism, and you believed also in the doctrine of direct action, did you not, on the part of the workers?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes.

Senator STERLING. And that direct action meant that you might accomplish your purpose by peaceful means if you could reasonably well, and by violence if you could not accomplish them by peaceful means?

Mr. FOSTER. I wrote the book as it stands.

Senator MCKELLAR. Bearing on this very subject, I want to call your attention to certain other extracts from your book on syndicalism and ask you whether you now believe in them.

On page 13, under the title “Bloodshed,” is the following:

Another favorite objection of ultralegal and peaceful Socialists is that the general strike would cause bloodshed.

This is probably true, as every great strike is accompanied by violence. Every forward pace humanity has taken has been gained at the cost of untold sufferings and loss of life, and the accomplishment of the revolution will probably be no exception, but the prospect of bloodshed does not frighten the syndicalist worker, as it does the parlor Socialist. He is too much accustomed to risking himself in the murderous industries and on the hellish battle fields, in the nigardly service of his masters, to set much value on his life. He will gladly risk it once, if necessary, in his own behalf. He has no sentimental regards for what may happen to his enemies during the general strike. He leaves them to worry over that detail.

The syndicalist knows that the general strike will be a success, and the timid fears of his opponents will never turn him from it, any more than will their arguments that it is "illegal," "unfair," and "uncivilized" weapon.

You believe in those views at that time, and you still believe in them?

Mr. FOSTER. I did at that time; yes.

Senator MCKELLAR. Do you still believe in them, or have you changed your views on that subject?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir—

Senator MCKELLAR. I want to now call your attention, on page 14, of this book, under the headline "The Scab":

A large portion of the syndicalists' success in their strikes is due to their energetic treatment of the strike breaker. According to syndicalists' ethics, a poverty-stricken working man, in his predicament, can do nothing save scab. He may beg, borrow, steal, starve, or commit suicide, and still retain the friendship and esteem of his fellow workers; but let him take the place of a striker and he immediately outlaws himself. He becomes so much vermin to be ruthlessly exterminated.

Have you changed your views on that subject?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I would never state that. I do not admire a scab.

Senator MCKELLAR. I did not ask you that. We are not discussing that subject. I am asking you if you still adhere to that doctrine or if you have changed your views about it?

Mr. FOSTER. I stated that it was not my intention to express my personal opinion, if I could avoid it, but I believe a workingman can do anything but scab. I think that is the lowest act of his life.

Senator MCKELLAR. You think a scab should be, to use your words here, ruthlessly exterminated as so much vermin?

Mr. FOSTER. I believe we can exterminate them.

Senator MCKELLAR. Do you believe they ought to be killed, the scabs?

Mr. FOSTER. I wouldn't go that far, probably.

Senator MCKELLAR. What do you mean by "ruthlessly exterminate"? That is a right serious question, Mr. Foster, and I want to say to you before you answer it—

Mr. FOSTER. I understand that, but it seems to me a proposition like that ought to kind of stand on its face. You do not think for a minute that I would write there that people should be murdered?

Senator MCKELLAR. What do you call exterminating as so much vermin? To exterminate vermin you kill them, and if you exterminate scabs you are obliged to kill them.

Mr. FOSTER. I wouldn't understand it that way at all.

Senator MCKELLAR. What do you understand by it? What would you do to them?

Mr. FOSTER. There are various ways of exterminating them.

Senator MCKELLAR. How would you go about it? Would you do it quietly, by poison, or what other way would you suggest to exterminate them?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the principal weapon, of course, is education. There is no question about that.

Senator MCKELLAR. Well, but you can not exterminate anything by education?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, you can. You can exterminate the scab.

Senator MCKELLAR. With education?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

Senator MCKELLAR. That is your method, and that is what you believe in?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. You do not believe in killing or stoning?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I wouldn't think of killing them. I never killed one in my life.

Mr. RUBIN. Did you ever hurt anybody in your life?

Senator MCKELLAR. Now, I want to call your attention to this:

The syndicalist is a race suicider. He knows that children are a detriment to him in his daily struggle—

Do you still adhere to that doctrine? Do you believe in race suicide?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I don't know that I would use those terms.

Senator MCKELLAR. Well, do you believe in it substantially?

Mr. FOSTER. I will say this: That I know the American people are consciously placing limitations on their families.

Senator MCKELLAR. If that is so, the question is what do you believe about it? Do you believe it is right?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, you can not indict a whole people. They are practically all doing it.

Senator MCKELLAR. In this book you say you believe it should be done and you give the reasons. Do you still adhere to that doctrine?

Mr. FOSTER. I think it is foolishness on the part of the workman to undertake to raise a large family on the wages that are paid.

Senator MCKELLAR. That answers the question.

I now call your attention to page 18 of your book on Syndicalism, where you say:

The syndicalist is as unscrupulous in his choice of weapons to fight his every day battles as for his final struggle with capitalism. He allows no consideration of "legality," "religion," "patriotism," "honor," "duty," etc., to stand in the way of his adoption of effective tactics. The only sentiment he knows is loyalty to the interests of the working class. He is in utter revolt against capitalism in all its phases. His lawless course often lands him in jail, but he is so fired by revolutionary enthusiasm that jails, or even death, have no terrors for him. He glories in martyrdom, consoling himself with the knowledge that he is a terror to his enemies, and that his movement, to-day sending chills along the spines of internationalism—capitalism—to-morrow will put an end to this monstrosity.

Is that your belief now?

Mr. FOSTER. I just want to say this about that. Of course, I can repeat what I have already said before, but if you will put them all in quotation marks, I will say yes; that stands.

Senator MCKELLAR. You will say what?

Mr. FOSTER. If you put all those terms in quotation marks, that stands.

Senator MCKELLAR. You say you still believe in that?

Mr. FOSTER. If they are put in quotation marks, I say yes.

Senator MCKELLAR. In other words, you still believe it is your duty to allow no considerations of legality, religion, patriotism, honor, or duty to stand in the way of your adoption of effective tactics to secure your ends, and to that you answer yes?

Mr. FOSTER. I just say this much, at the risk of being misquoted and misunderstood, that all of those terms are relative terms—

Senator MCKELLAR. I don't agree with you about that. I think they are terms of the highest importance.

Mr. FOSTER. In the Pittsburgh papers at the present time they are considering it patriotism to act as scabs. Now I can have nothing to do with that kind of patriotism. I give it no consideration whatever.

Senator MCKELLAR. We are not talking about what is considered patriotism in the Pittsburgh newspapers. What I am talking about is, do you still subscribe to the doctrine announced on page 18 of your book, which I have read to you, in which you say that being a syndicalist he allows no consideration of legality, religion, patriotism, honor, duty, and so forth, to stand in the way of his adoption of effective tactics.

Mr. FOSTER. I have answered perfectly plainly and distinctly that if you put those in quotation marks, I say yes.

Senator MCKELLAR. You still stand by that. That is all.

The CHAIRMAN. What do you mean when you say "put them in quotation marks"?

Mr. FOSTER. What I mean by that is, that that is a conception of some one else's conception of those particular things.

Senator MCKELLAR. I now call your attention to another very interesting statement found on page 39 of this book, under the head "Labor fakers":

The American labor movement is infested with hordes of dishonest officials, who misuse the powers conferred upon them to exploit the labor movement to their own advantage, even though this involves the betrayal of the interests of the workers. The exploits of these labor fakers are too well known to need recapitulation here. Suffice to say the labor faker must go.

To whom were you referring as labor fakers at that time?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, unfortunately, I was of the opinion of a good many men that men who did not happen to agree with my particular philosophy had some ulterior motive, but I want to say, as the result of a number of years' experience, that I think that the degree of integrity and honesty is high among the officials of these various organizations. There is no institution in the world but what has its crooks in it. I think that for disinterestedness, unselfishness, and honesty the leaders and officials of this union movement will compare favorably with those of any other institution in the United States, bar none.

Senator MCKELLAR. Then you were wholly mistaken in your criticisms of the organized-labor movement in this country when you wrote that paragraph, were you not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; when I said there were hordes of them. I do not believe there are; but there are dishonest men in the labor movement the same as there are in every other institution, and I say that they should go.

Senator MCKELLAR. Were you referring to any particular one, may I ask?

Mr. FOSTER. No; not any particular one.

Senator MCKELLAR. You were just referring generally; and, as a matter of justice and right, you think you were in error when you made that reference?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator MCKELLAR. You signed this book, "W. Z. Foster, secretary of S. L. of N. A., 1000 South Paulina Street, Chicago." Who are the officers of the syndicalist league of North America?

Mr. FOSTER. We did not have any officers to speak of.

Senator MCKELLAR. Why did you sign your name as secretary of an organization that did not exist?

Mr. FOSTER. It was just a very loose collection of groups.

Senator MCKELLAR. A collection of groups?

Mr. FOSTER. Of groups of men.

Senator MCKELLAR. Is there anybody of prominence connected with it besides yourself?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, yes.

Senator MCKELLAR. Were they connected in any way with the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. In no way.

Senator STERLING. Is any nonunion man who gets a place made vacant by a striker a scab under your rules?

Mr. FOSTER. Any nonunion man that takes the place—

Senator STERLING. That takes the place made vacant by a striker, a scab?

Mr. FOSTER. Not only a nonunion man but any union man who does it is a scab—a strike breaker.

Senator STERLING. Yes. Then, however much he may need work, and sees a chance for employment whereby he can earn money to support himself and family, he is called a scab because he takes that job and is visited with the condemnation of the union men and union leaders. That is right, is it?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, the presumption is that the man who quit that job endeavoring to better his condition needs it about as bad as anyone does, and that as far as workingmen are concerned, workingmen of principle, there is no job there to be had, and he has no right to step in there and take advantage of the other man's stand in an effort to better his conditions, to take his job away from him. That is what it really amounts to.

Senator STERLING. It would be more honorable for him to let his family starve than to take that job made vacant by a striker?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, I don't think that in this country the situation is so bad that a man is faced with the alternative of either being a scab or letting his family starve. I do not think we are up against that yet.

Senator STERLING. Have you not known cases, almost of that kind, about mills, where men were out of employment, and there were non-union men who sought the places simply as a matter of necessity, places made vacant by strikers?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not think anyone would go to work in a mill unless it was a matter of necessity.

Senator STERLING. You do not?

Mr. FOSTER. No; it is a case of necessity, of course.

The CHAIRMAN. There has been a good deal asked you about the I. W. W. question and your change of views; back in 1911, when you were a delegate to the Budapest convention—was it?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You were an avowed I. W. W. then?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And you were writing articles for Solidarity, which was the I. W. W. organ?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. At that time Mr. Gompers was engaged in—I don't know that I would say a movement, but Mr. Gompers was denouncing the activities of the I. W. W., was he not?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. And in an article in *Solidarity* of July 30, 1910, there is a scathing denunciation of the I. W. W. by Mr. Gompers. Are you familiar with that?

Mr. FOSTER. I can not say I am.

The CHAIRMAN. But at that time, when you were advocating the doctrines of the I. W. W. through the country and abroad, you were running counter to the policies of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Gompers, however, has not changed his views concerning the I. W. W., but your views have changed?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't think Mr. Gompers's views have changed—only to become more pronounced, possibly.

The CHAIRMAN. And you say now to the committee that your views have so changed that you are in harmony with the views of Mr. Gompers?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir. I don't know that it is 100 per cent, but in the main they are.

The CHAIRMAN. You have been asked about different writings. You must have realized the truth of the old saying, "Oh, that mine enemy would write a book." You seem to have written two—too many. You wrote the *Solidarity*, and I have a copy here, dated April 22, 1911, as follows: "Observations in Germany." That is the heading of the article. You say:

Beer plays a large part in the German revolutionary movement, even as wine does in that part of France where the "bunch" say it is a physical impossibility for a man to be a revolutionist and an abstainer at the same time.

Yours for the I. W. W.,

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER.

Is that one of your productions?

Mr. FOSTER. I kind of have a faint recollection of writing something like that.

The CHAIRMAN. You think it would be difficult for a prohibitionist to be a revolutionist?

Mr. FOSTER. I have kind of changed my mind on that, too.

The CHAIRMAN. You do not indorse this article I have read, then?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, according to what I have heard since Russia went dry, there were some important events over there.

The CHAIRMAN. What did you mean by "Yours for the I. W. W."; did that have any significance?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, I was just for it, that is all.

The CHAIRMAN. Now, March 25, in *Solidarity*, I read this:

As for the I. W. W., the American syndicalist organization—its militants, who are imbued with the real syndicalist theories, will do their best to prevent the S. P.—

What is the "S. P."?

Mr. FOSTER. The Socialist Party.

The CHAIRMAN (reading):

From protecting or preparing the ground for their organization. They will insist on a policy of strict official neutrality toward all political parties, and,

as individuals, they will vigorously combat the political-action theory being advocated by the S. P. or by any other party.

Yours for the revolution,

WILLIAM Z. FOSTER.

What did you mean by "Yours for the revolution"? What revolution had you in mind?

Mr. FOSTER. Just what I have stated in my writings.

The CHAIRMAN. The social revolution?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes, sir.

Senator McKELLAR. You said awhile ago that since prohibition had been enacted in Russia important events had happened there. Are you in sympathy with the Bolshevistic movement in Russia?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know much about it.

Senator McKELLAR. Then you do not believe in it?

Mr. FOSTER. Not knowing about it, of course I can not say that I do.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you in any of these articles in Solidarity recommend sabotage?

Mr. FOSTER. I probably did.

The CHAIRMAN. And believed in that at that time?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you changed your mind in regard to that too?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, that is part of the general conception; these things are all linked together.

Senator McKELLAR. And all spelled violence when you believed in them?

Mr. FOSTER. Well, it spelled a fight.

Senator McKELLAR. And violence.

The CHAIRMAN. Were you a delegate to the sixth annual I. W. W. convention?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. What year was that?

Mr. FOSTER. I don't know whether it was the sixth or the fifth. I was to one of them.

The CHAIRMAN. What year was that held?

Mr. FOSTER. 1911, I believe.

The CHAIRMAN. In spite of all these opinions that have been brought out, these opinions in your writings, and others that probably could be brought out, you say now that your views have changed and that you are operating as to this strike under the directions of the American Federation of Labor?

Mr. FOSTER. Not under the direction. We are very careful about that in the labor movement. Under the direction of 24 international unions, and with the indorsement of the Federation?

The CHAIRMAN. You are not antagonistic to the Federation?

Mr. FOSTER. Oh, no; the Federation has indorsed the activities of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Did you explain to the committee why it was the strike could not be postponed at the request of the President? I have forgotten whether you did or not.

Mr. FOSTER. I did not; but I can.

The CHAIRMAN. Will you do that?

Mr. FOSTER. The reason for that was this—well, there were a whole group of reasons in fact. The principal reason, I think, was that the companies were carrying on a policy of wholesale discharge of our men. The men, of course, wanted better conditions, they felt that their organizations had been in existence long enough to insist upon better conditions, and we were informed that the bosses in the steel mills, not in one place only, but in many places, circulated stories that the American Federation of Labor was in here just simply to rob the workers and to carry them along to a certain point, get the money from them, and then leave them in the lurch, and that if this strike was postponed it meant the abandonment of the effort and the steel workers would be left to themselves. I know that as far as the committee was concerned the postponing of the strike order would not have prevented the strike, because practically every district working in this movement had served notice on the committee that they were going to strike whether the committee postponed it or not.

The CHAIRMAN. How many men do you say are out on the strike now in the steel mills?

Mr. FOSTER. According to the best information I can get, Mr. Tighe submitted a list of some 362,000.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be in the United States Steel?

Mr. FOSTER. No; the United States Steel and the independent.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you tell us how many of those men are what have been termed "foreigners" here?

Mr. FOSTER. A large percentage of them.

The CHAIRMAN. When we use the term "foreigner" we use it as representing those who do not speak the English language—perhaps not a good definition.

Mr. FOSTER. I do not understand it that way myself. I understand a foreigner is a man born in a foreign country.

The CHAIRMAN. And whether or not he is naturalized?

Mr. FOSTER. Whether or not he is naturalized.

The CHAIRMAN. Using the term that way then, tell us about what percentage are foreigners.

Mr. FOSTER. There is a large percentage, naturally, because there is a large percentage in the mills, and we, in our organizations, probably have a slightly larger percentage even in the mills; that is, in those district that have not struck, 100 per cent. That is for this very good reason. When our organizers come into a district they make a general appeal to all of them to organize and the first man to respond is the man who needs organization most, that is the unskilled worker. That is our experience in the campaign and the unskilled worker is to a very large extent a foreigner. Then as the organization progresses the skilled man stands in the background and watches what is going on. He has seen many strikes in the steel industry and he has seen them all go to smash, and he stands in the background and watches what is going on and pretty soon as the organization extends from department to department he begins to take heart a little bit and he affiliates himself with it, and finally when an organization is reasonably well established it usually develops a sort of an avalanche of the skilled workers coming in, and then they usually complete themselves 100 per cent while the unskilled are still in only a partially organized condition.

I want to say this: There have been statements made here that Americans were not asked to join the organization or not asked to strike. That is absolutely not the truth. Every piece of literature that has been gotten out in the whole course of this campaign has been in English; possibly we sometimes used one language in addition; sometimes as many as six languages in addition, but I do not know of a single piece of literature that was gotten out in this campaign that did not have English.

The CHAIRMAN. The literature you got out?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. But do you have to publish it in six languages?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; in order that these men can read.

The CHAIRMAN. What are those languages?

Mr. FOSTER. We vary them from time to time according to the mills. They are English, Polish, Slavish, Croatian, Italian, and now and then Lithuanian, Magyar, and Hungarian.

The CHAIRMAN. Any Russian?

Mr. FOSTER. Never Russian. I do not believe we have ever had a piece of literature in Russian.

The CHAIRMAN. While this strike has been going on, have you been in communication in any way with the I. W. W. leaders?

Mr. FOSTER. Not a bit.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Vincent St. John?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. You have not seen him at all?

Mr. FOSTER. I saw him; yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. What is his position with the I. W. W.?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that he has got any position. I could not say.

The CHAIRMAN. He was formerly secretary?

Mr. FOSTER. He was an official in the organization.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you seen him while the strike was on?

Mr. FOSTER. No; I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you ever talked about the strike with him?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say for the information of the committee that a great issue has been made of this foreign question. There has been a systematic attempt to create a race situation in Pennsylvania and it is being done by the steel corporations there. They have raised the question of the foreigner, and all these ramifications about the Americans that were not asked to strike and not asked to join the unions was just so much of that propaganda.

The fact of the matter is this, that we have got many organizers in the field, and if you will ask Mr. Tighe how many foreign-speaking organizers he has got, I doubt if he will be able to say that he has got one.

Mr. TIGHE. No; we have not got a single foreign speaker on our list.

Mr. FOSTER. Not one man that can speak a foreign language; and I do not know of any other international union in this campaign, except the United Mine Workers and the Mine, Mill and Smelting Workers, that have any foreigners.

The CHAIRMAN. Men are joining, are they not, that do not speak the English language?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. How do you get to them?

Mr. FOSTER. In this way: They all speak a little bit, all understand a little bit, and they urge for organization—the conditions in the plants are so bad from their standpoint that you do not have to persuade them very much; in fact, they demand organization. And I want to say this further: We have local secretaries in all these localities, local secretaries in all these steel centers, and in Homestead we have Dick Riley, in Braddock is Gent—they are both Irish—in McKeesport we have Murphy, and in Clareton we have Patrick Henry Brogan.

The CHAIRMAN. Are they Irish?

Mr. FOSTER. All Irish, every one of them. So far as I know, we have not got one foreigner anywhere as a secretary. We have made our special appeal to the Americans in this campaign, because we know they occupy the skilled positions and are the strategic men in the industry.

Senator WALSH. When you say they are Irish, you mean of Irish blood?

Mr. FOSTER. Irish descent.

Senator WALSH. They are Americans, are they not?

Mr. FOSTER. Of course.

Senator WALSH. And none of them are Socialists, are they, if they are Irish, or I. W. W. men?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know of any. I will say this, in the selection of those men I have never appointed one, not one. If we are going to put a secretary in at Stubenville, or Wheeling, we take it up with the local central body there and ask them to pick out the best man they have got, and they give us a man.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you said anything about the meetings, the restraint of free speech? Have you touched upon that at all?

Mr. FOSTER. I did not.

The CHAIRMAN. Anything that has taken place in the way of alleged intimidations there?

Mr. FOSTER. There are certain mills in the Pittsburgh district that are not down 100 per cent—the Duquesne mill and the McKeesport mill. There are some of the others there that are not 100 per cent struck, like Homestead, which is probably 80 per cent, and the only reason those men are not out 100 per cent to-day in protest is simply because they have been and are being denied their rights of free speech and free assembly.

The CHAIRMAN. Some complaint was made about the State constabulary there. Have you had any complaint about them?

Mr. FOSTER. The State constabulary have performed the part of trouble makers pure and simple in that district, and I feel convinced in my own mind that if this committee had not gone into sitting there would have been many men murdered in the steel districts in Pennsylvania, due to the activities of these "Cossacks." But since this committee has been in session they have modified their conduct a great deal, due to the fact that the attention of the committee is being called to their activities there.

In localities where we have been allowed to hold our meetings there has never been a semblance of disturbance of any kind. Our meetings have been peaceable and orderly. A couple of nights ago

we had a meeting in the Pittsburgh district of ten to fifteen thousand strikers and it was perfectly orderly, not a ripple of excitement or disturbance of any sort. The day before the strike in Braddock and Rankin the burgess and the chief of police in both places said: "After listening to what your organizers have said we have got nothing to say except to repeat what they say. Just follow the advice of these men and there will be no trouble in Braddock or Rankin." And there was no trouble in any of these cases until they brought on this State constabulary and the others, I might call them outside disturbers, or agitators, to start the trouble.

Senator PHIPPS. During your campaign of organizing, how did the work progress? Can you give us approximately the number of men that were organized, say, on the 1st of June last?

Mr. FOSTER. That is a very difficult question, for this reason: That all the men do not come into our committee. We sign up some at our mass meetings, and then the local unions are holding meetings all the time, and there is a constant stream of men coming in, and it is very hard to tell.

Senator PHIPPS. Haven't you some system of monthly reports to know what these men are doing in the way of enrolling members?

Mr. FOSTER. From our secretaries, yes, but not from other organizers. That is their own business.

Senator PHIPPS. Was it a gradual or a rapid increase in the number that were enrolled from month to month?

Mr. FOSTER. It varied from time to time, and when we started they just streamed in, and then they gave them the eight-hour day and the war came to an end and the winter came on and the flu ban came on and the industry shut down, and that checked the organization for a time, but afterwards when it began to recover a little they began to stream into the organization by the thousands.

Senator PHIPPS. Up to the 1st of June of this year, say, what was your percentage of workmen at that time who had joined the unions?

Mr. FOSTER. I think up to the 1st of June we could safely say there were 100,000 men signed up.

Senator PHIPPS. Do you recall what the figures were say 60 days later, August 1?

Mr. FOSTER. That is pretty hard to say, although lots and lots of men joined during that period.

Senator PHIPPS. They were still joining, you say, during that 60 days?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. And since the strike they have joined by the thousands.

Senator PHIPPS. And did that continue during the month of August?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes. In some localities it has come to a standstill, but in others they would stream in.

Senator PHIPPS. In the face of that, the committee is hardly able to understand what you feared when you were called upon and requested to defer the date of the strike call until after October 6, when this meeting in Washington is to be held.

Mr. FOSTER. What we feared—we did not fear it; we knew that it was going to happen—was a wild, unorganized outbreak in the steel industry that would lead—nobody knew where—that would

destroy the organizations in there, so far as the American Federation of Labor was concerned; and in a situation like that, there was nothing else to do but to go ahead and try to retain some kind of control and order in the situation.

Senator PHIPPS. Now, after all is said and done, does it not appear to be the fact that the basis of this trouble is unionism or nonunionism, demand for recognition of the union?

Mr. FOSTER. No, sir.

Senator PHIPPS. What in your judgment is at the bottom of this dispute if it is not unionism?

Mr. FOSTER. At the bottom of this dispute is poor conditions in the steel industry, and the only way to right them is through the process of collective bargaining, and this fight is precipitated by a refusal to establish a system of collective bargaining whereby the men can take up and settle their grievances.

Senator PHIPPS. You have stated that you have not been in a position personally to know the conditions in the mills, the working conditions or the living conditions. You are telling us, then, what you have said, based on the information that has come to you as secretary?

Mr. FOSTER. I know something of the living conditions of the men.

Senator PHIPPS. Are they worse than they were five years or ten years ago, or are they better?

Mr. FOSTER. I do not know that they are worse. I can not speak of five or ten years ago. I know that at the present time every steel town in America that I have come in contact with is a disgrace to America, positively a disgrace.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Foster, I think we are through, and we are very much obliged to you. Mr. Gompers wants to be heard for 10 minutes. Before you proceed, Mr. Gompers, there are three witnesses here. Are those witnesses here now, and can we give them five minutes apiece?

Senator MCKELLAR. Bring them back to-morrow.

The CHAIRMAN. At 10 o'clock to-morrow.

Senator MCKELLAR. Mr. Gompers says he can get through in 10 minutes.