

could become completely self-sufficient; is not that in a nut-shell what Technocracy stands for? A. With the exception of the inference that might be drawn, you said that Technocracy would step in.

Q. Well, that was perhaps an unfortunate choice of terms and is not quite accurate; the set-up that Technocracy advocated would take over. A. Not by the Technocrats. One of our essentials was --

MR. ANDERSON: Howard Scott was to be the Dictator of the Continent?

WITNESS: No.

MR. BINCE: That might ^{not} have been in the minds of the members, but it might have been in the mind of Howard Scott.

MR. ANDERSON: I think probably you are correct there.

MR. BINCE: In this magazine which we referred to before, which was the last one issued because it was banned, this statement was contained:

"The decision of the political leaders of the Dominion of Canada on peace or war, conscription or voluntary enlistment, will have no effect on the stand of Technocracy Inc. Technocracy has stated its position, the same position on the question of foreign war that it has always hold since its inception. Technocracy Inc. stands ready with the blueprints for the New America --"; it reiterates its stand on foreign wars and objects to any part of North America either sending men voluntarily or by conscription, or sending supplies or materials to Europe to fight any wars. Now, since that time you say that Technocracy has changed its attitude with respect to the present war; that is correct, isn't it?

WITNESS: It has changed its attitude as regards --

MR. BINCE: The necessity for fighting.

WITNESS: Right. We have always maintained that when North