

MR. MacINNIS: What I can't see is this; your organization does not want to be associated with politics or politicians, but nevertheless you want to impose your will on political parties by your publication. Now, don't you think it would be a more fair attitude if you were willing to get in and take part and convince people by argument that these things should be done, instead of trying to impose your will on them.

WITNESS: I don't think that question enters into it at all.

MR. McKINNON: I think your article does have that effect.

MR. MacINNIS: I am not so sure that it does. If you take that article, it refers to political schemers; well, all of our political parties in Canada refer to each other as political schemers at one time or another. There is nothing particularly bad in that if you take it by itself. I think the attitude taken by Technocracy towards political parties is very much the same as the attitude that was established by the witness yesterday with respect to organized Christian religion or religious denominations.

MR. DUPUIS: Provided you don't hit below the belt.

MR. MacINNIS: I do not know that in Canada we have been fighting under Queensbury rules.

MR. BENCE: I have no particular objection to the term "political schemer", except when some person puts a peculiar emphasis on the word when he uses it.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. In this pamphlet, "Technocracy" that you filed -- Technocracy Plays America to Win -- under the title, Technocracy, the Organization, I read:

"Technocracy Inc. is neither democratic nor autocratic; it is not a reform movement, and it runs no candidates for any public office."

That is not clear. Nevertheless you would expect politicians and candidates who run for public office to accept your views