

J
103
H7
1941-1942
D4
A1
no.7

CONFIDENTIAL

SESSION 1942

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE
ON
DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE
NO. 7.

FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1942.

WITNESS:

Mr. Charles G. Norris, Brockville, Ont.

HON. J. E. MICHAUD,

CHAIRMAN.

J
103
H7
1941-1942
D4
A1
no.7

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
CANADA

1991 - 5 - 7

BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

J
103
H7
1941-1942
D4
A1
no. 7

CONFIDENTIAL

SESSION 1942

HOUSE OF COMMONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE
ON
DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE
NO. 7

FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1942.

WITNESS:

Mr. Charles G. Norris, Brockville, Ont.

HON. J. E. MICHAUD,

CHAIRMAN.

LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT
CANADA

1991 - 5 - 7

BIBLIOTHÈQUE DU PARLEMENT

1986

1986



Public Archives
Canada

Archives publiques
Canada

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

House of Commons,
Room 368,
June 26, 1942.

The Special Committee on Defence of Canada Regulations met this day at 11 o'clock a.m. The Chairman, Hon. J.E. Michaud, presided.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order. The secretary will please read the minutes of the last meeting.

Minutes of preceding meeting read and adopted.

THE CHAIRMAN: This morning we have a representative of Technocracy, Mr. Norris. If there is no objection on the part of the committee we will ask Mr. Norris to proceed.

MR. MacINNIS: Before Mr. Norris proceeds I might say that he called in to see me in my office and he said that Technocracy Incorporated never had any definite statement from the government as to why it was banned or declared an illegal organization under section 39C of the Defence of Canada Regulations. He informed me the only statement they have is a very brief one made by the Prime Minister on behalf of the Minister of Justice in the house during the 1940 session. I have not got that before me. He thought it would make his position easier if he could have some knowledge of the exact reasons for declaring the organization he represents an illegal organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: Technocracy is banned under section 39C specifically. Mr. Norris has asked for the privilege of coming before us and stating to this committee why it should not be banned. We have invited him to do that. He now asks that he should be given the reasons why this organization has been banned. Well, the regulations themselves state why all these organizations have been declared illegal. It is because they are thought to be subversive or their activities

detrimental to the war effort of Canada during the war. It is thought their activities constitute a menace to the security of the state in time of war. That is the reason why they have been banned.

MR. CHARLES G. NORRIS, called:

WITNESS: Well, gentlemen, I am at somewhat of a disadvantage for these reasons: one is that --

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. Pardon me. You had better identify yourself, Mr. Norris. Your name is what? A. Charles G. Norris.

Q. And your home address? A. 97 Pearl street west, Brockville, Ontario.

Q. Your occupation? A. Accountant.

Q. Were you formerly a director of a section of Technocracy Incorporated in Toronto? A. That is right.

Q. That was Section 1, R.D. 7943? A. Correct.

Q. Until when? When did you give up that position?
A. June 20, 1940.

Q. What do the letters and figures stand for? A. R.D. is an abbreviation for Regional Division. The figures are the latitude and longitude of the city of Toronto.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. How long did you occupy that position? A. Since the formation of the Toronto section in 1939.

Q. How long have you been interested in the work of Technocracy? A. I had been a member from May '39 until it was banned in 1940.

Q. Just a little over a year? A. That is right.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. From May 1939? A. That is right.

Q. That is the time Technocracy Incorporated established a branch in Canada? A. No, that is the time I joined the organization.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. Will you speak a little louder, please? A. Yes.

BY MR. BENICE:

Q. When was the work of Technocracy first undertaken in Canada? A. I believe it was the year 1934, either 1934 or 1935. I believe the first meeting was held in Vancouver under the auspices of the then editor of the Vancouver Sun, Mr. Cromie.

Q. Are you here purely on your own initiative or have you with you other people who formerly were interested in Technocracy Incorporated? A. We asked for a delegation to appear and in the reply received it said that they would hear me or my representative. It was in the singular, so I came along. However, there are many more who could have come and did not for that reason.

Q. The reason I am asking the question is this, you apparently were a member of the organization for a period of only about thirteen or fourteen months, whereas there must be people available who have been members since, we will say, 1934 and who are fully cognizant of the activities of the organization in that period until the time it was banned.
A. True.

BY MR. MacKINNON:

Q. Can you answer the question in regard to the previous history? A. I think I can answer practically any question you wish to ask me concerning its previous history.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. Would you tell me what Technocracy is? A. To do it briefly is rather difficult, but I will try to boil it down into as few words as possible. Technocracy is the application of science to the social order. The entire basis of Technocracy is that technological advances, the introduction of more power -- by power I mean outside of man-power, water-

power and so on -- the introduction of more power has entirely changed the processes of production and distribution; that due to this major change, the introduction of more and more extraneous energy, water-power, etc., the entire social structure in North America is undergoing a change, not because anybody wants it but purely from physical reasons; and Technocracy is a scientific analysis of the reasons why increased machine and power production necessitates a change; and the synthesis of Technocracy is the outline of a social structure that will operate no matter how great the amount of water-power, etc., that we use in production, in other words, how rapidly we produce goods.

Now I do not know whether that answers the question as it was framed or not. It has been stated that Technocracy being banned under the Defence of Canada Regulations must have been considered as either subversive or detrimental to the efficient prosecution of the war. For that reason I should like to spend a little time on exactly that point. Technocracy Incorporated has always stood for greater defence of North America. That goes back in the history of the organization from the time of its inception.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the time of its inception? A. Technocracy incorporated as an organization, in 1934.

BY MR. MacKINNON:

Q. You are purely a North American organization?

A. That is right.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. Was it incorporated in Canada? A. In the State of New York.

Q. Have you got a constitution and by-laws? A. We have, yes.

Q. Does it throw any light on your purposes? A. It does, although probably not as well as I can give you from other sources.

Q. Can you produce evidence to support the statement you make? A. I have documentary evidence to support every statement I make, practically.

Q. Will you produce them and submit them to the chairman? A. I wish to read the odd quotation from it and I will pass it over. The odd statement I will make I will not be able to support for the following reasons: when I was preparing the information to appear before this committee some two months ago, before I made the application, a representative from the R.C.M.P. kindly confiscated it, so I was not able to get all the data to support every statement that I will make.

Q. It is charged that you are an instrument of autocracy for the regimentation of your followers and the enslavement of your opponents. That is quite a mouthful and quite a charge to make, but that is the charge made against you, that you are an instrument of autocracy for the regimentation of your followers and the enslavement of your opponents.

A. I think the best answer --

Q. Perhaps you are addressing yourself to that now.

A. The best answer I can give you is, if you will allow me to do so in the short space of time --

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. I want to find out something about that statement you just made. You say you were preparing evidence to place before a committee of the House of Commons, presuming a committee would be appointed, and that that information was taken from your possession. First of all, when was that taken from your possession? A. In the month of April.

Q. Did you have in your possession more than one copy of it? A. No; I think that can be verified by the R.C.M.P.

Q. I just want to be clear on that point. Would you mind describing the circumstances of the material being taken from you? A. Well, as far as the circumstances are concerned, the R.C.M.P. appeared at my home.

Q. Where? A. In Brockville, with a search warrant and confiscated anything pertaining to Technocracy.

BY MR. HANSELL:

Q. May I ask this question: Did the officer have any conversation with you at the time? A. Well, a short conversation.

Q. In the process of obtaining the material? A. Yes.

Q. Did you tell him that this document was something you were preparing for the committee? A. No.

Q. He did not know that he was taking that particular document; it was just one of many others, I suppose? A. Well, as far as that is concerned, as I say, he took everything that pertained to Technocracy. I do not know how much in detail he went with it; he did not ask me very many questions in that regard.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. There was no charge laid against you? A. No.

BY MR. BENICE:

Q. Why did not you tell him you were preparing to present it before the committee as a matter of fact? A. As a matter of fact the reason why I did not say that is I did not know exactly what constituted an offence under that Act as far as the advocating of principles of an illegal organization were concerned. In other words, before this committee I will be quite frank, elsewhere there was no point as far as I could see in incriminating myself in any way.

MR. HANSELL: A man under those circumstances cannot think of everything, anyway.

MR. BENICE: No, of course. The thing he alleges before us is that he was preparing this material for a specific purpose. I should think, in view of that fact, that was the most legitimate reason he could have for having this material in his possession, and naturally one would suppose that he would tell the police why he had it. That is why I raise the point.

WITNESS: Before we go any further I first make this distinction there whether it carries any weight with you gentlemen or not, and that is this, I am not appearing here as an individual; I am appearing here in regard to the organization, and I believe the purpose of the hearing is to find out as much as possible about the organization, and the points that we wish to bring forward are not my own personal background or anything else.

BY MR. BENICE:

Q. I do not suggest that. You tried to suggest to us that you were not able to give us a full argument because of the fact the information was taken from you by the R.C.M.P.
A. The whole documentary evidence.

BY MR. HANSELL:

Q. The principle involved is going down on the record and it may be misunderstood. It might be assumed that the police took it from you because it was to be presented to this committee. A. That is not the case.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. As far as you know, that is not the case? A. No; I think I can --

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. Will you just briefly tell us how your organization functions?

MR. MacINNIS: It does not.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. Or functioned? A. I think for the purposes of this hearing it would be just as well if I did speak of everything as if it were in the present tense with the understanding that there is no organization, because these technicalities of using the exact language will be a little hard.

The organization functions in North America only, in the various countries. The members of the organization were at all times, and still are in the United States, those who were citizens of the country in which they held membership. In other words, no person who did not hold citizenship in the country in which he resided was allowed to join the organization. No aliens, no Asiatics, no politicians were members of Technocracy.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. Would that bar Mr. Bence and myself? A. I am afraid it would.

MR. HANSELL: Now, on that point, of course the word politician is in tremendous disrepute.

MR. MacINNIS: What is the definition of "politician."

BY MR. HANSELL:

Q. We understand, do we, that anyone who is interested in the government of this country is therefore not allowed to be a member of your organization? A. That would pretty well bar everyone, no. Our interpretation of politician as far as membership is concerned is one who on the public platform advocated the election and so on of any member of a political party.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. In other words, you went so far in your organization as to believe or advocate that people should not vote, your

own members should not vote? A. We never advocated that they should not vote.

Q. Your members, as a matter of fact, do not believe in voting? A. Well, that is a little different way of putting it.

Q. Well, I will put it differently to you. A. Yes.

BY MR. MacKINNON:

Q. Was it a principle or tenet of your organization that members were not to engage in political matters or to associate themselves with political parties and consequently that they were not to assist in the election of members of legislatures and parliament? A. I will read the actual regulation in the by-laws of the organization on that point. It is found on page 1 of the regulations, point B, Political Affiliations:

"No individual, however, shall be eligible for membership in Technocracy, Inc., who is an active --" and the word "active" is in blacker type --

" -- member or officer of, or who still subscribes to the principles of any political organization or party. Voting shall not be interpreted as constituting active membership in a political organization."

BY MR. HANSELL:

Q. Would you tell us the reason for a regulation like that? I might say that I am interested in Technocracy. I do not know much about it; I have read some of the literature; I am interested in it from the standpoint that it is aggressive; it is an advance of the age. I can understand how science is coming into its own, and so on, but what is the reason for such a regulation as that? I can be interested in Technocracy, but I cannot belong to it. A. I think the reason is quite obvious and it is this, that the whole idea of Technocracy, I say the social basis of Technocracy was to bring people to the realization of the need of social change,

a particular type of social change, and we do not wish at any time for the name of the organization to be linked in any way with an existing political party, because then you have the position where a member of a political party would be making statements possibly on behalf of his political party whereas people who knew he was an active member of Technocracy might take it that those were the principles of Technocracy. In other words, that a member of a political party was advocating something that Technocracy did not necessarily approve of.

Now, as I mentioned before, no member of Technocracy was a non-citizen. The Technocrats of North America are North Americans first and foremost.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. Who were the organizers of this? A. Howard Scott was the original --

Q. Who is he? A. A chemical engineer in the United States.

BY MR. HANSELL:

Q. Where was he born? A. I could not say.

BY MR. MacKINNON:

Q. An American citizen? A. An American citizen.

Q. You have no charter to operate in Canada? A. We have none, no.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. How does the organization operate to improve or change social conditions to meet the power of the age?
A. I should like to make one distinction before I answer that, and that is the answers to all these questions are answers pertaining to pre-war policy of Technocracy. The reason I make that statement is that Technocracy Incorporated has one sole aim at the present time which I will bring out later. The principal methods of operating a social system

in a power age are these: (1) If you have a power age that can produce an abundance then the idea of price and value disappear. Now, that is quite evident when you see anything that has been --

Q. That is, you say if you can supply an overabundance of power or -- A. Goods.

Q. You have power that can produce an overabundance of goods. That is what you mean? A. Yes.

Q. What do you mean by "overabundance"? A. I believe I used the word "abundance."

Q. Over supply. A. Abundance. As far as overabundance in a power age is concerned, there is no point in overabundance. As a matter of fact I believe the definition of the word would show that there is no such thing. An abundance of material. In other words, as much as every citizen can use. I will give that as my definition of abundance.

Q. I see. A. The reason why price and value could not operate, if you had true abundance; in other words, everything that everyone could use is exactly the same as you have when you have an oversupply or an abundance of wheat in Canada. I think you members had quite a little problem about that before the war began and possibly still, with the greater the supply the lower the price goes and eventually a point is reached where the government either has to peg the price or pay more to the farmers than they receive; in other words, the law of supply and demand, so-called, breaks down.

Q. But that does not prevent the necessity for the obligation of an exchange of that commodity in the community. For example, even if you have an overabundant supply of wheat, people are not always producers and there are people who do not produce wheat that must get it from those who have

an oversupply. A. That is right.

Q. How are they going to get that? A. By the use of a medium of distribution as distinct from a medium of exchange.

Q. A medium of distribution in place of a medium of exchange? A. That is right.

Q. You call it a medium of distribution? A. If the members wish I can give them a short outline of that.

Q. Yes.

BY MR. HANSELL:

Q. Before you do that may I just clarify one question in my mind? You talk of value and price. Of course, that is a little technical, but I understand through medium you assume that the value of a bushel of wheat is not 90 cents but rather it is the value in vitamins and so forth and so on? A. When I use the word "value" I mean terms of value would not operate, value would be meaningless.

Q. How would you correlate or how would you arrive at the value between a bushel of wheat and several hours of labour and a cord of wood? A. I will incorporate that in my answer to the chairman's question.

(B follows)

A. I am answering that in my answer to the question by the chairman. The medium of distribution proposed by Technocracy Incorporated is energy certificates. An energy certificate would be identified to the person, in other words, non-transferable. It would carry either his signature or his picture so that no one else could use that particular certificate.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. An energy certificate issued by whom? A. By the government.

Q. By the state do you mean? A. Yes.

Q. I see. A. The energy certificate would carry other identifying features, such as the area in which this person lived and worked. The means of obtaining goods with an energy certificate would be briefly these: the energy certificate would be non-denominational. There would be no particular number of units printed on each certificate. The means of determining the number of units required to obtain any particular article would be these: the number of units of energy, you could use any unit you wished, as used by engineers; the number of units of energy, extraneous energy, other than manpower, that are required to produce that particular item. And that is a fairly simple matter even at the present time. In other words, the amount of time that the individual spent at labor hours to produce any particular item would not be used in determining the number of units required to obtain the particular item. Anything that is entirely and simply the product of man's time would carry no stipulation as to the use of any unit to obtain it.

Q. There is no relation between a man's time and his energy? A. That is right, and the reason for that is this:

THE CHAIRMAN: I know some men with not much energy whom that would suit.

WITNESS: In 1938, that is the most recent figure I have seen, the amount of energy put forth in production in the United States and Canada was approximately 98 per cent extraneous energy and 2 per cent manpower.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the basis of that proportion of these figures, would you give us the 100 per cent? A. The amount of power used on the continent can be figured and has been figured in various statistical sources.

Q. That is, used in the previous season or period of time? A. The amount of power consumed in an area.

Q. And the consuming capacity of the public for the succeeding period would be based on the quantity used in the previous given season or period, provided the requirements are the same. A. Quite.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. How do you arrive at the relative amount of energy as between manpower and other types of power; do you take a certain amount, say one horsepower, to equal a certain number of man-hours? A. You may be exaggerating it somewhat when you say that a man can consistently put forth one-tenth of a horsepower at work.

Q. In other words, one horsepower of electrical energy equals the labor power of ten men? A. That is right, that is the base figure.

Q. And on that basis you figure that in production in Canada and the United States for the year 1938 that the amount of labor energy expended was as two to ninety-eight?

A. That is right. The programme of Technocracy was known to any individual in Canada who wished to investigate it; in fact, the slogan of Technocracy has always been, investigate technocracy. We do not care whether anyone agreed or disagreed with us, there is only one thing that we ever asked, and that was that we be investigated. Technocrats have at all times done

everything in a very open manner. In support of one point that I have mentioned there, that members of Technocracy have to be citizens of the country, I am going to submit a quotation from a folder put forth by the organization: "Any individual who is a citizen of a country on the North American continent in which he resides is eligible for membership in Technocracy Incorporated; with the following exceptions, no alien, Asiatic, politician or supporter of a political party is eligible for membership."

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. No one of those could be members of the organization?

A. That is right.

Q. You would take only a new born child? A. Pardon?

Q. I say, would you take only a new born baby?

A. A citizen.

Q. If I understood you aright you said that no one belonging to a political party could become a member of the organization? A. That is right.

MR. MacINNIS: Very few people out of the total population of Canada belong to any political party. They may vote for a political party but they do not belong to the party.

WITNESS: I will put it in another way. I do not think the Liberal party would accept as a member a person who is a member of the Conservative party.

MR. MCKINNON: It has been done.

MR. MacINNIS: They would not know the difference.

MR. BENCE: When a Conservative joins a Liberal organization he ceases to be a Conservative; according to what you have told us, when a man joins Technocracy he ceases to be a member of any political party.

WITNESS: That is it; as a matter of fact, we have a great number of members who resigned their affiliations with political parties to become members of ours. For years Technocracy has protested against the shipment of metals and oils to Japan,

Germany, Italy and many other powers that were known to be inimical to the welfare of North America.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. What form did their protests take? A. Articles in magazines, public speeches and so on.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. Could you give us any references to those articles or statements? A. I haven't them here at the moment but I could easily submit them.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. I think that point is substantiated inferentially in the statement before us. I would take it that it was.

WITNESS: In August of 1938 Technocracy presented specifications for the army, navy and air force to meet and repel any attempted attack from Atlantic or Pacific simultaneously, and charged that the military budgets of the U.S. and Canada were inadequate to produce on this continent a military machine that would repel invasion.

MR. MacINNIS:

Were they military men who prepared that statement?

A. I can't give you any idea who prepared it. It was presented by members of the organization, of whom many are in the army, the navy and the air force of the United States.

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. Presented to whom? A. At that time it was in the form of a magazine article which was sent to every congressman and senator in the United States. I want to say that that was and still is one of the methods that the organization uses; that was, that any major statement they came out with was sent to every member of Congress and the Senate in the United States, and later when the organization became larger in Canada the same thing was carried out as far as it was possible.

BY MR. BENICE:

Q. Do you happen to have with you the issue of Technocracy -- that is the magazine of the Technocrats, is it not? A. That is the name of it.

Q. The issue which came out immediately after the outbreak of the war, I think it was in the fall of 1939, containing an article by Howard Scott to which great exception was taken and which eventually resulted in the magazine being banned from this country? A. I have a copy of that.

Q. With you? A. Yes.

Q. Might I look at it while you are proceeding?
A. Yes. In September of 1939 Technocracy demanded the development of a continental strategy and the immediate planned generalship of all continental operations for the security of North America. And now, the reason for that has become very obvious since the outbreak of the war. For years Technocracy emphasized the necessity of building highways to Alaska from the United States in order to guard against invasion from Asia; and our idea of Asiatics has always been well known, that we always feared that the Asiatics would become our enemies. I wish to quote from the issue of "Technocracy" which is the organization's official publication, this item here which was printed in November of 1940.

"An Alaskan highway is being footballed around as a possible project, but all the Alaskan highways proposed so far run out of Hazelton or Prince George, B.C., through difficult terrain of the B.C., Yukon, and Alaskan territory. Neither the Canadian nor the United States outside Alaskan highway proposals disclose that the only road connecting Vancouver with Prince George is via the Fraser River Canyon. This road is a single track trail on the side of a cliff along which it would be literally impossible to run our giant diesel truck-trailer combinations; and yet

this is the way that our political schemers are proposing to provide a land connection with our far-off bases in Alaska.

Technocracy proposes both an inside and an outside highway to Alaska. The inside highway would go north from Great Falls, Ontana through Lethbridge, Calgary, Edmonton, Peace River, and along the valley of the Mackenzie to the Arctic Ocean, crossing westward from there along the valley of the Porcupine into the Yukon River valley, thence south to Fairbanks and Anchorage. Another branch would run out to Nome and another to Bethel. The highway from Anchorage would continue out to the end of the Aleutian peninsula.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. Do you think the use of the words "political schemers" strengthened that report in any way? A. Well, they are politicians anyhow.

MR. MacINNIS: You would think there was something sinister about anything pertaining to government.

WITNESS: Not to government.

THE CHAIRMAN: From that it would appear that you label as a sinister organization, or as having sinister motives anyone who seems to oppose you. What is the relationship between that article and Technocracy?

WITNESS: It is published by us.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. In the name of and under the control of Technocracy Incorporated? A. That is right.

Q. But what is the relation between that article and Technocracy and its activities? A. In relation to that article -- I am going to try to make that clear by following it up a little further on -- this is one of the articles which were being put forward by the organization by way of proposals for the defence of North America.

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

and your doctrines and implement them; is that why you would expect those you are debarred from being members of your association to accept your conditions and your conception of social welfare and implement them? Notwithstanding that fact, you do not accept them as members of your organization.

A. No, I do not think that is the reason, I do not think they are interested in compelling any political party to do anything. We have placed before them our ideas, which I believe the right and even the duty of citizens of any country. I do not think we have ever brought any political pressure to bear on any political party.

MR. BENCE: You have, in the same sense that we understand political pressure; in that you have sent telegrams to the members of parliament and to the Prime Minister of Canada and in that way you have exerted pressure.

WITNESS: We did that once.

MR. MacINNIS: I do not know whether this will be the place to bring it up, but on the point raised by the chairman, that is one which I think should be clarified by the witness at some time during his submission: where governments both in Canada and in the United States and in other countries where government is carried on by some form of public administration and in dealing with other democratic countries, governments are elected by a popular vote of the people. To set up a new government that would bring in or maintain a different system of society would mean that you would have to supplant the present government for your government: how are you going to do that, and how would the public administration then be carried on, and what public control would there be over the administration? Those I think are, to me, the most important points in your set-up. I do not know that this is the time to go into that and I am not going to press for an answer at the moment.

MR. MCKINNON: Before you leave this it should be answered.

WITNESS: I did that pretty well in a former article.

In July of 1940 Technocracy advocated the immediate acquisition and fortifications by the United States and Canada of bases at the following points: Georgetown, Cumana, Curacao, Guantanamo bay, Bermuda, St. Johns, Hamilton inlet, cape Farewell, Galapagos islands, gulf of Fonseca, Magdalena bay, and Pago Pago, and the immediate fortification and strengthening of the following bases in possession of the United States: Attu, Dutch Harbor, Kodiak island, Anchorage, Juneau, etc.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. Do you know anything about fortifications yourself?

A. I am an accountant.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. What was the date when they recommended these fortifications? A. It was recommended in print in July, 1941. It had been recommended before that in speeches.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. Your map refers to you as "Technique of America"?

A. We define technique as functional government, or government by technical men.

Q. And this map suggests the boundaries of the "Technique of America"? A. Right.

Q. And you have a new form of continent, a new continent, functioning on the aegis and according to the policies of Technocrats? A. No, not under the aegis of Technocrats; that has never been one of our policies. It is set out in this folder that you have here on Technocracy Incorporated will be dependent upon the establishment of a new social order, the technique of the new America, and when that is established members of Technocracy Incorporated will only hold such positions as their abilities will determine.

Q. Of course, when a majority of the population become Technocrats and are converted to that doctrine the majority of

them will be Technocrats and so you will disband.

A. There would be no further use for the organization.

Q. No further use for the organization as incorporated, the vast majority of these people will be Technocrats.

A. Pardon?

Q. These people will be Technocrats then. A. At least these people will realize that something is being done and may not be Technocrats.

BY MR. BENICE:

Q. You would still believe in Technocracy, though?

A. Certainly.

MR. BENICE: I think we are arguing somewhat at cross purposes.

THE CHAIRMAN: A person who believes in Technocracy and practices Technocracy must be a Technocrat whether he belongs to an incorporated society or not in the city state of New York, or Cuba, or Central America or Canada; he is a Technocrat and he can't be anything else.

MR. BENICE: I cannot see the sense of it, we seem to be arguing at cross purposes.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. I would like to ask the witness what he means by technical men? A. Technical men.

Q. What does that mean --

MR. DUPUIS: Technical men, I suppose that includes professional men.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, no; I think the question asked by Mr. Hazen should be answered first because it is general; and then Mr. Dupuis would be free to particularize. Answer the question asked by Mr. Hazen, please.

WITNESS: A technical man is an expert in his own line of production, distribution and social service.

MR. HAZEN: You include doctors and lawyers and surgeons?

WITNESS: Certainly, they are all persons on social service.

MR. MacINNIS: Where would the lawyers come in?

MR. BENCE: He does not include them.

WITNESS: There are too many lawyers on this committee for me to answer that.

MR. MacINNIS: You are being politic now.

MR. HAZEN: Does it include bankers?

WITNESS: No.

MR. HAZEN: You would leave bankers and lawyers out of this scheme of yours altogether?

MR. MCKINNON: Wouldn't we have a nice bunch.

WITNESS: You would not leave the lawyers out, I said, the bankers.

MR. ROSS: I understood you to say that you would leave the lawyers out.

MR. MacINNIS: That is what I understood you to say.

WITNESS: I said that there were too many lawyers here for me to answer that.

Technocracy states that the present system of distribution is not possible, and that crime in North America would be reduced to approximately 5 per cent of the present figure --

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the present figure? A. That is an unanswerable figure.

Q. Why do you say it would be reduced to 5 per cent?

A. To 5 per cent of the present crime; the reason being that most crime is committed of or as a result of pecuniary advantage.

THE CHAIRMAN: The history of the world contradicts you on that.

MR. ROSS: What was that last phrase you used?

WITNESS: I said, the majority of crime is committed because of or as a result of pecuniary advantage; in other words, money.

MR. ROSS: I would be inclined to agree with you on that.

WITNESS: In November of 1941 Technocracy stated that

the day of the huge battleship was through as soon as some one country produced fleets of bombers having 6,000 miles or more range and carrying 25 to 50 tons of bombs each, and so claimed that North American should be the first country to produce them. Now, that has since been vindicated. For instance, in the United States the United States government has issued order orders on the proposed huge battleships, and at the present time Congress is advocating that even the battleships, the large battleships that have been started, be transformed into aircraft carriers.

THE CHAIRMAN: This view was established by people who do not belong to Technocracy Incorporated.

WITNESS: In making these statements I am not attempting to say that we were the only ones who held such views. I am bringing these comments forward to show that Technocracy Incorporated is not and will not be inimical to the defence of this continent or to the security of Canada. I think that any of these points --

C-1 follows.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. What about the action of this country fighting overseas for the defence of Canada? A. In September --

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. That is one of the charges made against you. It is charged Technocracy Incorporated was definitely opposed to Canada's war effort and it is charged that your activities constitute a menace to the security of the state in war time. It seems to me that these are two charges that should be answered. A. If these are actual charges that are made I will answer them specifically.

Q. These are charges that have been made and charges that you should meet, if you can. A. In September of 1939 before Canada declared war the Canadian section of Technocracy Incorporated sent a telegram to the Prime Minister Hon. Mackenzie King, outlining our stand and if the gentleman at the end of the table would let me have that magazine I can read it verbatim.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. I wanted to use it. As a matter of fact I think you made a slight mistake when you said before the outbreak of war. A. The Canadian section sent that telegram before Canada declared war.

Q. The telegram in here refers to the outbreak of the second world war. A. The second world war, yes, but before Canada declared war.

Q. There was an intervening week there? A. Yes.

Q. I cannot find any date on it. A. You can probably get that evidence here because copies would be kept here, I imagine. The text of the telegram the Canadian section sent to Prime Minister King is this: --

but as I say, you can obtain that easily enough.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. You say sometime between September 3, which was the date of the outbreak of the war -- A. Yes.

Q. -- and the time in which Canada's parliament met and Canada declared war? A. Yes. The telegram reads as follows:

"We, the officers and members of Section . . . , R.D. . . . , Technocracy Inc., wish to notify you that we stand ready to defend Canada from any alien attack. We, the officers and members of this Section of Technocracy Inc., are unequivocally opposed to the conscription of the manpower of Canada for any war anywhere off this Continent. We contend that, in view of the distress of our citizens the manpower of Canada should be organized immediately to provide the mobilization for human needs in this country and this Continent."

That was before Canada declared war.

Now, you can ask all the questions here you like, but I want to bring that up to date.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. That is not the complete telegram? A. That is the complete telegram that all Canadian sections sent to Prime Minister King.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. How many sections are there in Canada? A. I cannot tell you.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. What is the membership in Canada? A. The membership is nil.

Q. What was it? A. I cannot say; I was an officer of one section only, I would not know complete numbers.

Q. That is the difficulty you cannot speak for them

BY MR. MacKINNON:

Q. Who would know it? A. The continental headquarters of Technocracy would know.

Q. Surely you have contact with the rest of the organization across Canada or you did have, I should say. A. Yes.

Q. There must be a headquarters in Canada that keeps a record of all the various associations? A. No.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. It was a North American organization? A. The headquarters were in New York with sections and members in all the principal countries in North America. There is only one headquarters. It is a North American organization and not a Canadian, British, United States, or any other country's organization.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. There was a branch in Canada? A. There were several branches in Canada. There was a section in British Columbia and in every western city and town and a few in the east.

Q. You had one in Montreal? A. No.

BY MR. MacKINNON:

Q. So nobody in Canada had a record of them? A. No.

BY MR. BENICE:

Q. You said you were going on to bring that message up to date. A. That is right.

Q. Can you do that? A. Yes. That was in September 1939, before Canada declared war. At that time the political parties in Canada also were opposed to the conscription of man-power in Canada for war overseas. In the election that followed shortly after, I believe in 1940, at least three of the political parties had that as a basis of their platform.

conscription is concerned now? A. No, I am not.

MR. BENICE: They were against it.

MR. DUPUIS: Yes, but I submit the point of this organization being subversive is not because of that.

MR. HAZEN: The charge against them is they were opposed to Canada's war effort. He is giving evidence to show they were not, and he has produced evidence to show they were ready to defend Canada but opposed to conscription.

WITNESS: Right. Well, in September 1939 as we all know in Europe you had a situation where the same government, the same heads of governments and the same cabinets were in control of Great Britain and France as were at the time of Munich. Now, Technocracy opposed, as we stated in the telegram, the conscription of man-power in Canada for overseas. At that time --

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. Were you opposed to sending troops voluntarily?

A. No, we never were.

BY MR. BENICE:

Q. That does not bear out the article prepared by Howard Scott, contained in that magazine. The whole gist of that article is opposition to sending of men overseas or to the conscription of the resources of North America for fighting a war outside of North America. Is not that true? A. That is right.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. Then, will you correct the answer? A. Yes, I will correct that.

Q. So they were opposed to sending troops overseas even voluntarily. A. That was the statement made by Howard Scott.

Q. As the statement of your own organization.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. Would you say in that statement that Howard Scott was speaking specifically for the Technocracy members in Canada, the members of Technocracy in Canada? A. The largest membership in the organization was in the United States; the article was written for consumption in all parts of North America.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. You do not admit being pacifists? A. No, we never have been pacifists; we have always been 100 per cent for the defence of our territory.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. You think it would be better for the American continent to wait until Hitler comes here? A. No, sir.

Q. To defend yourself against him? A. In 1939, as I just mentioned, the governments that we had in England and France were the same as we had at the time of Munich. Now, in the spring of 1940 when the British people themselves repudiated the then government or the heads of the government and instituted a government that really prosecuted the war effort, Technocracy's position was this, and this was published in the Technocracy Digest, which was published in Vancouver, B.C. It is dated the 1st of July, 1940; but as is the case in most magazines, it was published about the middle of June, before Technocracy was declared illegal. The chief editorial in the magazine is as follows:

"Technocracy is Organized to Prevent Sabotage

Any threat to our equipment, any attempt to create social confusion, is prejudicial to the interests of Canadians.

Technocracy's analysis of the social order on the North American Continent has brought to its members a clear understanding of the meaning of citizenship. This social analysis 'bears down hard' on a study of the

physical means whereby the people of this Continent live. Our paramount interest has always been concerned with the production and distribution of goods and services, with the security and well-being of people, with efficiency.

It is imperative that the physical means of production continue operating without impediment. Sabotage, in high places or low, is treason to the people of this country and this Continent.

The implications of this position form the core of Technocracy's specifications of citizenship.

Today, throughout Canada, a strong feeling of indignation, a roused intolerance is evident against all forms of sabotage and what is termed 'fifth column' activity. The training of every Technocrat automatically places him in sympathy with this feeling and puts him on the defensive against any threat to the security of Canada.

Our educational and organization program is well known. It is also known to be in complete accord with the statutory limitations and legal requirements of the Dominion of Canada. Therefore Technocracy Digest offers its assistance to the authorities of the Dominion of Canada and reiterates that all Canadian Technocrats stand prepared to assist all law enforcement bodies in thwarting any attempt, either from within or without, to destroy, disrupt, or sabotage the physical equipment and natural resources and the orderly operation of all functions providing for the welfare of Canadians.

Technocracy and Technocrats of Canada lack the facilities to be as articulate in behalf of the safety of Canada as they would desire, but Technocrats cannot be charged with inconsistency in placing the welfare of

Canada and Canadians foremost.

What is a Canadian Technocrat? He or she is first and foremost a citizen of Canada. Each Technocrat has undertaken to adopt the scientific approach to social problems. The use of data and information not susceptible of verification is non-Technocratic. In this approach there is no room for emotional prejudices or viewpoints. Concerned only with the facts, Technocrats have found that the dangers threatening North America are greater than those threatening any other Continental area. Other civilizations are threatened with and experiencing military invasion. Our civilization faces a collapse of social operations. No comparable area on the surface of the globe presents such a complicated, precarious internal situation as does this North American Continent. The march of events abroad, the spreading force of armed might complicates this situation even more.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. No what abroad? What was that you read there? What was the phrase just before you stopped? A. "No comparable area on the surface of the globe --"

Q. Did you say something about no participation abroad; did you say that?

MR. MacINNIS: No, he did not say that.

WITNESS: "No comparable area on the surface of the globe presents such a complicated, precarious internal situation as does this North American Continent. The march of events abroad, the spreading force of armed might complicates this situation even more. Technocrats must be ever more on their guard. Technocracy, pledged to the security of America must become ever stronger!

In other lands a few hundred thousand men may capture avenues of distribution, enforcing capitulation of the populace. Here, a fraction of that number of men could possibly disrupt the entire Continental operation of production and distribution. So interlocked and interdependent are all phases of our industrial organization that any widespread interference with power or transportation on this Continent could force an early capitulation of our populace -- but here we would capitulate to chaos and worse!

Here on this Continent there is no independent part. On this Continental area live some 170,000,000 people whose very existence is made possible, first, by the stupendous amount of equipment at their disposal, and second, by a degree of social unity and coherence. Any threat to that equipment is a threat to the population. Any attempt to create social mistrust, or confusion and division along any lines whatsoever is prejudicial to the interests of Canadians.

More than any other group Technocracy understands this, and every member of this Organization knows that the protection and operation of this country is his first obligation as a citizen; that involves the protection of the physical equipment and the preservation of social order. Every functioning member is in training so that the operation of the physical equipment will be assured, even though, eventually, the present political-financial control will find itself unable to maintain operations.

These facts indicate that Technocracy Inc. is the most patriotic organization in Canada. With no axe to grind, no political 'gravy' to seek, no business interests to serve, and no special privilege aspirations,

Technocracy Inc. is free to organize a defence against destruction and destitution on this Continent.

At the outbreak of the European war thousands of Technocrats throughout Canada, at their own expense, sent telegrams to the Prime Minister of Canada offering their services in the case of any foreign attack upon us. It is not known if other organizations, now loudly 'patriotic,' took a like action, nor is it any concern of Technocracy's -- so long as the means whereby we Canadians live remain unimpeded through actions of emotional 'jitterbugs.'

With the development of increasing diligence on the part of the authorities, plus evidences of hysteria among certain groups, there will arise an increasing number of investigations. For eight years Technocracy has consistently repeated one request. That request has been, and is, that every intelligent citizen of this Continent investigate Technocracy. The facts are all in our favor and we welcome investigation by any one. The facts are in our favor because Technocracy is in favor of the facts!

Members of Technocracy Inc. must, however, take every precaution against the possibility of being classed as members of a political organization. To a Technocrat the communist smells as bad as the fascist, and the nazi is equal to either. That any person should strive or even hope to set up any of those political philosophies on this Continent is sufficient evidence that that person is unable to comprehend the significance of the facts and is therefore exceedingly undesirable in this Organization. In addition, an attitude on the part of any member that even implies political bias cannot be tolerated in this Organization.

As present social trends on this Continent continue, all Price System organizations and groups will become more unstable, more unreliable. This one Organization must remain and must gain in stability and respect as the Price System approaches its end. When the Price System on this Continent has reached the end of its road, there will be only one Organization which can show Canadians and North Americans where they are going and how they are to get there; only one Organization in which the populace can have any confidence. That Organization will be the one which stands for the adequate defense of Canada and the Continent, and which can present the blueprints of a new social order.

To further enhance the usefulness of Technocracy Inc. in the present crisis, General Regulations have been issued requiring that all able-bodied Technocrats join and assist the duly authorized local authorities in all Home Defence activities.

We have a stupendous job to do and not much time in which to do it.

Every Technocrat will consider it a privilege to be called to any duty which will safeguard the lives and physical wealth of his country from invasion -- from within or without."

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. What are you reading from? A. Technocracy Digest, published in Vancouver, B.C.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. By whom? A. By the Vancouver section of Technocracy Incorporated.

Q. They would not be speaking for the complete organizations throughout America, Technocracy Incorporated? A. I might state there all the articles of a nature of that kind

were always submitted to continental headquarters to make sure that it was the views of the organization.

Q. Then, this man Howard Scott's statement, what about it? Was any statement made by Howard Scott as to policy also to be submitted? A. Submitted where?

Q. To the organization headquarters. A. Continental headquarters, yes.

MR. HAZEN: He is the headquarters.

WITNESS: He is the director in chief.

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. When he speaks is he speaking for Technocracy throughout America? A. Yes.

Q. Well, then, when he says that you are opposed to the voluntary system of enlisting men for overseas service he is speaking for all Technocrats, is he? A. Well, it depends when you say "is he." Just before we go on, may I say there is considerable confusion in all this discussion because you have not allowed me to bring this up to date.

BY MR. DUPUIS: Wh

Q. What you have read from that magazine purports to be the policy of the Technocrats? A. Yes.

MR. HAZEN: He has not brought it up to date.

MR. BENICE: That is part of bringing it up to date.

MR. ROSS: Go ahead, bring it up to date.

WITNESS: The thing is this, many people and organizations advocated something before the outbreak of this war and have since changed that policy in accordance with the defence of this country. In the August-September issue of the magazine 8141, published by the sections of Technocracy Incorporated in the Cleveland area, which was about two or three months after Technocracy was banned in Canada, it said this.

I wish to read the statement made by headquarters of the organization at that time regarding the banning of Technocracy in Canada.

"Political Action Against Technocracy in Canada

The defeatist fears of the political forces of Canada have led them to take action against the only organization in that country which will prevent ultimate chaos. Acting under the cloak of wartime necessity, political Canada has moved against Technocracy in an hysterical attempt to block the march of events. The happenings preceding this action are herewith placed on record.

War developments have brought out the following basic features of Technocracy:

That Technocracy is completely North American in its structure and membership, that is, all members in Canada are Canadian citizens, and all members in the United States are United States citizens.

That Technocracy never has had any foreign affiliation or support.

That Technocracy is one hundred per cent opposed to communism, fascism and nazism.

That Technocracy stands for efficiency and is actively on guard against sabotage of all kinds.

That Technocracy stands for the defense of this Continent.

Continental Headquarters Instructs Canadian Technocrats

These features of Technocracy were accentuated in a letter of General Instructions, recently sent to all Canadian Sections, which contained the following paragraphs:

'Every Technocrat, male and female, capable of performing adequate service duty is hereby instructed

to join a duly qualified local body of Home Defense. All Sections and members are hereby instructed to assist the legally qualified officer personnel of the Dominion of Canada in the detection and prevention of all subversive activities, sabotage and alien propaganda.

'Continental Headquarters hereby instructs all Technocrats in Canada that it is their patriotic duty, as members of Technocracy Inc. in Canada, to give their full aid and co-operation, as loyal Canadians, to the Dominion of Canada in uncovering and combatting all "Fifth Column" activity of any kind whatsoever.'

Canada Technocrats Outline Defense Program

Authorized by CHQ, the Technocrats of Yorkton, Saskatchewan, on June 6, 1940, took the following action which was reported in the 'Yorkton Enterprise,' as follows:

'Technocracy Inc., Regional Division 10251, moved in their big guns backed by most of their infantry and trained a bombardment on those attending a public meeting of the War Effort Committee in the City Hall Tuesday night and all but blasted a resolution through with seven clauses which they claimed would stop the "pussy-footing, carpet-bagging and go to town to win this cockeyed war." They did succeed in having their resolution passed on the control committee for analysis in the hope that those of the Yorkton district will show our government at Ottawa that all citizens here are prepared to go all out to wage a total war against the enemy. . .

'The following resolution was moved by Mr. Jansen and seconded by Mr. Chapman.' (Both of 10250-1.)

'We are faced with the most ruthless and efficient enemy in the world. He must be met with the same

ruthless efficiency that he exhibits. In order that this efficiency be provided, 10250-1, Technocracy Inc., a non-political organization, states:

'(1) That every person in the Dominion of Canada 21 years of age and over be immediately conscripted in the service of Canada and placed on the same schedule of remuneration, rations, and allowances as the common soldier at the front, for the duration of the war. (Invalids and children excepted.)

'(2) Complete conscription of wealth and natural resources, as well as currency and exchange for the duration of the war.

'(3) Complete conscription of all patents, patent rights and copy rights to facilitate production of the most efficient equipment technologically possible.

'(4) Correlate the operation of all agriculture to a new high productive level.

'(5) Furnish our Allies with all the necessary food supplies, clothing, equipment, tanks, guns, planes and munitions that they now lack, free if necessary as our war effort and contribution in order that Totalitarianism and Dictatorship be defeated.

'(6) Speed up production by having all important industries operate on a twenty-four hour basis.

'(7) To prevent sabotage of functionally important sequences would suggest such precautionary measure as the wire fencing of such places as the water works, city wells, water tower, electric power plants, sewage disposal plant and armory and all communication centers with double wire fencing -- inside fence to have high tension wires. (Fox farms now have this.) One or two guards at each place is only a farce if real sabotage were contemplated.'"

That action was taken before Technocracy Incorporated was banned in Canada by Canadian Technocrats.

MR. HAZEN: One section.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. What is the title of the article? A. British Empire vs. Technocracy.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. One section of the organization passed that resolution? A. Right.

Q. Was not that a resolution passed by one section? A. That is right.

Q. That section passed the resolution. Did that resolution have the approval and support of Technocracy Incorporated? A. Right. I mentioned right at the top of it, "authorized by continental headquarters."

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. That seems in contradiction of the article that you read by Howard Scott. A. In 1939?

Q. Yes. A. Yes.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. It says "manpower be conscripted for Canada in the same way as those fighting overseas." That is what you read? A. Right.

Q. There is something in that? A. In other words --

Q. Do you mean conscription for the defence of this country? A. Right.

BY MR. MACKINNON:

Q. Where is the defence of this country, right at home; is that what you mean? A. There?

Q. Yes. A. Defence is primarily here. The resolution as I read it contained this clause, "furnish our allies with all the necessary food supplies, clothing, equipment, tanks, guns, planes and munitions that they now lack, free if

necessary as our war effort and contribution in order that Totalitarianism and Dictatorship be defeated."

Q. That is fine to a point. What I am trying to get at is this, as I follow the picture. You are willing to give them every assistance and you are willing to have conscription for the defence of Canada; in other words our troops must be kept home, as I gather it? A. No. The first clause here is that all persons in the Dominion of Canada 21 years of age and over be immediately conscripted in the service of Canada. Now, the service of Canada may be here, in the United States, Alaska, England or anywhere else.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. That is not what it means.

MR. ROSS: It does not say that.

WITNESS: All right.

BY MR. BENICE:

Q. As I understand it, they pass that resolution for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of the war effort?

A. Right.

Q. And you are telling us now that the Technocrats of Canada in any event, and probably the Technocrats in the United States, because they endorsed that resolution have withdrawn from the stand that they took in the fall of '39?

A. Right.

Q. And are now in favour of a complete and all-out war effort. Now, according to the text of the resolution passed at Yorkton -- A. They are now and were then in June 1940 when it became apparent with the fall of France and the change of government in England that a large change had taken place in the course of the war.

Q. Did they reverse their position completely?

A. Right, as regards that one point.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. That is not what it says. A. Now, I am also submitting something that was mentioned in the last article I just read. This is a letter that was received by all Canadian sections of Technocracy on June 1, 1940, from continental headquarters. The letter reads as follows:

"To: All Technocrats in Canada June 1, 1940.

Subject: General Regulations on Home Defence

1. Technocracy Inc. reaffirms its position on national defence as stated in its telegram of September 5, 1939, to Prime Minister Mackenzie King.
2. Continental Headquarters hereby reminds all Technocrats in Canada that as loyal Canadians they must render full support to the defence program of the Dominion of Canada.
3. Every Technocrat, male and female, capable of performing adequate service duty is hereby instructed to join a duly qualified local body of Home Defence. All Sections and members are hereby instructed to assist the legally qualified officer personnel of the Dominion of Canada in the detection and prevention of all subversive activities, sabotage, and alien propaganda.
4. Continental Headquarters hereby instructs all Technocrats in Canada that it is their patriotic duty, as members of Technocracy Inc. in Canada, to give their full aid and cooperation, as loyal Canadians, to the Dominion of Canada in uncovering and combatting all 'Fifth Column' activity of any kind whatsoever.
5. Failure on the part of any member of Technocracy Inc. in Canada to carry out these instructions will result in immediate charges of conduct unbecoming a

Tech Technocrat and a Canadian, resulting in immediate
cancellation of membership.

Salute!

(Sgd.) Howard Scott,
Director in Chief
Technocracy Inc."

(D follows)

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. What date is that again? A. June 1st, 1940.

Q. And that forms part of the statement that was sent to Ottawa which said that they were opposed to conscription for overseas service? A. No.

Q. It forms part of that article, does it not?

MR. DUPUIS: In justice to the witness I am going to read a telegram which was sent from the director in chief and which states:

MR. BENICE: What is the date of that?

MR. DUPUIS: The date is not given. It was before the resolution was passed and it says, "entire membership in Canada is in full support of the Dominion of Canada's programme of national defence".

MR. ROSS: What is that date? Was it about the middle of September, 1940? Where was it sent from?

WITNESS: It originated in the United States and from now on pretty well when I speak of the policy of Technocracy Incorporated I refer to it as it has found expression in the United States since June 20, 1940.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. Before you go further, would you tell me if your organization is banned in the United States? A. No, sir, it is not.

MR. P.M. ANDERSON: Before Mr. Norris starts on any new section I have a few questions I would like to ask him with respect to two circulars, Mr. Chairman; with your permission.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. ANDERSON: The first one is "Technocracy and War". It is issued by continental headquarters Technocracy Incorporated, 155 East 44th Street, New York, N.Y., and this one went to Technocracy Incorporated, Northside, Saskatchewan.

MR. BENICE: When was that distributed?

MR. ANDERSON: I have no information on that. Mr. Norris may have some.

MR. BENCE: You do not know even where it was sent out from?

MR. ANDERSON: I do not know, I have no information on that. It may be that the wire referred to just now would show that; I am not sure as to that, but I want to quote two or three paragraphs:

"The frontier days of yesterday are past. The frontiers of America are no longer geographical. The frontiers of America's tomorrow are technological. The patriotism of this Price System is the last refuge of the chiseler and the solace of the sucker. In peace he can die in the ditch; in war he can die in glory. America must needs have a new patriotism for its technological frontiers of tomorrow. It must needs be a patriotism of advance, a positive proposition for the youth of the New America, a patriotism that is a negation of all that was yesterday, a patriotism so great that the youth of today will fight for it, and if necessary die for it, in order to provide the youth yet to come with a country worth living for.

American has no war off this continent. America's war is here and now in this country and on this continent -- a patriotic war against the peace of this Price System, against its poverty and its malnutrition, its crime, its sudden death, and its disease. It is a war of plenty versus poverty, of technology versus toil, the war of tomorrow against yesterday, of science versus chaos. It is America's only war. It is a war to annihilate the social syphilis of business and its paresis, political administration. This is the only war that the youth of America will fight.

Within the next few years this war will have to be fought and won. The youth of America has no future until it fights and wins this war. And the senility of yesterday had better stand aside; for when the youth of America fights this war, it will be utterly ruthless. The youth will not negotiate, it will not compromise, nor will it accept surrender. It, in its greater patriotism of a New America, will present a clean, hard, bright design for living that will be the glory of all the ages. And when the youth of America presents its ultimatum, let no minority, racial, religious, or economic, attempt to bar the highway to the New America; for if one does, the youth of this continent will concede nothing short of that minority's annihilation.

Wars end in victory or defeat, but the peace of this Price System has no end, merely disintegration. So let's offer the youth of this continent a new war, a fight worthwhile, a battle royal, a war to fulfill this continent's rendezvous with destiny. Let's declare war on peace, the peace of this Price System. Who in hell wants to live forever!"

Are these the principles of democracy?

WITNESS: Pardon?

MR. ANDERSON: Are these the principles of your organization?

WITNESS: What do you mean by these principles?

MR. ANDERSON: Those set out in the material I have just read?

WITNESS: No, sir.

MR. ANDERSON: I have one more similar document entitled "Technocracy Indicts":

"Technocracy Inc. predicts that destiny shall declare the Price System 'no dice', and without anger or malice issues fair warning to these dominant interests, that

if they persist in maintaining this conspiracy in the face of the technological march of events this generation of Americans will at that rendezvous with destiny adjudge them to be guilty of continental treason. Then may God have mercy on their souls!"

Does this represent the use of force by your organization?

WITNESS: No, sir.

MR. DUPUIS: You deny that that is your publication?

WITNESS: They were not distributed by our section, but they are publications of Technocracy Inc.

BY MR. BENICE:

Q. Do you know when they were published? A. Some time in the summer of 1939.

Q. Before the war? A. Right.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. As I understand you what you say is that you have not advocated the over-throw of government by force? A. No.

Q. Have you advocated the over-throw of the government by national walk-out? A. That is one thing we have always denied, and we could not do it in this country. One of our basic principles is that production and distribution of these products must be maintained under all circumstances. That is the reason why the labor unions were not any too friendly with us because we did not favour walk-outs.

BY MR. BENICE:

Q. My understanding of Technocracy, from my discussions with some of my friends who are in it -- and I have no hesitation whatsoever in saying that some of my friends who occupy reasonably high positions in the engineering world were members of Technocracy Incorporated -- I understood them to say that they were convinced that our present system would eventually break down and that Technocracy was waiting only for that breakdown and that they would then immediately step in with their blueprints of a scheme whereby North America

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

America was threatened in any way shape or form that we would be 100 per cent behind any defence effort.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. What I want to find out now is when and how you came to the conclusion that we were now threatened and when did your organization come to the conclusion that we were now threatened so that Technocracy should support the war effort? A. Well, I would say that it was roughly a few weeks before the fall of France; in other words, it was when France failed we withstand the opposition to Nazi domination.

Q. You mean, when it became apparent that anti-Nazisism could not win without the support of the people in this continent?

A. Right.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. Might I point out that the opposition to Canada's taking any part in war off this continent is obviously not a matter for action because of subversive activities. We know many people who take that position, and would only become subversive when the individual organization would take an overt action to give effect to it; possibly it would not even have to be an overt action, but it should at least have to be definitely shown that it was subversive.

A. May I answer Mr. MacInnis' question by referring to some material which I have here which was issued by the organization prior to and since the beginning of the war which definitely states that we could not on this continent have a change by force. Here I have a set of five postcards issued by the organization for the use of its members sending messages, but they were in use before we were banned.

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. Was that just by some local organization? A. This was issued by the headquarters in New York.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. Do you know when those were issued? A. Roughly some time in 1939, I would say.

Q. Before or after the beginning of September?

A. Of 1939?

Q. Yes. A. They were before. I know that the general organization had these postcards: the first one reads,

"Technocracy states that the imminent social transition neither requires nor permits of revolution, but must needs proceed within the channels of a planned and orderly progression -- that progression which is unique for this continental area. A failure to accomplish this imperative demand of our advanced technology would bring chaos on the North American continent."

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. Is not that a very limited conception of the idea of revolution; revolution does not necessarily mean violence or the use of force? A. Well, that is what is referred to there.

Q. Any social change is in fact a revolution?

A. The popular conception of revolution is force.

Q. Yes, but that is a cock-eyed conception; and Technocracy as a technical organization should not have cock-eyed conceptions. A. This is another one in the same sense:

"Only Americans under American leadership can build the New America. We need no orders from Moscow, Berlin, or Rome. No importations of European social philosophy -- communism, socialism, fascism, or any other "ism" -- should be permitted to choke American ingenuity and progress. A unique technique is required. And America has the tools and the right kind of men for this technique".

"Technocracy was the first to point out that technological advance coupled with the vast resources of this continent makes it possible to increase production to a degree capable of providing all the goods and services required to meet the physical requirements of each and every American".

And:

"Technocracy will not appeal to the people of this continent to indulge in either bullets or ballots, or to oppose or over-throw anything. It will not waste its efforts in asking its members to protest against any of the idiocies of this Price System. It will always realize that the most efficient disintegrators of the Price System are its present political and financial leaders."

And here is the other one:

"Technocracy Inc., is building a trained and disciplined organization capable of meeting the command of technocracy. This organization, the Technological Army of the New America, is designed to assure the continued functioning of the equipment on this continent. Such an organization requires the participation of all types of people. Individuals who qualify may obtain membership".

And here is another leaflet issued by Continental Headquarters, and this one was in circulation some years before -- it was printed in July of 1937 and reprinted in June of 1939.

It says:

"Technocracy states that the imminent social transition neither requires nor permits of revolution, but must needs proceed within the channels of a planned and orderly progression -- that progression which is unique for this continental area. A failure to accomplish this imperative demand of our advanced technology would bring chaos on the North American continent".

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. And what is the date of the publication? A. It was originally printed in July of 1937 and this one was issued in June of 1939.

Q. From what place? A. From Continental headquarters in New York city.

Q. And the policy of the Canadian branch of Technocracy is in full accord with Technocracy in the United States?

A. At the present time, do you mean?

Q. I mean the United States technical programme.

A. It is one organization, we do not make any distinction.

Q. You do not disagree with them at all? A. No Technocrat can disagree.

Q. What I want to know is, in 1942, on May 9th, the Toronto Saturday Night carried a clipping which referred to a full page advertisement appearing in the San Francisco Chronicle which reads as follows:

"If any Canadians had any qualms about the banning of Technocracy in this country, they should be set at rest by even the slightest examination of the campaign which that amazing organization, with great expenditure of money for advertising and offices, is now staging in California and other parts of the western States. The San Francisco Chronicle carried last week a full page advertisement (which it denounced with great editorial vigor in the following issue) calling for the complete and immediate confiscation of all the property, money and business, and the conscription of the persons, of all the inhabitants of the United States under the final authority of an individual always referred to as "Commander-in-Chief" and never as "President". This authority is to supersede all state and local governments, to collect all their taxes, local and national, to operate all businesses, to command all persons, to suppress all

public communications in foreign languages, to abolish all foreign language associations, and to remove all "party politicians" (obviously including Congress) and "business leaders" (obviously meaning owners and managers) from all their functions."

A. Might I ask where the quotation is from?

Q. It is from the San Francisco Chronicle. A. A newspaper?

Q. A newspaper, a full page advertisement by Technocracy.

A. I have here a full page advertisement which was published in the New York Times on Sunday, March 8th.

Q. Of what year? A. 1942 -- it is a full page advertisement, the one referred to in that.

Q. Is this still your policy? A. With your permission I will read this.

MR. BENCE: May I ask, before you go on, what was that a news item?

MR. DUPUIS: It was an advertisement from Technocracy.

THE CHAIRMAN: What are you reading there, is it the advertisement which appeared in the San Francisco paper?

MR. ANDERSON: I think he is reading from a news item reporting the advertisement.

MR. BENCE: Then that would be a newspaper man writing something by way of interpretation of the advertisement.

MR. DUPUIS: No, no.

MR. BENCE: Might I look at it?

MR. DUPUIS: Yes. This advertisement appeared in the San Francisco Chronicle and the day after it appeared the Chronicle denies it with great editorial vigor in the subsequent issue of the paper.

MR. MacINNIS: That is what you read from?

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, he read from the editorial.

MR. DUPUIS: In the editorial the day after they criticized the advertisement.

MR. MacINNIS: Which did you read from the advertisement or the editorial?

MR. DUPUIS: No, that was a reprint which appeared in Saturday Night of Toronto.

WITNESS: Here is the full page advertisement which is headed "Technocracy urges total conscription of men, machines, material and money -- with national service from all and profit to none." Some of you gentlemen might like to look at this advertisement. It is available to you if you wish to see it. Or, would you like me to read the advertisement?

MR. MacINNIS: No, we haven't got the time.

MR. ANDERSON: Is that the same advertisement which appeared in the San Francisco paper?

WITNESS: I can't say so.

MR. BENCE: This item that Mr. Dupuis read from appeared in Toronto Saturday Night under date of the 9th of May, 1942 and it is an editorial article and refers to the San Francisco Chronicle and the advertising, and it appears to approve the editorial action by the San Francisco paper. It comments on what was in the advertising but it does not do anything more or less than that.

THE CHAIRMAN: We will have the advertisement entered as an exhibit.

EXHIBIT 2: Technocracy advertisement in New York Times, March 8, 1942.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. Were members of Technocracy Incorporated prior to being banned going around obtaining diagrams and sketches of power plants and essential industries in Canada and forwarding them to headquarters in New York? A. What is that?

Q. Did members of Technocracy Incorporated in Canada obtain diagrams and sketches of power plants and essential industry in Canada and forward them to headquarters in the United States; and if they did that, why did they do that, and to what extent did they do it? A. In the first place,

certainly none of the Technocrats in our area did it, I will not make any definite statement on the others. But I will say this, that the Technocrats were interested in any power production equipment and so on; it was featured in pictures in all our magazines to emphasize the power age; that is the only reason any Technocrat might be taking pictures of power plants and so on. They appeared in all our magazines to emphasize that one point.

Q. This is not pictures, it is diagrams and sketches.

A. Off hand I would say, no. I cannot vouch for the rest of the Canadian Technocrats though. I certainly have no knowledge of anything of that nature.

Q. That is what I wanted to know, you have no knowledge of that? A. Right.

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. Before going on to another point; referring to those articles read by Mr. Anderson? A. Yes.

Q. You recognize those as literature issued by Technocracy? A. Right.

Q. Where had you seen them before? You appeared to recognize them as being literature issued by Technocracy Inc.?

A. Because they had been sent to our section in Toronto as file copies.

Q. As file copies? A. Yes.

Q. They had been sent to headquarters of your section in Toronto? A. Yes.

Q. You saw them there? A. Yes.

Q. I suppose they would be sent to all the organizations in Canada? A. Right, file copies of any new publications that were sent out went to each section.

Q. And you have seen them there? A. Right.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

to disprove of what was done? A. The only ones I saw were the ones on our files, and we did not hand out any copies of those circulars.

Q. Why not?

MR. ANDERSON: Why didn't you hand them out?

WITNESS: Because, first, when we obtain all these file copies, at that time each section makes their own selection; each section chooses the ones which they wish to order for use in Canada -- and of course, they have to pay for them -- and naturally they select the ones which they figure will best serve the territory in which they are working.

MR. DUPUIS: And they use different things in different parts of the country.

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. Were any other issues along the same lines as those sent to Toronto -- were any others along the same lines as those read by Mr. Anderson here forwarded to you at Toronto?

A. There were a number of the same set-up -- I think there were five altogether.

MR. MacINNIS: That would not be politics by any means, would it?

WITNESS: Since the outbreak of the war in the United States -- I want to bring this question of policy on defence right up to date -- the following is part of a monthly newsletter from headquarters to the various sections:

MR. MacINNIS: It is one o'clock, Mr. Chairman, if the witness cannot finish now I think we had better make arrangements to have him here before the committee again.

MR. BENCE: How long would it take you to complete, Mr. Norris?

WITNESS: That depends on how many questions I am asked.

MR. BENCE: If we let you go ahead how long do you think it would take you to finish?

WITNESS: Approximately half an hour.

MR. BENCE: I think we had better do that then; could we meet this afternoon?

THE CHAIRMAN: We could, if we can get a quorum.

MR. MacINNIS: Let us make it 4 o'clock and get this off our hands.

THE CHAIRMAN: I doubt if I could be here at 4 o'clock.

(The committee continued its sitting in camera).

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Committee resumed at 4 o'clock.

Mr. MacKinnon - Acting Chairman.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: We have a quorum, and we shall now recall Mr. Norris.

Mr. Norris, you had some remarks to make at the lunch hour when we adjourned.

MR. CHARLES G. NORRIS, recalled:

WITNESS: After the discussion this morning I thought that probably the way to expedite matters the most would be if I gave you in concise form a few of the reasons why we consider that Technocracy Incorporated should never have been declared illegal in Canada and that the ban on that organization should be lifted at the present time.

I mentioned this morning that all Technocrats in Canada were citizens of Canada; that Technocracy had consistently advocated greater defence for this country and this continent; that at the outbreak of the present world conflict the members of Technocracy telegraphed Prime Minister Mackenzie King stating their willingness and that they stood ready to defend this country against any attack; that in June 1940 when it became apparent that the course of the war had changed that Technocrats in Canada had publicly called for total conscription in Canada and that the Technocrats in the United States had done the same thing shortly after that; in June 1940 it was made a requisite of membership in Technocracy Incorporated in Canada that the member be able-bodied and at least become a member of one of the home defence or the reserve forces; that in the United States in July 1940 and November 1940 Technocracy Incorporated called for a general defence and outlined a good many of the requirements of defence of this continent, a few of which are: they called

for the production of the United States and Canada be integrated into one productive mechanism such as more or less is underway at the present time. Technocracy proposed functional control by industries; in other words, somewhat similar to your present trend, the metal controller, the oil controller, etc., functional control over complete industry.

On December 7, 1941, at the time of the attack on Pearl Harbour the director in chief of Technocracy telegraphed President Roosevelt from Los Angeles, where he was speaking at the time, affirming the loyalty of all Technocrats in the United States and that they were confident in the leadership of the president as the constitutional commander in chief, and also declaring that it would provide for unity in North America if the president in his speech to congress the next day should call for a declaration of war not only upon Japan but upon all the thirteen signatories of the Axis pact.

In the United States Technocrats called for the following points in national defence and in continental defence. The design of an immediate highway and railway from Quebec City to Hamilton Inlet to defend the continent from the northeast; the immediate construction of two highways to Alaska which I mentioned earlier. Immediate construction of highways south to Mexico and Central America, under the Panama Canal and east to the Guianas for the defence of the Panama Canal and the Caribbean; the immediate construction of a second Atlantic-Pacific canal through Nicaragua to ensure that the two coasts of North America will not be isolated from each other; the immediate construction of the St. Lawrence ship canal to enable vessels to be built in the safety of the Great Lakes; the immediate construction of a canal from the Hudson river via Lake Champlain and the Richelieu river to the St. Lawrence, the other side of Montreal, to provide for the possibility of

the United States navy protecting the eastern part of the United States and Canada in case of surprise invasion in which the enemy gained the Gulf of St. Lawrence; the immediate deepening and further construction of the Erie Canal to allow warships to branch from the Hudson canal at Albany and emerge in Lake Ontario at Oswego in case any enemy should reach Montreal; parity of the Canadian dollar with the United States dollar by means of the United States underwriting the Canadian dollar and pegging it at parity.

In connection with that the following is the message that was sent to both Prime Minister Mackenzie King and President Roosevelt by headquarters of Technocracy Incorporated:

"Technocracy proposes that the government of the United States place the Canadian monetary structure and exchange rate on a parity basis with that of the United States, i.e., that the Canadian dollar be underwritten and 'pegged' to a parity basis with the United States dollar. This would enable Canada and Canadians to purchase from the United States 16 to 20 per cent more per Canadian dollar than is now possible under the existing disadvantageous monetary exchange relationship.

Technocracy proposes that the United States and Canada abolish all tariff barriers at their common boundary line, i.e., that they agree to unrestricted reciprocity. Such full trade reciprocity would enable the United States to ship surplus fruits, vegetables and other products to the people of Canada as a much needed step toward raising the nutritional standards of Canada.

Technocracy repeats its long-standing proposal, well-known to Canadians, that the entire productive effort of both the United States and Canada be

interlocked as one unified production program under planned direction.

Technocracy proposes that the prices of products exchanged under such reciprocity be 'pegged' at a standard parity in both countries under the parity-stabilized currency plan proposed herein.

Technocracy proposes that the United States government undertake complete financial responsibility for the construction of an Alaska Highway from Great Falls, Montana, to Fairbanks, Alaska (via Lethbridge, Calgary, Edmonton, the Peace River, and the Mackenzie and Yukon rivers), and that Canada grant the United States the required permission. Technocracy also proposes that both countries agree to immediate action in the construction of the vital St. Lawrence Waterway Project, to be financed by the United States; and that Canada and the United States jointly establish a permanent Great Lakes water level control. It proposes further that the joint establishment of bases and connecting super highways on Canadian territory for Continental defense be undertaken at once."

It also calls for the immediate institution of a program of building such long range bombers as would make North America impregnable from attack. In support of this program Technocracy presented complete designs of such a bomber, to the commander in chief of the United States. Complete blueprints and designs of such an aeroplane called the Flying Wing were presented. This Flying Wing was modelled and tested in wind channels, etc., in California, and I wish to submit this evidence.

(BB follows)

THE FLYING WING.

"The cover of this magazine and the inset on this page reproduce a drawing of the Flying Wing super-bomber designed by Technocracy Inc. For years engineers have been working on designs which would break away from the conventional plane. Research and experiments have been conducted, models built, and today, planes of the Flying Wing design have been made and flown. (Northrop Aircraft, Inc. of Hawthorne, California, is reported to be testing a two-engine flying-wing pursuit ship). There is no question of doubt as to the feasibility and efficiency of the Flying Wing.

The Flying Wing bomber, as designed by Technocracy, and shown herewith, is the largest plane ever proposed. It is literally a huge, streamlined Flying Wing. All machinery and facilities are within the wing itself. There is no fuselage.

Technically, the Flying Wing is within reach of production now."

(And this, by the way, was published in November of 1941)

The United States is in a position to lead the world in this development. Technocracy's design is available to the United States government. America has the technological skill and the facilities to make the great aeronautical advance involved in producing these planes. No other country has the technological capacity to produce a plane of such size in quantity.

The specifications of the Flying Wings superbomber are as follows:

Wingspread:	330 feet
Range:	12,500 miles
Ceiling:	35,000 feet
Speed:	over 300 m. p. h.
Bombload:	50 tons

The Flying Wing bomber will be powered by four pusher-type motors. The entire job is designed for technological mass production. No rivets or hand methods would enter into its construction. Planes of this size could not be produced in quantity by the methods used in the aviation industry today.

The Flying Wing will be used primarily as a bomber, but it may also be used as a transport for troops and war equipment or as a freighter of the skies. As a bomber it will carry 50 tons of bombs -- 100 half-ton bombs. With armament and bomb racks removed it would carry 300 fully equipped men or two 25-ton tanks. It will have a unique and deadly armament, so deadly that it will blow any existing fighters out of the sky before they get within their own range. There would be no need for an accompanying force of protecting fighter planes on attacks undertaken by the Flying Wing.

Technocracy proposes construction of sufficient of these giant bombers to provide a force for each of the defense bases surrounding this continent. From these bases the attack could be carried by the Flying Wings to almost all parts of the world -- right to the home front of any potential enemy of this continent.

In action the bombers would operate in squads of 11. Then of these squads would form a squadron. Then squadrons would form a fleet. Thus each fleet would consist of a total of 1,100 bombers. Technocracy proposes 11 such fleets on the Pacific side of the continent and 11 on the Atlantic side. There would therefore be a total 'front line force' of 24,200 Flying Wings.

A single fleet of 1,100 planes would carry a bomb load of 55,000 tons or 110,000 bombs of 1,000 pounds each! The bombing action would be in pattern formation.

If necessary five fleets from one coast (leaving six in reserve on that coast) could be used simultaneously, converging over a single objective. Such an air armada would drop in one bombardment the almost incredible total of 275,000 tons of bombs. This is a greater tonnage of bombs than the German Luftwaffe dropped on England in the first two years of this war. Total annihilation of the objective, whether it be city, industrial area, or fleet at sea, would result. The Wings of the continent would only need to pass over their objective once.

In addition to the Flying Wings the Airforce would consist of long-range, twin-motor, fighter-interceptors with heavy firepower. Their range would be 2,500 miles. The total airforce would exceed 50,000 first-line war planes, plus reserves, trainers, and those planes used exclusively by the army, the navy, and the fortifications.

As advancing technology enables alien powers to increase the range and effectiveness of their air offensive, it will become necessary for America to lead and not to follow. This is not merely an emergency, but a permanent requirement for the defence of this continent. It is necessary now for America to have an offensive weapon equal to the Flying Wing. Technocracy presents the specifications for the security of America. For the first time in history technology has presented us with the opportunity to be ruthless. If alien powers threaten our existence shall we not make use of our technology?"

Q. By the way, have the blueprints and so on been accepted by the American government on that? A. I could not say.

Q. Does it mean anything; that is, is it working out;

has anybody accepted it as a practical proposition?

A. I believe it has been, but I have not been in touch with that lately. I know that at the time they were presented to the United States that Howard Scott was requested to release the plans to no one other than the United States Army Airforce.

Q. And they were presented when? A. In 1941.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. I take it that your point is that this material is being presented to demonstrate that Technocracy is behind the war; that is purely why you are giving that? A. Right. In the United States at the present time Technocracy is carrying on a work that is vital to the war effort in every way; helpful to the war effort. Before the outbreak of the present world war there were in both the United States and Canada a considerable number of amateur radio operators who were also Technocrats, and who formed a Technocracy emergency network which had the following aims: This is entitled the "Technet":

"Scope and Purpose of the Network. The operators who respond, one by one, by giving their call letters and reporting their activities are part of a vast continent-wide network of amateur radio operators who realize the importance of a disciplined body of communications technicians, who can and will function in any emergency that might confront the people of the North American continent. Whether the emergency be continental in nature, such as the attempted invasion by a foreign nation or the collapse of an economic system, or whether the emergency be local such as storm, flood, or earthquake disaster these operators stand ready day and night to step in when established methods of communications are disrupted.

There are many amateur networks but the majority of them are loosely bound together by mere ties of acquaintanceship and get on the air simply to gossip about their hookups. They are willing to function in an emergency but they lack the discipline and coordination for which the Technet is striving and which it has attained to a remarkable degree".

In the United States Technocracy grey cars owned by members of the organization are at the present time equipped with public address systems and are used by local and military officials in various work, such as helping at parades and so forth. The California area has fleets of motorcycle escorts squadrons which have been used for both the military and local officials in escort work because they were enough to see the need of such communications as two-way short wave from a motorcycle. In other words, they have a motorcycle corps that can escort a parade and speak to one another back and forth along the line of the parade and that keeps things operating smoothly. Technocrats appear to be loyal enough to ferry bombers across the Atlantic to go to England and Egypt; and to act as squadron commanders as well. Technocrats were in the Wake and Midway Islands defences, and practically every other defence force in the United States.

BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN:

Q. They are in the Canadian army too, are they not?

A. That is right. Now, for these reasons and others I submit that Technocracy Incorporated has not been and is not today in any way hindering the war effort. The sole aim of Technocracy Inc. at the present time is to win this war. The social programme for Technocracy has for the duration of the war, shall we say, been put on the shelf. In March of 1942 this following release was sent to all U.S. sections of Technocracy by headquarters; as to clarifying the Technocracy programme at the present time:

4. Total Conscription is an outgrowth of Technocracy and has been in our literature for nearly two years, but it is not to be confused with the social programme of Technocracy. In making this demand for total conscription, Technocracy is not calling for the installation of Technocracy's social programme. This distinction must be clearly made. Total conscription is a victory programme for installation by the government of the United States under the war-time authority of the constitutional Commander in Chief of the nation. It does not call for the installation of Technocracy or for the placing of this organization in any position of authority. It is impossible for anyone to accuse Technocracy of having political ambitions, or attempting to foist itself upon the nation under the guise of a war-time emergency.

CC-1 follows.

It is to be noted that the 'New York Times' announcement calls for the end of Total Conscription 6 months after the termination of the war. It then becomes a matter of the circumstances at that time and Technocracy will not indulge in idle speculation of what the conditions may or may not be then. One thing is certain: If America loses the war through failure to mobilize, no one will have to worry about wages, dividends, or union dues. We will all have a burlap sarong and a bowl of rice, and our worries will be over.

Total Conscription is the Program. Technocracy is not asking for anything for itself. The march of events calls for the mobilization of America to win this total war, and Technocracy is urging this as its contribution to the nation. The time and manner of winning that war will determine the kind of peace.

To state Technocracy's position clearly the members should point out that Technocracy is proposing that the Government 'quick freeze' both corporate enterprise and union structure for the duration. Technocracy is opposed to the conscription of labor alone. Such is class legislation that would destroy the unity of the nation and effectively sabotage the war effort. Such would be a fascist move of the first order. Technocracy is also opposed to the class legislation of capital alone, which might be construed as a communist move. Total conscription, on the other hand, partakes of neither fascism nor communism and is the only method of creating a fighting national morale. Let's make it one for all and all for one!

Technocracy is opposed to any American profiting through war prices, war wages, war profits, or war racketeering through the spilling of American blood in defense of the country."

Technocracy has always pointed out that social change on this continent can come about only by peaceful, orderly means and has never advocated change of government by force of any kind. They have never advocated the overthrow of government in any way, shape or form. For these reasons I submit that Technocracy Incorporated as an organization and Technocrats as citizens have been and will remain patriotic and loyal citizens of the country in which they live, and that the action declaring Technocracy Incorporated illegal was a mistake in the first place, and that mistake should now be rectified so that Technocrats will not still carry the stigma that is now upon them. In that connection I might state that any known former Technocrat has three strikes on him before he starts, if he wants to do anything to help Canada's war effort; because as long as the government of Canada considers that Technocracy Incorporated is illegal under the Defence of Canada Regulations, he is under suspicion as far as the local authorities, etc., are concerned.

In closing I would say this: that for some reason unknown to ourselves there seems to be a concerted action across Canada on the part of officials of either the R.C.M.P. or the Justice Department to place a further stigma upon former officials of the organization. After practically two years since the organization was declared illegal, they have appeared at the homes of dozens of former officials and searched the premises--and in many cases made arrests -- at the following places that I happen to know of myself, and there are probably many more: Vancouver Island, Trail, Nelson, North Battleford, Prince Albert, Regina, London, Toronto, Brockville, Ottawa, New Glasgow, Nova Scotia.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. Did they make arrests in those places? A. No. They carried out searches and confiscated any file copies of

Technocracy magazines, etc., that were contained in any of these members' homes.

Q. Do you know whether or not they found any substantial quantity of new literature? A. As far as I know, there has not been. I cannot verify that, of course, but anything that I know of, they were single copies only.

Q. In your own instance, did they seize material of the type that you have been using to back up your evidence here? A. That is right.

Q. Maybe I asked you this question before. But did you have more than one copy in your possession of any material which was connected with Technocracy Incorporated? A. No, not more than one copy of any one piece of literature.

Q. Was a quantity of that, if I may ask, what I would call fresh or new literature? A. There were, I would say, approximately six or seven magazines.

Q. New ones? A. That is right.

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. By new you mean issued since Technocracy was outlawed? A. In Canada.

Q. Issued since then? A. Yes. Issued in the United States, that had been brought over by friends in the United States.

Q. It was all issued in the United States? A. Anything since the ban has been issued in the United States; definitely.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. Then apparently the searches were made because they believed -- I am just putting this as a question, and you can answer it as you please -- that apparently there was fresh activity amongst these people who formerly were members of this banned organization? A. Well, I do not know why they were carried out. I know that there has not been any fresh activity in Canada. About the only thing that has ever been

done is that former members of the organization might write to each other occasionally. But that is all.

Q. But they have been continuing to get this literature. Persons like yourself have been continuing to get Technocracy literature into the country by some means or other. A. We have not been getting it in, no.

BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN:

Q. It was brought in to you. The fact remains you had possession of it.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. You say it was brought to you by your friends?

A. Yes.

Q. So that you have got it into the country? A. In single copies only.

Q. Yes. But it would come to you as a former member. It might come to another person in the same town as a former member also? A. That is possible.

Q. Yes. A. None of this has been requested. We have no authority over what anyone in the United States might do. Some of it has been mailed out from the United States, a single copy.

Q. In view of the fact that it is an illegal organization, I should think you would agree that the police were justified in their actions because apparently you are continuing your activities. I am not saying that the ban is justified.

A. No.

Q. But you are certainly continuing your activities in connection with an organization that has been banned. A. No. We are not continuing our activities.

Q. By reading and studying this literature. A. I do not think that reading a single copy of a magazine would be classed as carrying on activities.

Q. So far as you could take that magazine and discuss it with your friends, it would be. If you were passing it on to your friends, it would be. A. If that were to be the case, then if Technocracy were declared illegal in Canada under that theory, every book on Technocracy in the public libraries of Canada should have been confiscated.

Q. Yes, possibly; if they are being circulated among the people to propagate the theories and principles of Technocracy, I am inclined to agree with you. A. The same thing is true of literature in the libraries on communism and fascism and so on.

Q. If it is used for that purpose, yes. A. In other words, all that any member had in their possession were single copies of various items of literature.

BY MR. ANDERSON:

Q. Might I just ask a question there? You said you had knowledge of these cases. Have you knowledge of the Prince Albert case you mentioned there? A. Demorest?

Q. I forget the name. I think that is the name.

(DD follows)

WITNESS: In Prince Albert, Demorest was arrested and tried and the Appeal Court turned down the decision.

MR. ANDERSON: There is a recent case that has not been tried yet in Prince Albert.

WITNESS: No, I did not know there was any arrest there.

MR. ANDERSON: I am not sure whether there was an arrest. There was a search made, and what I want to tell the committee is that it came to my attention by way of some complaint coming in from Prince Albert, and the information I received, if I remember correctly, was that there had been a large quantity of technocracy literature found in this house.

WITNESS: Well, the same thing was true when they searched my house; they found a large quantity, but there was no more than one copy of any one. I had all my files and magazines from the time before the ban.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. You had a library of it? A. Yes.

MR. ANDERSON: I understand there was more than one copy. However, I may be wrong. I do not want to commit myself on that.

WITNESS: In Ottawa itself a civil servant was brought up for possessing single copies of technocracy literature. At first it was stated that his evidence -- that he had literature which was detrimental to the efficient prosecution of the war. After reading the literature that charge was changed to one of advocating the principles of an illegal organization; also of being a member of an illegal organization. Now, both those charges were dropped in Ottawa. The other case I happen to know of personally is the one in Toronto. The same two charges were laid - the charge of advocating the principles was dismissed, the charge of being a member was upheld and a fine of \$200 was imposed. That case is now up pending appeal, and the peculiar part of it is from our angle that as far as advocating the principles

is concerned, the sole principle that is being advocated anywhere at the present time by technocracy is total conscription and the more efficient prosecution of the war.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. You were not prosecuted in Toronto for that - for advocating total conscription, were you? A. For advocating the principles of an illegal organization, and the only principles he was advocating was total conscription.

MR. ANDERSON: May I take credit for the Department of Justice: the Deputy Minister instructed that the charges be withdrawn.

BY MR. BENICE:

Q. I am not particularly worried about that angle because I have perfect confidence in the courts and the system of jurisprudence in this country, and I believe that certainly if the evidence is not there judges will not convict. At least, there have been very few cases of miscarriage of justice? A. I mentioned that in passing as an item of interest; apparently the Department of Justice is taking action against technocrats at the present time.

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. Did the conviction in the Demorest case stand?
A. No, it did not stand.

BY MR. BENICE:

Q. Would you tell me this: when technocracy was legal in this country there were visits from Howard Scott in various centres throughout the country - I do not know whether there were any down east or not? A. No.

Q. You were not present at any meeting that Howard Scott addressed? A. I was.

Q. At that meeting was it the practice of technocrats to salute Howard Scott and Howard Scott to salute them?
A. Not to salute Howard Scott and Howard Scott to salute them.

Q. Was there some kind of salute? A. Yes, technocracy had a salute. It was the closest to the standard salute of all armed forces in North America and in most of the English speaking parts of the world. In other words, the salute was merely a semi-military salute.

Q. What was the purpose of that in an organization that was purely scientific? A. The purpose of it - unfortunately I have not the regulations that dealt with that or I could submit them to you - but the purpose of it was to maintain an esprit de corps; in other words we technocrats knew each other as technocrats and would recognize each other as such with that form of greeting. Instead of shaking hands we just went like this (indicating salute).

MR. ANDERSON: And you wore special uniforms?

WITNESS: I am wearing one now. The reason I wore it was that if you brought that up you would know what it is. It is merely a grey serge suit, that is all; and the purpose of that was once again so that one technocrat would know another technocrat.

THE CHAIRMAN: I have a suit like that too; they are not restricted to technocrats.

MR. MacINNIS: That is the trouble when a person has more than one.

WITNESS: The other purpose of the grey suit was this: to create a respect for technocrats. In other words, any person who was wearing a grey suit was not supposed to indulge in anything that was not of a respectable nature. In other words he was not supposed to go out and get drunk and so on while he was wearing the grey suit. One statement, more or less of a slogan, that has been used about the suit in the organization was that you cannot tell a christian from a democrat but you can always tell a technocrat.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. Well, this was a militant form of organization, I

suggest? A. It depends on what you mean by the word "militant".

Q. A certain amount of regimentation about it.

A. Well, once again it depends upon what is regimentation. Practically any organization has some form or symbol and so on. You have your Elks and Moose that wear their paraphernalia.

Q. I say that this regimentation was based on military lines; there was a salute and there were uniforms and all that kind of thing? A. This will, perhaps, bring it a little clearer than anything else. The organization, besides being known as Technocracy Incorporated is also known as the Technocological Army of the New America; in other words, a technocological army, an army of producers by machines.

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. Have you any other methods of identifying one another than by the salute and the suit of clothes? A. I mentioned - I brought this along with me to show you in case you wanted it. I am not wearing it, but this was the monad - the symbol of technocracy, worn in the left-hand lapel. The monad is the old Chinese symbol of balance.

EE-follows

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. Sample of what? A. Balance. As regards Technocracy it was used to show a sample of balance between production and distribution.

BY MR. O'NEILL:

Q. The colour was red and white? A. Red and silver actually. It was supposed to be red and grey but to be worn on a grey suit it was red and silver.

Q. It was in a circle on the sign.

BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN:

Q. Now, does that complete your presentation? A. Unless there are any further questions.

Q. If you will sit down probably the committee would like to ask you some questions. You might as well make yourself comfortable. I think you had some questions to ask, Mr. MacInnis.

MR. MacINNIS: I was going to ask a couple of questions largely for my own information but it would be for the committee's information as well. The questions have nothing to do with the organization being subversive or anything of that kind.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. How do you expect to make the change from the present representative system to the system of technological administration that you had in mind? A. Well, Technocracy suggested three or four methods but never stated that any one was more likely than the other for this reason, that it would depend almost entirely upon the situation at the time, whether it came about through a period of chaos as we envision or whether it came about by the popular demand of the people and so on. I will give you about three of the methods suggested in a minute, but I would liken it to the same question asked the fire chief of Ottawa, how are you

going to put out the next fire. He won't be able to tell you because he won't know whether it will be a building fire on which you would use water or an automobile or gas fire on which he would use chemicals or an incendiary bomb on which you would use sand, and so on. It would depend on the circumstances what suggested method is being used. But the most probable one is that it would be done by the existing authorities. I will give you an illustration of just what I mean by that. In several cities in North America when conditions in that city, financial and so on, social and so on, come to such a condition that the city council felt that they could no longer cope with it, they either voluntarily or through putting the question to the people by a plebiscite, decide to have a city manager form of government and give up their old form of council government. In other words, they adopt a partial form of functional management. That is one possible method, that your present government officials would in either a time of national emergency or through a recognition of events make the change themselves.

The second most probable way is as Technocracy has always stated that Technocracy might if circumstances were such take political action once in order to have the change of method of government from political to functional.

The third method that was stated as most probable was that of a national plebiscite, a national plebiscite held because of either the first point that I raised that the government realized the necessity for change or because of popular expression of will throughout the country; in other words, the majority of the people seem to desire it and the plebiscite would be held.

Q. You mentioned two or three methods and one of them was the city manager method, but I think that is not a good illustration because you do not change your system of

government; you change the method slightly. Almost every city operates on a city manager system through the heads of departments. I was for several years in the city council of Vancouver and we really in effect had a city manager there although we never appointed a city manager. We had the chief engineer, the controller and the corporation counsel. These three were essential. In almost any part of the city administration you can put all those functions under one head but you still have your city council which formulates policy and the city manager operates within the ambit of the policy formulated by the council. That is the way I think it operates. Then you said that there might be a breakdown of the present system; but that presupposes a revolution in the sense that you used it this morning, not a violent change of form of government. Then you said you might take political action once.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Might you not change your mind?

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. After that then do I assume that once you get political control you would do away with the forms and institute ^{technocrat} control; and in what way would technocrat control -- mind you I am merely trying to get information -- differ from any other dictatorial control if you are only going to make reference to the people once? How are you going to continue your control as a democracy? Whether you like it or not it must be one of two things. You must continue either by the will of the people or by the will of a group or individual. A. First of all I would have to give a definition of dictatorship. To a technate a dictatorship is the imposition of the will of one person or a small group of persons upon the entire social system. Under a technate, under a technological form of government you would have the following method of obtaining your government and it would

have to function in a certain way. The members of the government would be chosen as follows: each function, each sequence, for instance, the steel industry we will say, the production of steel would be one sequence. By that production of steel you would have right from the bottom to the top functional control in that each individual would of necessity start at the bottom and work to the top through the method, shall I say, the merit method of proving his worth in the following way. As he started at the bottom you would have the foreman over him. When that foreman was promoted to a higher position that foreman knowing his men would choose the person who was most capable among that group of men to become foreman and the same form all the way through so that when a person was chosen as the most efficient person in a particular industry or sequence then he must have worked through every step from the bottom to the top. He could not skip and start in as the office boy and suddenly through some type of pull jump five or six positions.

Now the operation of technate presupposes a form of Technocracy, presupposes that on this continent or anywhere else in the world where this condition came about that we produce through the use of more and more power more goods than we can sell.

(FF follows)

In other words, we produce an abundance. Now, as soon as you produce an abundance so that you can supply everyone with not only what they require but with what they want then there is no advantage, shall I say, material advantage, to a type of dictatorship; and also the more complicated and the more complex your system of production and distribution becomes the more integrated it becomes. Through large scale mass production the less personal will and person desire can be forced on anyone else. For instance, you have the operation of a power plant. The general manager of that power plant cannot become a dictator in the sense that he can enforce his will upon anyone who is using that power because the production of power by the power plant requires certain operations and certain methods and he cannot suddenly that instead of operating the plant one way he will operate it another way altogether different; just because he wants it that way it must be technically possible to do. Now, that is perhaps a technical explanation; that in mass production and mass distribution methods you can never have dictatorship; and not only that, there is no sense of having a dictatorship of any kind when you are producing and distributing in abundance.

BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN:

Q. But who is going to be at the head of this set-up; who is going to set up this huge body of personnel that is going to supervize all this; and how are you going to get them into those positions where they can do these things?

A. I started out first through just the first of the three sequences to show you how you would get the person most able in the sequence, one who had worked his way right through the organization and finally reached the top. You would have the same thing in other sequences; for instance, you would have it in health, you would have it in medicine, you would have it in the production sequences and the various transportation, communication and other sequences; you would have exactly the

the same thing. The only place where any choice could be made would be the Director-in-Chief, or whatever the head of the government might be called; and that would be probably by just from among the most capable men in each of the several sequences; you would have perhaps eighty sequences altogether each with a person who had made himself the most capable in his own sequence. These eighty sequences would choose from among themselves a person who was to be the head of the government. Now, that, of course, pre-supposes that the system would already be in operation. That would be the ultimate method.

BY MR. BLACK:

Q. And all the quipment would be publicly owned?

A. It would not be owned.

Q. Did you say it would not be owned? A. No; in other words, all concept of ownership except just the possessions that you need to live with -- such as clothing and so on -- have no meaning whatever when you have no form of monetary exchange.

THE CHAIRMAN: Well, gentlemen, we unfortunately are short of a quorum now and we cannot legally carry on; I do not suppose there is any purpose in just a social visit.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. I was wondering if I could ask one question; I do not care whether it goes onto the record or not: for instance, you could not go over from the present system, particularly if a change was made because of a breakdown, you could not go over from the present system of -- you may call it scarcity, if you like, or anything you like; or inadequate production -- to a system where there would be full production all in one operation? A. That is right.

Q. And consequently that ideal of abundance would not operate. I agree with you that there would be much less need

of government when everyone is economically provided for, but during the period of transition how would your government be carried on? A. That is just the point I was trying

to bring up, that what I had mentioned would naturally be after the system had been operating for some time. As far as the transition period which before the war expansion began we figures might take anywhere from 12 to 15 years to produce full abundance; during that transitional period you would have a functional government just as I mentioned before, or drawn up on a little different lines and chosen by slightly different schemes; and that is, for instance, say the copper industry -- the person they consider the most capable in the upper bracket would be selected, and the same thing for other sequences all through -- as I said before, we do not care who does it, and the most capable person in the copper industry possibly would not be a Technocrat.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. Don't you think that things being done right now under the stress of war are largely along the lines that you have been suggesting? A. That is what I have been pointing out.

Q. And what you would like to see is this system that is developing now due to war necessity carry on to peace?

A. Right.

GG-1 follows.

A lot of these other things that I have tried to explain and so on are more or less by the board. I do not expect you to approve of everything about Technocracy. I do not expect you to agree with everything I have said. I do not like everything about Technocracy. There are lots of things about it I do not like. But that is not the point.

MR. MacINNIS: I assure you that I had no thought like that in mind.

MR. O'NEILL: I created a wrong impression. I am like my friend Angus MacInnis. If there is anything in your idea, I want to get it; that is all.

THE ACTING CHAIRMAN: Well, we are legally all washed up. I want to thank Mr. Norris for his presentation.

---The committee adjourned at 5.25 p.m. to meet again on Tuesday, June 30, at 11 a.m.

- - - - -

BIBLIOTHEQUE DU PARLEMENT
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT



3 2354 00485 554 3