

J
103
H7
1941-1942
D4
A1
no. 9

CONFIDENTIAL

SESSION 1942
HOUSE OF COMMONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE
ON
DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

NO. 9

THURSDAY, JULY 2, 1942

WITNESSES:

Mr. Jean Pe nverne, barrister,
Representative of the Ecole
Sociale Populaire;
Rev. Father Louis Chagnon, S.J.,
Representative of the Ecole
Sociale Populaire; and
Mr. Alfred Charpentier, President,
Confederation of Catholic Workers
of Canada.

J
103
H7
1941-1942
D4
A1
no.9

HON. J. E. MICHAUD,
CHAIRMAN.

J
103
H7
1941-1942
J4
A1
no. 9

CONFIDENTIAL

SESSION 1942
HOUSE OF COMMONS

SPECIAL COMMITTEE
ON
DEFENCE OF CANADA REGULATIONS

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

NO. 9


THURSDAY, JULY 2, 1942

WITNESSES:

Mr. Jean Pe nverne, barrister,
Representative of the Ecole
Sociale Populaire;
Rev. Father Louis Chagnon, S.J.,
Representative of the Ecole
Sociale Populaire; and
Mr. Alfred Charpentier, President,
Confederation of Catholic Workers
of Canada.

HON. J. E. MICHAUD,
CHAIRMAN.



 Public Archives Canada Archives publiques Canada

861138

1991 - 5 - 7

MINUTES OF EVIDENCE

House of Commons,
Room 368,
July 2, 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: We have a quorum, and we shall now proceed.

Minutes of previous meeting read and adopted.

Correspondence read and dealt with.

MR. MARTIN: I wonder if letters like that should be read to this committee? All of us could produce letters along that same line dealing with individuals. This is a matter surely for the tribunals that deal with these cases.

THE CHAIRMAN: This letter was addressed to the committee. Both the letters read were addressed to this committee and were signed by people holding official positions. I thought it was advisable to have them read anyway.

We have here this morning a delegation representing
Ecole Sociale Populaire, -
which wants to make representation on, I presume, communism and other associations banned by section 39C of the Defence of Canada Regulations. Would you come forward, gentlemen, and take your seats? The delegation is composed of Father Louis Chagnon, Mr. John Penverne and Mr. Alfred Charpentier, the head of the Catholic Union of Workers in the province of Quebec.

MR. JOHN PENZERNE, called:

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, madam and gentlemen, in order not to duplicate what we have come here to tell you, if you will have the kindness to listen to us, I will take one aspect of

the question, Rev. Father Chagnon will take another aspect, and Mr. Charpentier, who is the president of the Catholic Federation of Labour, representing approximately, I think, 50,000 people, will take another aspect of the question. We believed it might be better to just give an outline of our thoughts that have been put down in writing and then proceed if such be your pleasure, Mr. Chairman, with speaking from documents coming from the communist party.

We are taking the position that the communist party, as we have it here in Canada, should be in the future what it is now in virtue of the ban placed upon it, an illegal organization, whose activity is forbidden and in which membership is declared by law to be against the interests of the country and an indictable offence.

We take it as self-evident that a party or an organization has no entity apart from its membership; therefore, if the government has chosen, after due consideration, to ban a party or an organization, it is because the aims, the speech, the activities of the membership of the party or organization have been judged detrimental to the interests of the country. It is futile to try to separate the members from the party as though they could be Simon-pure while the party, an imaginary entity, might presumably be something else again.

Historically we have the facts: The executive committee of the party, after investigation by the R.C.M.P. were tried and several members were condemned to the penitentiary, among others the present leader, Tim Buck. To declare that the trial and the condemnation were unjust is to indict and condemn the bench of the country. Therefore, at that time, the activities of the members were such as to be justification for years in the penitentiary.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. What year is that you mention? A. I believe that

was 1931.

For years since its foundation the party has conducted revolutionary, subversive activities in this and many other countries, following, and boasting that they followed, the lead given by Moscow to bring about the overthrow of the present system. Their own literature and the daily press are there to prove these statements, and in a moment I shall speak, Mr. Chairman, from their book, "What the Communist Party Stands For, the Communist Party in Canada."

As is to be expected from experts in anti-government activity they are naturally going to take all the necessary precautions to avoid prosecution and condemnation; they are going to engage the best legal talent they can afford; they are going to utilize every institution set up by democracy for the safeguarding of individual liberty. Their public pronouncements are going to be models of democratic rectitude and earnestness. It is their business to appear perfectly respectable; it is what you would expect from the sort of an organization.

They are going to accommodate their activity to the time and circumstances. Before August 1935 the party favoured and fostered party-led unions here in Canada and they sprang up all over the country. After the congress in Moscow, on recommendation by Dimitroff, the boring-from-within policy was adopted, and overnight the party unions were scrapped. More recently we have the attitude of the party towards the war. No matter what glib explanation they may cook up now, the fact remains that as long as Russia was not involved they were violently against the war and did everything possible to impede the war effort of this and all allied countries, and we will attempt to show, gentlemen, from documents, original documents coming from the party that have come out since the war and up, I believe, to the latter

part of 1941. Similarly, as far as affiliation with the Third International is concerned; for years the literature of the party carried the notation: Communist Party of Canada, Section of the Third International. When it was found that such affiliation was not finding favour in Canada and the U.S., the public expression of it was dropped from the published matter. Now that opposition to the war is liable to turn against the party, it is to be expected that anything they publish for public consumption is going to be filled with exemplary fervour for the war effort. Such time-serving is perfectly in keeping with the tactics hitherto current in the party, and fools no one at all conversant with the past of the organization. Ample proof for the above statements is contained in the daily press of any nation infected with the presence of members of the party. Great hilarity was produced by the frantic efforts of the party leaders in the U.S. and Canada to keep up with the violent changes in the party line, as anyone who has read the papers of the last few years may well remember.

The party and its activities, that is the activities of the members of the party, were judged by the competent authorities of the country to be of a treasonable nature, as opposed to the interests of the country as those of the fascists and nazis, and together with fascist and nazi organizations and individuals declared illegal in Canada, with subsequent internment of those individuals known to be members of the banned organizations. Therefore the supposition is that the Department of Justice acted with knowledge and due respect to law and British traditions of fair play in passing sentence and imposing sanction. There have appeared groups who challenged the legality of the government's action; it would repay the effort to investigate the make-up of these groups, their membership is highly interesting from the point

of view of their long affiliation with communist inspired activities; their interest in what happens to those they have conveniently labeled fascist or nazi. Despite the agitation stirred up by these groups, the fact remains that unless we wish to condemn the Department of Justice and its officers, we must accept their action in banning the communist party as dictated by a study of the facts and a sense of duty to the country.

So the situation was created that the party became illegal, many of its members were interned, and its activity had to be carried on without the law, it was driven underground, and immediately official documents, constitutions, declarations, letters to members of the house began to appear, apologia for the party, filled with the most orthodox statements of grim determination to eliminate (liquidate would have been more genuinely communistic language) all the foes of democracy. And there took place also a movement throughout the length and breadth of the land which resulted in telegrams, letters, delegations to the house and to this committee; and the remarkable thing about which is that those identified with the movement are exactly those who have for years been identified with every effort of the party. For those who have studied communist party activity in this and other countries, this was exactly what was to be expected. That is the way the party works, and the organization has been perfected for many years for just that type of emergency and that type of activity. Quite naturally the advocates of lifting the ban are going to make a great play of stressing the thoroughly respectable recent pronouncements of the leaders and it is impossible to point to party activity that contradicts the public pronouncements. Most of the members are in internment camps and those at liberty are working under cover, there is no publicity attached to what they are

doing or saying at the present time, and the country is asked to believe that the party, which was founded for revolutionary overthrow of every form of government, which was violently opposed to all Canada went to war for, and which up to a few months ago was carrying on activities which brought about the ban on the party, has suddenly had a complete change of heart, has now become the mainstay of democracy and a model of patriotic fervour.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. You do not believe in such a drastic conversion?

A. I do not, sir.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. You do not believe that coming into the war with the Soviet Union as an ally of the United Nations and the necessary directing of the fight with Germany might not have some influence on those persons who were members of the communist party? A. Well, they have got, I suppose, at least to appear to be logical, sir, about the matter. It is to be noted, and I shall quote from documents in a moment, that their attitude has completely changed from the moment that Soviet Russia entered the war.

Q. Quite right. A. In order to be logical they had to follow suit.

Q. Naturally. A. I think Father Chagnon will speak on that aspect of the situation.

Q. Does it not indicate to you that ^{they} / might have been dangerous before because Soviet Russia was an ally of Hitler, and now that Soviet Russia is an enemy of Hitler they may not now be dangerous? A. Well, as a matter of fact it is not, I believe, to be forgotten that the communist party of Canada have advocated the overthrow by force and violence of the state as they call it.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. Do you know -- A. And if they have changed that attitude or that stand I would say that is their meat, it has been their meat in Canada --

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. Let us presume that they have, that there has been evidence for and against that kind of thing in this committee; but they advocated the same thing in peace time, and following your argument there is no reason why they should be legal in peace time if they advocated that, any more than they should be legal in war time. A. Right.

MR. BLACK: We had them prosecuted in 1937, was it not?

MR. BENCE: In 1931, under section 98 of the Criminal Code, but that section was eliminated.

MR. BLACK: That was in peace time.

MR. MAYBANK: I think the point there, Mr. Black, is that they were prosecuted under section 98 but section 98 was wiped out.

MR. BLACK: I know; it should never have been.

MR. MacINNIS: I think Mr. Bence has put his finger on the question that we have to deal with. This organization was legal in Canada prior to the war. It was declared illegal not because of anything in its programme or in its philosophy in regard to the overthrow of existing societies. It was declared illegal --

MR. BERTRAND: I would not be ready to admit that.

MR. MacINNIS: I am quoting nothing but the facts. It was declared illegal because of its danger to the state during a time of war because of subversive activities. Now, if that is removed I do not believe that this committee can take upon itself to recommend its continuance because -- the continuance of the ban -- because of its philosophy or its programme, because we have nothing to do with these things.

We are dealing with the Defence of Canada Regulations and we must consider any organization that is banned, how does it come under the ban under those regulations.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. Do you know if since the entry of Russia into the war they have changed their idea about overthrowing the government by force?

THE CHAIRMAN: Their whole basic principle of --

MR. BERTRAND: If they have still the same philosophy.

WITNESS: As I attempted to show, Mr. Bertrand, in these few things that I have just completed reading and which I will attempt to show also from their documents, the communist party is a party which since its existence has favoured the complete overthrowing by force of what they call the capitalistic state or bourgeois government. Our point of view --

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. Just a minute. I want to make myself clear. The only point I want to obtain from the witness is his judgment as to whether or not the communist party should be illegal in peace time and war time or both. I base that on the philosophy which he has described. A. I would say definitely yes.

MR. BENCE: That is all I want to know.

WITNESS: Now, regarding the other question I would say this: having studied the activities of the communist party in Canada for at least twelve years and even ever since the other war when I came back from Germany, having been a prisoner of war for 34 months where I saw what the communists were doing in Germany -- I saw their activities in Paris in the 1919 during six months I was there from January to August, 1919. I actually saw the 1st of May, 1919, when there was a very grave danger of revolution in Paris and when that was fomented by the communist party. I listened to what they were

talking about in Germany from the 4th of November, which was a few days before the armistice, November 1918. I saw the red flag being hoisted at the camp where I was at that time. The language I heard there is the same language that I have heard from the communists throughout Canada, and I say, at least for us who believe in our institutions as we have them, at least for us, this is a dangerous party in time of peace and it is a dangerous party in time of war. And these people, notwithstanding the fact that since the entry of Russia into the war, are attempting to show what we French, Mr. Chairman, call the patte blanche. They are still carrying on, I am convinced, their underground work and still endeavouring to sabotage, still endeavouring to enter into the army and have their people there ready for the proper time during this war or after the war is over to bring about a violent overthrow of the state as we have it in Canada.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. Can you produce evidence to support that statement? I think that is important. If you can produce evidence to support that statement that is something that we would like to have. A. I have, I think, made it clear that since the entry of Russia into the war we have not been able to lay our hands on any documents because they are very careful.

BY MR. BENICE:

Q. Just on that point, do you believe that the communist party will do anything which will sabotage Canada's war effort?

MR. MAYBANK: That is the whole point.

WITNESS: If, as a matter of fact, these people ever thought at any given moment it would serve the aims of the communist party to sabotage the war effort they would not hesitate to do it. That is my opinion of the communists.

BY MR. MAYBANK:

Q. Would you say then in your belief that they would sabotage the war effort when we and Soviet Russia and the other United Nations are still fighting Hitler? A. Well, as long as Russia remains in the war I believe that the communists of Canada have still to be logical with themselves.

Q. Therefore as long as Russia is in the war there is no necessity to have them illegal, then? A. Right. No, no; as long as Russia is in the war they will carry on their underground work to appear to be working as good Canadians in this war. But I still believe that notwithstanding the letter that was written, I believe, by Tim Buck, which I have got here, in 1941, after Russia went into the war, a letter which is absolutely in contradiction of everything that Tim Buck and his friends have said, notwithstanding that letter they are still thinking in terms of the communist party of Canada.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. Have you got any literature whatsoever to prove this? We would like to have it if you have anything of that kind. A. I have literature to show that up to 1941 they were very very strong against the war effort of Canada.

MR. BENCE: There is no question about that.

WITNESS: That they recommended sabotage; that they recommended that the party do everything in its power to undermine the army and to have their own men in there so that they could be ready for the moment when this international war might become a civil war. I am convinced of it. The communists are people who deal with us, gentlemen, as being gentlemen, as being gentlemen who will not answer them in kind. They know, or at least they think that the common bourgeoisie, as we are, will not answer them back in the same language, will not use the same methods as they do, and therefore it is blackmail on their part. At the present

moment they are showing some friendliness because Soviet Russia is in the war, that is all. If Soviet Russia were to drop out of this war for one reason or another the communist party will again change its attitude, it is easy for them.

MR. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman, the witness referred to sabotage and that the communist party was carrying on their sabotage at the present time. In this committee sabotage used in that way must be sabotage of Canada's war effort. When the witness brings up that point and makes the assertion that sabotage is carried on he must submit proof that sabotage has been carried on since June 22, 1941, because that is the very crux of the situation. We cannot consider what sabotage may be in their minds at some future time under some future circumstances. We must consider sabotage in connection with the present war.

WITNESS: In connection with the present war there has been that for they brag about it, ever since or up to the time Russia entered the war. Now they appear to be quiet; they appear to be good Canadians; they appear to be good patriots. They will tell you in their own words, and they will write it down, that they are as good patriots as you and I; they will tell you all that; but as I said, if Soviet Russia drops out of the war the communist party is going to go back to its old tricks. They do not believe in our form of government; they do not believe in our institutions. They will be ready at any time to overthrow this state if they can do it; and that is why I say that at the present time they are showing this patte blanche, this white hand I was speaking about, there is danger they might revert back in a moment to their former belief. There is a French proverb which says: A blancher la tête d'un nègre, on perd sa lessive. If you try to wash a negro's head you are losing your soap. That is the situation with regard to the communists.

Statements have been made, I believe, in the press, by people who are some of the highest people in the Canadian army that there was clear evidence to show that the communist party was boring in into the army. What is going to happen? In 1919 when I came back from Germany and was in Paris, as I said a moment ago, the communists thought they could bring about revolution because they had a considerable hold on the army. And I heard a lot of communistic talk amongst the French soldiers; and finally when they realized that they could not depend on the troops that were in Paris they had to give up the ghost.

MR. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman, suppose everything the witness has said is true, as far as we are concerned he is dealing with assumptions. This committee cannot recognize assumptions.

MR. BERTRAND: No; if you admit everything he says is true --

MR. MacINNIS: I am not admitting it; but suppose it is, it still remains, as far as this committee is concerned, for the witness to give evidence.

MR. BLACK: He is giving us his own personal experiences.

MR. BENICE: The witness is perfectly consistent. He believes the communist party is detrimental to this country at any time and he is basing his argument on their philosophy and he says we should not allow them to propagandize in this country at any time, whether in war or in peace. The problem that we have to deal with in sitting on this committee is whether, if the communist party is legal, it is of great danger to this country at the present time and likely to affect our war effort. If it is dangerous to the country at this time then it would be dangerous to this country in peace time.

MR. BERTRAND: Our problem is whether it is more dangerous

to legalize it than to leave it as it is.

MR. BENCE: Purely from the viewpoint of Canada's war effort. I am against the communist party 100 per cent, naturally, but the point is this, that we cannot deal with it on any other basis than whether or not they are going to be subversive of Canada's war effort. That is what the Defence of Canada Regulations are made for.

MR. ROSS: The witness thinks they would be.

WITNESS: Here is my answer. Suppose that an individual had a criminal intent against another individual -- and I think we can say beyond doubt that the communist party has had a criminal intent against the state up to a certain time. Their admission is there in black and white. If an individual had a criminal intent against a certain individual and he comes to you and he says, "Well, my mother and my sister have come to me and they have prevailed upon me that I should not endeavour to kill that man any more." What else have you got but his own word? Should you judge him in the light of his past wrongdoing and his past life? His past life has been his intent and desire to kill that individual. That is the thing that he has preached ever since he was able to preach anything, the thing which he has kept constantly at in a constant way.

BY MR. MAYBANK:

Q. I think there is one point we might keep in mind in regard to this submission and that is whether the communist party may be a lot of bad eggs or not. We have already decided that they are quite legal as far as the criminal law is concerned and quite a proper organization up until the time of the passing of the Defence of Canada regulations. There used to be a law that rather impinged upon that, it was called section 98. Now we wiped that out. That does not say quite that we gave them a clean bill of health, but it does

say that we declared that there was nothing in the criminal law especially to impinge upon that. That being the case we surely are in this position: there is nothing at all to be considered by this committee except the danger, and I would say the present danger, not future danger, of the communist party with reference to the war effort and that only. If we go any further than that we are going into a field that has already been pretty well gone over.

MR. BERTRAND: We have to admit that they are working on common ground. There is a document that was sent to a few persons in Montreal dated September 11, 1941. I have a copy of the document. This document shows that what the witness is saying now is true. I am informed that the Mounted Police have not been able to identify the document as an absolute authentic document, but I think with this explanation the document should be read to the committee.

MR. MAYBANK: I do not wish to stop the presentation at all.

WITNESS: May I give an explanation of the viewpoint?

MR. MAYBANK: It certainly is clear that parliament has already settled that in peace time these people are all right or at any rate no special law is necessary, so unless we keep our heads solely to the question of injury to the war effort it seems to me we will be going far beyond our terms of reference.

WITNESS: Would you just let me say a word here, gentlemen? You have amongst your members a man who was a Crown prosecutor for many many years and who has had experience in criminal law and its enforcement before the courts. I refer to Mr. Bertrand. He will tell you, I am sure, notwithstanding the fact that section 98 was done away with, an offence, if it is equivalent to sedition, still comes under the Criminal Code.

MR. MAYBANK: Oh, sure.

WITNESS: And your sections 39A and 39B, with the exception of a very few words, are the equivalent, are they not, to sedition in the Criminal Code?

MR. BERTRAND: About the same.

WITNESS: Now, this gentleman, who has experience with crime in a big city such as Montreal, knows also that our Criminal Code falls far short of the necessary requirements to protect the state against what has been called "organized crime." The code is all right to deal with the average individual criminal; the code is all right to deal with what I would call the incidental criminal, but the code surely is not sufficient to deal with organized criminal rackets, and the communist party is better organized than any criminal racket has been organized on this whole continent. The communist, as I attempted to show a moment ago, knows that we deal with things in a certain manner; we are gentlemen, and we boast of that quality, if it is a quality, that we have; therefore I say you cannot deal with the communist party in the same way as you can deal with some other political movements of another kind. They are particularly strong in their way of organizing underground, because it has been their traditions ever since there has been communism. They have studied that; they have had generations of men who have made it a constant life study, and that is why I say that the individual communist is an individual who represents the gravest danger for Canada and its institutions.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. Do you believe then that there should be a restoration of something like section 98 of the Criminal Code? A. I believe it would help very very much, and I think I can say this, speaking for our group, that we would favour that immensely, and I think that we can go a step further and say that the province of Quebec as a whole would favour that. I

say that without any hesitation of any kind.

Q. I presume you would favour what they call padlock legislation? A. Quite, and I have no doubt also --

MR. BERTRAND: We would not go that far in Quebec.

WITNESS: As far as I am concerned I am ready to make the statement.

MR. BERTRAND: The padlock law was such a law that a padlock could be put upon a house and there was no writ or anybody arrested.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is a horse of another colour.

WITNESS: May I say this also, sir, that you surely would have much better information on that than we have. You can get very much better information than we have, I should think, from the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. Does the witness know of any other democratic country at this time in which the communist party is declared an illegal organization? A. Well, offhand I would not be able to tell you, but I think that the "Worker" is still under an indictment in England.

Q. That is true. A. It is the greatest source of propaganda.

MR. BENCE: That is a paper.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. That is a paper. It was banned, as Sir Norman Birkett said when he was before us, because of propaganda; it created a defeatist attitude during the war. He also pointed out that no communists in Great Britain were arrested since the war began and the organization has always functioned. The same is true in the United States and the same is true in most of the countries that we know.

A. Father Chagnon will possibly be better able to answer your question than I am. In any event, there is this, have we got

to take the same attitude as other countries? If we feel in Canada it is dangerous for us does it matter to us in Canada what England or what the United States is doing or not doing?

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. Well, only in this connection, that you mentioned a moment ago the fact that the communist party was expert in underground activity. They became experts in underground activity in my opinion because every democratic movement in Russia was suppressed and it has always been suppressed, and there was no other way in which the people who disagreed with the government could give expression to their point of view, and consequently there grew out of the conditions which they were compelled to adopt that attitude. I think we should hesitate for fear by suppression we might just create the thing that we are afraid of. A. Well, what difference is there between the individual who says, "I am going to go out and kill somebody," and the individual who thinks that he is going to go out and kill somebody? I think they are both dangerous and I believe that a revolver should be kept away from both of them.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. The point is this, and as I understand Mr. MacInnis I would put it this way, that the communist party was legal before the war and presumably it will be legal after the war.

MR. MacINNIS: Unless there is legislation passed declaring them illegal.

MR. BENCE: The only reason they are illegal now is because it is feared they will interfere with Canada's war effort. Inevitably if we continue the ban on the communist party and they are able to build up in the minds of the people of this country generally the belief that they should not be illegal and they are able to present to the people of the country generally cases which appear to be absolutely

unanswerable they are going to bring to their banner, as a result of what they claim is prosecution -- I am not saying it is -- many many people who would not have thought of joining the communist party otherwise, and that is the thing I am most concerned about. A. That is a question of psychology with reference to revolutionary movements. Whom have they attacked more bitterly in Canada? They have attacked bitterly in Canada not the Liberals nor the Conservatives, but they have attacked most bitterly the C.C.F., and not because they do not agree with them, no, but because they want revolution.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. MacInnis in particular.

WITNESS: I do not know whether they have attacked Mr. MacInnis in particular; I know they have attacked Mr. Woodsworth considerably and Mr. Coldwell recently very very much. They have laid their attack precisely at the door of the C.C.F. or the socialists because socialism, as far as they can see it themselves, does not advocate the overthrow of the state by force or violence. The communists want to keep their own electoral clientele and be able to secure a further clientele; so the socialists are being severely dealt with; it is not socialists who are going to handle the peoples' problems, say the communists, because look at how they are cooperating with the bourgeoisie. They tell the socialists, "We are going to overthrow the state by violence and we want you to help us in doing this job." If I were a socialist I do not know whether I would not resent that language very much.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. Possibly if you were a socialist you might feel like dealing with them with the iron hand or with the strong whip, but it may be the very best thing that would increase the prestige of the very party that you were banning. A. It may be a question of psychology applied to revolution. Here is the point. When this war is over I say they will be a great danger, especially immediately when our soldiers come back

from overseas and immediately our industries have to tell their workers that there is no more work for them. That is where the communist party would be of great danger, much more danger than it is at the present time on the 2nd of July, 1942. That is when they are going to bring about their revolution, their bloody revolution.

MR. MAYBANK: We may be able to prevent that by having work for them to do.

WITNESS: How are you going to do that with these soldiers, sir? May I ask, will you be able to, when they come back and take off their uniforms, give them a job at \$25 or \$35 a week? You won't be able to do that and that is the period they are going to use.

MR. MacINNIS: If the war lasts several years longer you admit we will be able to finance the war, and surely we will be able to finance our people in peace and provide them with work. That is a social problem the government can take care of, and surely the government will have a constructive proposal to take care of a situation of that kind.

WITNESS: Let me put it this way. Suppose when the war is over and the communist party is legal and at that time Soviet Russia will not be in the war any more, are not they going to go back to the platform they have stood for?

MR. BENICE: Naturally.

MR. MacINNIS: Possibly they will.

WITNESS: They will only wait for that very minute.

MR. MacINNIS: We are looking for a new order after the war in which Russia will take her part in reconstruction, a new international order. That is implicit in the statements made by Roosevelt and by Churchill and by the Russians themselves.

MR. BENICE: A 20-year pact.

BY MR. MARTIN:

Q. The question I think you should bear in mind is this and when Mr. MacInnis put the question to you you said, "Well, what does it matter what they do in England or what they do in the United States." From one point of view your observation is correct; on the other hand we can profit possibly from the experience of those countries, and the question I should like you to consider, Mr. Penverne is this, having in mind your objective, which I agree with, that is to say, you do not like the communists, you are afraid of their doctrine. I share that opinion, but I am wondering whether or not you are not defeating your purpose. I am not saying you are, I am just wondering. The English example is a pretty strong one where they laugh at communists. We say, oh, well, the problem is different in that we have a different kind of population and so on. I am not convinced that the problem is any different and I think that what you should consider here is to demonstrate to us that the communists will make more headway under a system of freedom than they will under a system of restraint. That, at any rate, would be the point that you would have to convince me on. Without interfering with your presentation, I wish you would address yourself to that.

(B follows)

B-1

THE CHAIRMAN: Mr. Martin, is it not a fact that one of the reasons why communism did make such headway in Britain was because the laboring class in Britain were better organized than in any other country, and on a basis that kept them free from the policies and advocacies of communists, while in Canada and the United States they were not, the trade unions were not organized on the basis of real trade unionism; and they did in England, and that is why the communists had a profitable field of activities in making converts and adherents, by making representations to unorganized labor who are at a disadvantage, not being genuine trade associations or whatever it might be; that would be far better and that is the reason why they took easier in Canada than they did in Britain? An; is it not a fact that it is evidence that they have made some headway in labor organizations just by the representations that were made to this committee since we have been sitting?

MR. MARTIN: That may be true, but it does not convince me. I have in mind this: for instance, Cardinal Verdier, of Paris, was one of the princes of the church who took the view that the way to deal with communism in France was to meet it out in the open, and he did not ban their publication. I have talked to him about this thing. Then, perhaps the leading philosopher in the Catholic church, Jacques Maritin, takes the same view; that we do not want communists and their doctrine of reform and so on; they are abhorrent to us because of their particular materialistic interpretation of history and so on. But there is another point of view (but I have always shared your own, and I am not convinced that it has been a wise one); now, in my own city we have a strong labor organization and that organization has been; I must say at the outset that it was dominated undoubtedly by communist influences, and in some respects it is not free from that now; but the influence of Maritin-- and this is something

in which you will be interested -- he came to this very city and visited one of the Catholic colleges with the result that the priests in that college are taking a vital interest in the problem of organized labor and now you will find in these trade union organizations a great deal of the local communist influence has actually gone down because of the interest of the church in training its priests and its laymen to an appreciation of the situation. And after all the church, through the papal encyclicals, has no reason to feel that it is not progressive in this movement; and rather than curb communists by law they have gone into their meetings and have met them face to face. And I must say that that procedure seems to have had a greater progress than the padlock method. Now, there is the issue, it seems to me, which I put to you in the best of faith, and because it is quite evident that you have paid a lot of attention to this problem. I should very much like to have your comments on it.

WITNESS: Well, Mr. Martin, we came here with the intention of not duplicating our evidence and Father Chagnon will be much more able than I to answer your question. It was our intention that that aspect of the question would be taken up carefully by Father Chagnon; and, I believe, Mr. Charbonneau who is the head of substantial organizations of Catholic workers, and he will also be able to speak on that.

It seems to us that the past of the party and its multiple changes of front or line should induce the greatest caution in accepting the present pronouncements of party spokesmen on their face value. The criminal caught in the toils of justice and sensing the possibility of escaping the consequences of his misdeeds is very liable to become an eloquent preacher of all the virtues and a model of civic rectitude. But only a sentimental sob-sister would be taken in by his words.

Since the party is precluded by the ban from acting at the

present, the value given to its pronouncements is to be gauged by its past: that past has earned the incarceration of its leaders and the ban of the party. Virtuous pronouncements are no guarantee of permanent reform.

Since there is little possibility of complete knowledge of communist activity at present for the man in the street or members of the house, due to the undercover nature of that activity, it is evident that the main source of information should be those whose duty it is to ferret out and study that underground, subversive activity; we are fortunate in having in Canada a body of men unequalled in their record for dealing with that sort of thing. The fact that the R.C.M.P. have continually been sniped at by party members and their sympathisers throughout the land should prove to members of the committee the value of their testimony. There is nothing the party fears more than the dispassionate recital by the R.C.M.P. of the facts they know from their investigations. If they testify that those communists still at large and those who have been known in the past to accept the leadership of the party are still continuing their wonted activities in the trade unions and in our industrial life, then it is only sound common sense to disregard the high-sounding public pronouncements of the party leaders and the specious arguments of sympathisers, be they paid legal lights or misguided, so-called liberals with a long-standing pink hue.

England has not changed its attitude towards the party: the ban is still on the Daily Worker despite tremendous pressure brought by mass meetings, etc. Pronouncements by labor leaders and parliamentary officials demonstrate that they are too well aware of the true character of the party to be taken in by any change assumed under the exigencies of present circumstances. Attorney General Biddle of the U.S. has recently shown what he thinks of the same group. The vast majority of

the people of Canada was perfectly satisfied that the government did the right thing by putting the communists where they could do no harm: they will be just as satisfied if the government keeps them there as long as there is serious business to be done.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. Are you referring to the Bridges case? A. Yes.

MR. MAYBANK: You had better couple that with the Biddle case, because they occurred simultaneously.

WITNESS: That was about the same time.

MR. MAYBANK: What I mean is, we are citing that, something that was done in a foreign country, and that is not quite germane, and I think that they should be brought in together. I think we have to cite the Biddle case alongside the other one because they come together.

WITNESS: I for one maintain the point of view that I was explaining a moment ago; that because certain things might be acceptable in certain countries there is no reason why they should be acceptable here. May I say this, that I am convinced after having been in the other war, and after having been in touch with various papers and various statuses in society, that I am practically certain of one thing, that public opinion is much more enlightened in England than it is here in this country. I believe that the average Englishman can take in the situation a little better than the average Canadian; I may be right or I may be wrong, but that is my considered opinion, that certain propaganda might not be dangerous in England whereas it might be dangerous here. And I would say, to be fair, that certain propaganda might be dangerous to the Roman Catholic which might not be dangerous to the non-Catholic. It might be dangerous in my province.

MR. BERTRAND: That is your view, anyway?

WITNESS: Right.

6. Air to the Russian allies has nothing to do with the

present question: we are dealing with the communist party of Canada, which on its own testimony severed its connection with the Russian dominated Third International, and elects to stand on its own record and merits.

It is to be borne in mind that we are dealing with a party founded for the sole purpose of carrying on revolutionary activity; its whole strategy, its mentality is focussed towards that purpose and the means it adopts are directed and chosen with that end in view. This is amply borne out by the past history of the party in Canada and corroborated by that of communist parties in other lands; clever use of fraud, deceit are part of its stock in trade, until circumstances bring about the possibility of its assuming power, at which time it appears in its true colours. Every democratic country which has allowed communism to operate within its borders has had to pay the price in revolution and bloodshed. In dealing with shifty, crafty opponents one must be thoroughly on one's guard and never more so than when they appear, all sweetness and light, to be full of friendly protestations and warm expressions of undying devotion.

It is true that there appears in C.P. circles still operative a fervent zeal against the Axis, against the fascists (most of the agitation for lifting the ban is carried on under the slogan of "Free the Anti-fascists"). What else is to be expected? For years the fascist and nazi organizations have claimed, rightly or wrongly to have come into existence for the purpose of fighting the communist organization. The two groups have been mortal foes (except during the strange interlude when Russian communism's alliance with Hitler naziism allowed the latter to start the war) for years, and now, the democracies, of which they are both equally foes, are lined up in a life and death struggle against the nazi-fascist aggregation. The communist group throughout the world are in the position

of having their main battle fought for them: is it any wonder that they profess great enthusiasm for the war? What else is to be expected? The thought, however, should not be absent from our mind, that they are perhaps expecting to profit by the exhaustion of the democracies at the end of the struggle, to take up again their interrupted world revolutionary aggression against them. Naturally they are not going to stress that side of their war attitude. But it is not impossible that evidence exists in the government files that such a state of mind exists. It certainly would explain a lot of newly born enthusiasm. And it should give the true friends of Canada and democracy seriously, furiously to think.

Now, Mr. Chairman, on the subject of meetings, I have here some of their propaganda since the war started. I have here the Beacon, published by the Young Communists League -- this bears no date but from the text we can decide that it was written late in 1940. And now, here in the Beacon, published by the Y.P.L., the communist organization in Quebec, they have exactly the same sense of thought and the same views as expressed in the programme of the Canadian communist party in 1934.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. Will you show us the text which is similar?

A. I have marked some of it.

MR. MARTIN: You might establish the date on which that issue of the Beacon was published.

WITNESS: This would be from the same context.

MR. MARTIN: That would be after June of 1941?

WITNESS: No, prior to June of 1941. This quite evidently was written in 1940, because it has no reference to Russia being in the war. Now, let us see:

"Neither of the two groups of belligerent countries lags behind the other in plunder, atrocities and the endless brutalities of war. But in order to fool the proletariat and distract its attention from the only real war of liberation, namely, civil war against the bourgeoisie both of 'its own' and 'foreign' countries, in order to further this lofty aim, the bourgeoisie of each country strives, by means of lying patriotic phrases, to extol the significance of 'its own' national war, and to assert that it strives to vanquish the enemy, not for the sake of plundering and seizing territory, but for the sake of 'liberating' all other peoples except its own."

That is very good revolutionary defeatism.

MR. BENICE: That little book to which you referred; what is that?

WITNESS: That is the programme of the communist party in Canada. It is also printed in French.

MR. ROSS: I asked you whether or not there was any constitution or bylaws of the programme of the communist party in Canada either or before or since the period from 1937 and 1938?

MR. ANDERSON: I think we can deal with that.

MR. BENICE: Do you remember that?

MR. ANDERSON: Yes. I have material to submit on that.

THE CHAIRMAN: Was 1938 the time of the change?

MR. ANDERSON: That was in 1937.

WITNESS: From the French edition, "ce que veut le" -- what the communist party wants. And that was printed by, Association Des Editions Contemporaines, Montreal -- it was published in December of 1934 by the Contemporary Association of Montreal, Quebec -- and that is where you can find the most violent talk against the Canadian socialists, the C.C.F. party.

MR. BENCE: They are not the only ones who talk against the C.C.F.

WITNESS: Some people might find it rather strange at times.

MR. BERTRAND: I think the committee ought to have the part where they refer to the C.C.F. party; the communist party are absolutely wrong if those documents are there.

MR. MARTIN: There is no question about that.

WITNESS: They start on page 35 under the heading, "No Need of Revolution", and they say:

"The social-reformists of the C.C.F. say there is no need of a revolution. They say democracy has prepared for the workers all the means necessary to achieve socialism. Let the workers use universal suffrage, they say, to send C.C.F. leaders into the legislative assemblies. Let them form a majority in these assemblies. When this is done, the road is open to pass laws abolishing the capitalist system. Of course, there is the B. N. A. Act which prohibits the confiscation of property by legal procedure, but this, say the C.C.F. leaders, can be overcome. Let us revise the B.N.A. Act so as to permit parliament to enact socialist legislation. Let parliament then enact a law which orders the big corporations to cede some of their industrial establishments and their property to the state. Let us not expropriate them, say the C.C.F. leaders, not by any means! Let us pay them with bonds issued by the government and redeemable in the future. This will mean introducing socialism by pacific methods. No revolutions; no seizure of power; no infringement upon the law; no mass action; no expropriation of the exploiters. Everything lawful. Everything in a gentlemanly fashion. The electoral law works. The citizens vote. The legislators assemble. They count noses and find a C.C.F. majority.

The C.C.F. majority in the House of Commons, passes a law. Capitalism passes out, the big trusts bow before the 'will of the people'. 'Gentlemen, you are the lawful heirs of our system', they say politely, and leave the stage for the Woodsworths and their associates.

What a sweet picture! And how deceptive! We are sorry to mar such an idyllic scene. But we communists are realists, and we do not wish to be carried away by fancies, especially when these fancies are beneficial to the capitalist system as they tend to keep workers from fighting the capitalist state." And so on and so on, I could quote it ad nauseum, the whole thing. There are about eighty odd pages of it; and unfortunately, take the French translation, Mr. Chairman, it is very bad French, but still it may be very good propaganda.

Now, I do not know whether this evidence has been placed before the committee or whether you want that evidence, but the evidence is there; and possibly some of the people might present that evidence if it has not been presented to you already.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes, we will have it.

MR. BENCE: Could we have that little book?

THE CHAIRMAN: You will have it, I think.

WITNESS: You will find the material which I just read in the book at page 35 and continued on page 36. Now, that is the doctrine of the communist party in Canada.

MR. BENCE: You said that you were linking that up with the other papers there, the Y.C.L. paper, could you give us something in that indicative that that policy is in force?

WITNESS: Yes. This is from page 2: there is so much to it that it is very hard to locate.

"The fact that the imperialist war has entered a new stage of ferocious intensity, that 'our own' imperialists have

been suffering defeats, and that reaction is going to frenzied extremes in its attacks on the working class -- all this puts to the sharpest test the revolutionary firmness and understanding of every communist.

It is at times like this that the bourgeoisie, along with its violence and fascist repression, exerts the full pressure of chauvinism, of capitalist deception and hysteria, in an attempt to wipe out the influence of the class-conscious vanguard of the workers, to defeat the strike and anti-conscription and other struggles of the working people, and to harness the masses to the war machine of imperialism.

MR. BERTRAND: You have no document similar to that published after the entry of Russia into the war?

WITNESS: No. There is the Beacon. There is here a political letter dated December, 1940:

"We propose an independent people's government." That is very much along the same lines. There is an appeal to the French in respect to Canadian emancipation as it relates to French Canada and it is signed, Sydney B. Ryerson, who was I believe up to the end of 1940 the secretary of the communist party for Canada, Quebec section. He has been replaced by a French-Canadian since.

MR. McKINNON: Where is he now?

WITNESS: He is still in some executive capacity, he has not been grabbed up, to my knowledge.

MR. MARTIN: And you say that he was succeeded by a French-Canadian?

WITNESS: Yes. The name of the new man is Emery Samuel. You will see what they say here on page 11 of this letter:

"The comrade who replaces me will carry the full political responsibility of leader of the party in Quebec. As for myself, while charged by our leadership with new tasks, I shall continue (I could not, indeed, do otherwise!)"

to give of the best of my strength and energy to the revolutionary struggle for the emancipation of French-Canada".

You see, they do what we call in French give them the carte blanche -- extend the open hand -- they say that they will work with you. They go on:

"We must take drastic and far-reaching measures to assist them in reaching the masses of anti-conscriptionists, the thousands in the training camps and barracks, the youth in the factories, all those who are only waiting for organized, live leadership."

"Our French-Canadian comrades must henceforth constitute, in the leading posts, not only a numerical majority (which has long been the case), but the actual, responsible leaders. This development, under way for a long time, will now be accentuated. To assure that this takes place, I propose, with the agreement of our party's leadership, to resign as provincial secretary, in order that a French-Canadian should be elected to this key post. Let no one consider this a symbolic gesture, simply. The comrades who replaces me will carry the full political responsibility of leader of the party in Quebec. As for myself, while charged by our leadership with new tasks, I shall continue (I could not, indeed, do otherwise!) to give of the best of my strength and energies to the revolutionary struggle for the emancipation of French Canada!

And I quote that from this letter which says the annual meeting replaced Mr. Ryerson by this other fellow by the name of Samuel.

MR. MCKINNON: Is this fellow Samuel still active?

WITNESS: He is very active. I think possibly my good friend here, Mr. Chagnon may be a little more au courant with that.

MR. ROSS: Does he mention force? He used the word revolutionary, does he mean by that force of arms?

WITNESS: Yes. You will see that all throughout this issue of the Beacon. And I have here a copy of the "Red Martlet", which was intended for McGill students, and which is also issued by the Communistic Youth League. The wording of those four pamphlets which have been published in 1940 -- I do not know whether that one was or not, the Red Martlet is of December, 1940 -- the text shows the desires and expresses them exactly as being in keeping with the programme of the communist party of 1934. You will find other stuff there; you will find stuff such as this, for instance: this is entitled, "To beat the conscription plot of the King government!" It is addressed, to the parents of Canada, and to the military "trainees"; and this was in an envelope bearing the absolute date of October, 1940. I will not quote the whole thing; but with respect to conscription it says you must fight the whole thing. It says, "the conscripted man must fight for their interest, and for the interest of the Canadian common people against those of the exploiters!" And then, "learn the art of war, so you may be able to fight for an independent socialist Canada, free from the rule of Canadian exploiters who are the lackies of foreign powers.

MR. MARTIN: I put a question to Mr. Cohen when he was on the stand about that and he admitted it.

WITNESS: He admitted that?

MR. MARTIN: Yes, when he was here.

MR. DUPUIS: Have you any such material published since January of 1941?

WITNESS: No, Mr. Dupuis, unfortunately I have not. I said before you came into the room that they are very cautious people. They have now changed -- you have this letter

from Mr. Tim Buck which is dated in 1941, shortly after Russia got into the war, which is an absolute contradiction from the first word to the last of the principles of the communist party in Canada. You can and you must look all that over very very carefully at the present time, sir.

Here is some material from 1940, though, sent out as a Christmas card, Mr. Chairman; greetings for Christmas and the New Year; and the most violent wording there is used.

THE CHAIRMAN: Who sent that?

WITNESS: This is the Montreal section of the communist party, the Young Communist League.

MR. MacINNIS: Does it mention "Christmas greeting"?

WITNESS: Here on the face is, "Christmas and the New Year"; and it says:

"On the even of the New Year, faced with continued misery and bloodshed, the communist party urges you to follow the example of the Soviet people who, led by the communist party of Lenin and Stalin, rid themselves for all time of their landlords and capitalists, took control of their own destinies and of the wealth of their country and obtained liberty, equality, security, culture and opportunity for all." And then it goes on with, "Peace on earth, good will towards men".

MR. MacINNIS: Your main point in mentioning it was that it rather indicates that perhaps they are under the general impression that after all there is something in their change of heart, because that is a rather clear recognition of the birth of Christ and of the benefit that He brings to the world.

MR. MARTIN: I do not know whether Mr. MacInnis is being factitious or not now.

THE CHAIRMAN: He is trying to be. Did you say it was sent out as a Christmas card?

WITNESS: On the face it says, "Greetings for

"Christmas and the New Year".

MR. MARTIN: I know that I have sent greetings to some of my Jewish constituents on their important day.

MR. MCKINNON: You don't miss a bet, do you?

WITNESS: In this card, by the way, if you are interested, it says: "Christmas week, traditionally associated with peace and the brotherhood of man, finds us in the 16th month of horrible war."

"In this festive season of interchange of presents --

what gifts do the rulers of Canada and of the British Empire offer the people for the coming year?

Mr. Churchill is giving the people "blood, toil tears and sweat".

Mr. King is giving the people betrayals and broken promises -- a policy of extended war with conscription to provide its cannon fodder.

Mr. Lapointe is giving concentration camps for those who defend the true interests of the people against the war profiteers.

Mr. McLarty is giving the people the burden of war costs, through crushing taxation and a Hitler savings plan.

Mr. Gardiner is giving the farmers starvation prices.

Mr. T. D. Bouchard is giving the unemployed his slave labor plan.

And to the bankers and industrialists they give subsidies, record-breaking profits in war contracts, and the 'green light' to disregard the rights of labor."

MR. MARTIN: Mr. T. D. Bouchard is mentioned, what does it say of Mr. Michaud, what is he doing?

WITNESS: He is not indicated so far..

MR. DUPUIS: Are you going to file all this?

WITNESS: Here is another one: "Canadiens Debout!",

B-15

written in French, because, as I said, we must not forget that they are trying everything. They are trying in French-Canada what they tried in France.

C-1 follows.

And so on. They are ready to say all sorts of lies. Now, another one here is entitled "1917 - 1940, Twenty-three Years of Socialist Freedom." The document extols the virtues of Soviet Russia and so on. They call the bourgeoisie of Canada everything under the sun, and I think they take a poke or two at the C.C.F. in this document. Another document is "Stop the Blitzkrieg on Lives and Livelihood." It opens with these words, "Fellow Canadians," and was signed by "Evariste Dube, President, the Quebec Party, and "Emery Samuel, Secretary."

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. What is the date? A. According to the envelope which was attached to it it was dated June, 1941.

BY MR. MARTIN:

Q. What date, June 1941? A. June 1941. I could possibly give you the exact date.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. Before the 22nd? A. June 6, 1941. In most of these documents they speak against conscription and so on being adopted.

MR. BERTRAND: They were all in favour of a yes vote; they called a meeting in my district and filled a large hall with about 600 people.

MR. DUPUIS: We know now why you had a majority in your riding.

MR. MARTIN: Would you say they were the only ones in Quebec who have changed their minds on conscription. Never mind that question.

MR. MacINNIS: It was a leading question.

WITNESS: No, not leading; I would not construe it that way. Here is another document headed "Fête du Travail, 1940, Labor Day, 1940."

THE CHAIRMAN: No names on it?

WITNESS: No names of individuals.

MR. DUPUIS: I wonder if I could ask a question --

THE CHAIRMAN: He has one more document to file.

WITNESS: "May Day, 1940, for International Working Class Solidarity! Against Imperialist War! For Peace and Socialism." On page 3 they have the following:

"For seven bitter years the Canadian capitalists backed Chamberlain's policy of building up Hitlerism. Look back over the years and ask: Why were Austria, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Albania, Spain, Memel and China sacrificed to the Berlin-Rome-Tokyo axis? Why did Chamberlain lend billions of pounds to Hitler for armaments, for the guns that now kill Britishers? Why the Munich sell-out? Was Chamberlain mad?

No! Neither Chamberlain nor Mackenzie King were mad. Hitlerism was deliberately built up, nation after nation was sacrificed -- for an aim!"

And they mention some of our Canadian bourgeois, Mr. Mackenzie King and H.R. MacMillan, Sir Herbert Holt. I think they mentioned the C.P.R. and Mr. Beatty, and so on. And this is full of the same communistic talk as you will find in this 1935 programme.

Possibly the committee has not seen the letter written by Tim Buck in 1941, that I referred to.

THE CHAIRMAN: There was a document referred to a few minutes ago by Mr. Bertrand and I understand it was a circular letter.

MR. BERTRAND: The document that was received by a few persons in Montreal, which is dated the 11th of September, 1941.

THE CHAIRMAN: I think we will leave all reference to that document off the record. The members will have the opportunity to read it.

WITNESS: This is the last document, Mr. Chairman, addressed "To the Military Trainees and their friends." This is a letter of March 1941 from the "Young Communist League," and it contains language such as this:

"Think before you die!

They have conscripted you to die!

In a few days you and six thousand other twenty-one-year-olds will be forced into Four Months' Training.

How was the government able to enforce conscription when the people elected them on their promise of 'No Conscription'? Step-by-step -- first National Registration, next, thirty-days' training of non-permanent militia. Then overnight, by order-in-council, King and his big shots drafted the boys into the permanent army reserves.

Where will this lead?

Can we trust the government's promises of 'Defence of Canada's shores'? No, King and Ralston have already pledged to send hundreds of thousands of you overseas to protect the profits of Britain's war in Europe.

We Communists, told you 'Our' government would lead us to war!

We told you that these war-mongers would enforce conscription!

Now we tell you, 'Do not be tricked into going to the graveyard of Europe, Asia, Africa!

Get wise to yourself!

Don't be shoved from the bread-lines to the front-lines for the sake of more and greater profits for the big bosses!

Cannon fodder is cheap for the profiteers who force the people to pay for the war,

who interne trade union leaders,
who kill all personal freedom.'

They forced you from your homes, your friends.

Now at camp, demand good food, enough clothing and proper medical care. Tell them if you are fit to train, they must keep you fit. Don't be a hero to-day to become a cast-off hobo to-morrow!

If you see a to-morrow!

Unite at camp and protest against forced training.

Form camp committees to protect your daily interests, to demand freedom of speech!

Your slogans must be

'Four months must be the limit!'

'We refuse to die on the graveyard of Europe or Asia.'

That is all I have to say, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

FATHER CHAGNON, called:

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman, honourable gentlemen, you will easily see I am not very much at home in speaking in English, but if you will give me your indulgence I shall attempt to speak in that language and I hope you will be kind enough to excuse mistakes and defects. Probably I should explain my presence in this delegation. For many years I was a professor of Ethics at the Gregorian University of Rome for six years, 1934 to 1940. I am now professor of Ethics at the Jesuit Seminary at Montreal. I have been interested in social questions and made a particular study of the problem of communism. Besides that in my teaching work I took part in the activities of the Ecole Sociale Populaire of Montreal. This institute is under the direction of the Jesuit priests and has been working for more than thirty years in order to promote social principles, spread christian social principles, organize lectures and publish publications and magazines, and more recently editing a new Catholic review entitled "Relations."

Notwithstanding my poor capacities as an English speaker, I represent to-day the staff and also, I may say, I express the views of all the readers and subscribers who follow our publications.

Here is the problem we are facing: should the ban now in existence on the communist party in Canada be lifted, restoring that party to legality? We answer in the negative, and we contend that in order to preserve the security of this country and to foil the enemies who plot subversive revolution, the ban on the communist party has to be maintained. We hold that communist propaganda is detrimental to the vital interests of our country and to the efficiency of the war effort. We are firmly convinced that communist activities are spreading seeds of social troubles and may develop very serious danger for the future, mostly in the after-war period. Therefore, on account of its harmful propaganda the communist party must remain an illegal organization, whose activity is forbidden by the Defence of Canada Regulations.

Now to support this opinion I do not want to repeat the argument so cleverly presented by Mr. Penverne. I just want to submit that I believe we cannot forget the condemnation pronounced in 1931 by a very high tribunal in Ontario after a trial that revealed subversive activities of the party and more recently by a very important decision issued, I think, by Mr. Justice Chevrier in the spring of 1940. We cannot forget the sabotage work and the anti-Canadian propaganda during the first two years of this war. From September 1939 to June 1941 how many pamphlets and manifestos were issued by the Canadian communists representing this war as a great "capitalistic affair," a bloody enterprise for the interests of big businesses.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. I read the same thing in Le Devoir in 1940. On the

1st of July, 1940, Mr. Richer of Le Devoir said something similar to this. A. I am sorry, I do not want to discuss the attitude or the standards of Le Devoir. At any rate Le Devoir cannot be accused of communism. The communists represent this war as a bloody enterprise for the interests of big business and international finance. They were preaching defeatism and distrust against our government.

But now the Canadian comrades emphatically express their loyalty to Canada and their zeal for a total war. How can we explain that sudden change? Is it love for our country; is it real patriotism that is the inspiring motive of this sudden conversion? Is it not quite clear that our Canadian communists were converted to war by the aggression of Hitler against Soviet Russia?

Now, because I just mentioned Soviet Russia I will try in a few words to clarify our own position on this subject. We have sincere admiration for the courage and the splendid resistance of Russian armies defending their soil and their homes against the brutality of hitlerian invasion. We approve the collaboration, military and economic, with Russia to win the war; but, as Mr. Churchill himself has clearly stated, collaboration with Russia does not mean approval of communism, admiration for Russia heroically fighting against Hitler does not mean admiration for communism as such or even for the communist experiment of Russia.

Now, after this statement on our own position towards Russia, I want to consider where the Canadian communist party stands in this new situation. The comrades have suddenly passed from anti-war to pro-war policy; they try to exploit our admiration for Russian resistance to invaders and transform it into admiration for communism.

I shall now quote a few words from a recent manifesto, issued since the entry of Russia into the war. Here are the

few words from the manifesto published in French; at least I got a French copy.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. Can you produce the manifesto? A. I have a few lines. I did not get the whole manifesto, but I have a few lines.

Q. Have you that manifesto here? A. I have not it in my hands now, unfortunately. I think perhaps that Mr. Penverne has this manifesto of the 1st of May, 1942. Here are a few words:

"The people of the Soviet Union have accepted enormous sacrifices. . . they are going to fight until the end in order to defend their new socialistic mode of life, in which there is no exploitation of man by man, no social inequality, no race hatred. The many nationalities of the Soviet Union are bound by a firing patriotism and a unity that has won to them the admiration of the whole world."

BY MR. MARTIN:

Q. What is wrong with that? I do not see anything wrong with that so far. A. Please, sir, those very few words, this apology for communism, I may say, covered with the other sentence -- we pay ourselves tribute of admiration to Russia for the gallant fight -- but they say "they are going to fight until the end in order to defend their new socialistic mode of life, in which there is no exploitation of man by man, no social inequality, no race hatred." Having seen those words, their clear policy, praise for communism, there implicitly they say in our country unfortunately there is this exploitation of man by man --

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. There is no doubt that they are apologizing.

BY MR. MARTIN:

Q. Yes. A. They say there is no exploitation of man by

man, no social inequality, no race hatred; it is a kind of paradise.

Q. We have lots of race hatred in this country. You as a French-Canadian should know that. A. I think there is still communist propaganda in this war. Of course, as Mr. Penverne has mentioned, they are very careful now, and it is covered up by this praise for the war effort. Now this is the strategy of our Canadian communists: whilst advocating total war effort and full support to Russia, they will have a new chance of spreading everywhere the seeds of a social revolution in Canada; the crusade against Hitler is just for them a welcome opportunity of preparing the victory of communism in a Canada that will remain exhausted and overburdened by the crucial problems of the after-war. If the communist party is declared legal in our country, the comrades will much more easily poison the workers' minds with Marxian ideas, class hatred and the so-called "proletarian consciousness," and later on at the right moment, they will be able to start the revolutionary storm.

Nobody can deny, our communists are more than ever planning a social and economic revolution.

Q. You say more than ever now? A. Exactly, because I think they find new hope in these difficulties and in the problems of after-war.

Q. You say in spite of their being declared illegal they are doing it underground and are doing it more than ever. That was your statement? A. Not exactly. They are hoping, they are planning more than ever. They are more careful in their propaganda; their propaganda is not so open now; but we do not know exactly what they are saying in their talks to the workers.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. Have they created any strikes since Russia entered

into the war?

MR. MCKINNON: That is a hard thing to answer. I do not know how any person can very well answer that.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. Have they demanded shorter hours of work; have they done anything like that?

MR. MCKINNON: It is pretty nearly impossible to trace it down. A strike may have taken place for any one of a dozen reasons.

MR. O'NEILL: We might probably be on sound ground or we may not. We cannot prove anything.

MR. MARTIN: I would be inclined to think that they would not, but that document that Mr. Bertrand has produced disturbs me. I think we should consider that later.

WITNESS: In the pamphlet quoted by Mr. Penverne before the entry of Russia into the war they were stating openly this war is for us a good chance because of the problems that will arise after the war and we shall have a good chance to strike the right blow. They said that quite explicitly at that time. Now they are more careful, and I think they are hoping that the great changes that inevitably will result from this war will give them their chance.

MR. MARTIN: I do not think there is any question about that. I do not think anyone would deny that; I think we must assume that.

(D follows)

So I keep on; but they say, that, as we are told, the communist party is planning a peaceful and legal revolution with democratic methods, without the use of force and violence to get into power. In that letter to Dr. Manion in 1939 Mr. Tim Buck very emphatically writes: "We are not advocates of force and violence.....it is stated in the preamble of our constitution, socialism will be achieved only by means of the expressed democratic will of the majority of Canadian people. The communist party rejects and repudiates any proposal to forcibly impose socialism upon Canada against the will of the majority of her people". Now, I think this is one of the arguments brought in favour now of leaving the door open against communists. To this statement I may oppose many objections: first of all, the Canadian communist party remains a branch, a section of the Communist Internationale, the famous comintern. We all know that the constitutions of the comintern drafted in 1920 were imposing to all national sections a very strict discipline, a very radical action to obtain the victory of the proletariat. To draw out the spirit of these constitutions, Lenin himself very frankly indicates the different steps of the proletarian revolution to be achieved: "overthrow of the bourgeoisie", by violence, confiscation of her properties, destruction of the state machinery parliamentary, judicial, military, bureaucratic, administrative, etc., exile or incarceration for the exploiters more dangerous and more obstinate without exception." And Lenin adds this warning: "it is only by the most severe civil war that it will be possible to achieve the education, instruction and organization of the exploited masses.....and to transform them into a large and free association of free workers.

Lenin asked on one occasion, "how can we accomplish revolution without shooting? (and I quote from Trotsky, Lenin, p. 159).

And then, to make clear the meaning of the dictatorship of the proletariat, Lenin wrote: "The scientific concept, dictatorship, means, nothing more or less than power which directly rests on violence, which is not limited by any laws or restricted by any absolute rules" (Lenin, collected works, vol. 25, p. 441).

Now, there is the answer to some of the communists, or some of the sympathizers; they say, of course these declarations of Lenin's and similar documents were referring to Russia's background and not to conditions in North America; and, moreover, that the policy of the comintern has been mitigated and now repudiates the use of violence and force. This is too easy an answer. I ask, then, the communist comrades to explain why for years and years, until 1935, namely until the "popular front" policy in all countries of the world there was a split between communists and socialists. Why this violent antagonism between the red international and the "yellow international", why these bitter attacks of the red communists against the socialist trade-unions or the socialist parties faithful to the Amsterdam international, whose president was Van dervelde, at that time? The red communists were laughing at the shyness and timidity of the social-democrats not bold enough to abandon the old methods of democratic legality. The red communists were boasting to be real revolutionaries, the genuine sons of Karl Marx, Engels, and Lenin, ready to use all means and to seize every opportunity for instoring the famous dictatorship of the proletariat. Now, this split between the socialist parties and red communist parties cannot be explained, unless we admit that the red communists were much more radical, ready to use all methods, legal or illegal, force and violence, when the time is ripe and when there is a good chance for a favourable opportunity.

Now, gentlemen, this point is very important; we have always discussed this question, do they advocate force and violence to overthrow our form of government?

MR. MacINNIS: Mr. Chairman, how about coming back this afternoon at 4 o'clock?

MR. BERTRAND: Yes.

THE CHAIRMAN: If it is the wish of the committee it is perfectly agreeable to me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. MARTIN: I think everything that you are saying and everything that the Father says, is all right, but I do not think it meets the issue before us. We admit all that. Now, is it a wise thing?

WITNESS: I think it is very important for the committee to know that even now they are planning social revolution by force and violence. It seems to me to be the vital issue.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is what we are trying to find out and we are asking you to give us some proof that it is so.

MR. MARTIN: That is right.

WITNESS: I have given the history of the party and I come to the present this afternoon. You will get that, and you have to be here then.

MR. MARTIN: I will be here.

The committee adjourned at 1:05 o'clock to meet again at 4 o'clock p.m. this day.

- - - - -

AFTERNOON SESSION

The committee resumed at 4 o'clock.

THE CHAIRMAN: Order, gentlemen. Is it your pleasure that we shall proceed?

FATHER CHAGNON resumes the stand.

WITNESS: Mr. Chairman and honourable gentlemen, I will try to resume where I left off my statement this morning. We dealt with the point as to how the communist party is to be maintained, and I am coming to this point and I shall try to answer this objection in favour of communism. They say now in recent years the communist party had a new policy, a mitigated policy; they repudiate force and violence; they are not a subversive party. My answer is first this, that until very recent years in all countries of the world, mostly in Europe, there was a very violent split between all socialist parties and the communist party and very bitter attacks on the part of red communists against the yellow socialists. So I ask how can they explain those violent antagonisms except the red communists are very much more radical and are ready to use all means legal or illegal --

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. There was a booklet on this subject which I read a few years ago on the Bolshevik and the Menshivik. The Menshiviks are not in favour of using force to arrive at their aim, and they existed in large numbers in Russia at the time of the revolution; but as they were not willing to use force, although they were a larger number, they were overthrown by the other.

WITNESS: You are perfectly right, sir. But all over the world, mostly in France and Belgium for years and years, until very recently, until the popular front, there was this split, this violent antagonism between the socialist parties, the old

classical socialist party and the red communists.

Now, to support this statement I want to invoke the testimony that seems to me to be of great value. I just want to quote a few words of a speech made in parliament by a member who was very well informed on socialist conditions and certainly not in favour of capitalism and our present social order. I mean the late Mr. Woodsworth. Of course, I do not want to discuss the theories of Mr. Woodsworth, but I think we all agree in paying homage to his great sincerity and earnest desire for social reform. In a very important speech in February, 1933, as appears in the House of Commons debates on page 1797, Mr. Woodsworth is reported as having said:

"Let me say that we must distinguish clearly between the C.C.F. and communism. It is quite true that both believe in a changed social order, in a new economic system. The communists are convinced that this can be brought only by violence. They think it cannot be done in any other way. We believe that it may come in Canada by peaceful methods and in an orderly fashion and that is the purpose of our organization."

I think these words are very significant. Mr. Woodsworth did not want to be unfair to communists, but he cannot refrain from stating that communists are pursuing a change of social order by violence.

This morning there was some discussion about the American policy in regard to communism. I read recently a very large volume entitled "Isms." I read a report prepared by the National Commission of the American Legion in 1936, page 13. The extract I give now is from the official report of the United States House of Representatives. They indicate the main tenets of communism. They say:

"What communism stands for:

Hatred of God and all forms of religion;

Destruction of private property, and inheritance;--"

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. I thought there was a return to religion in Russia. Do you know anything about that? A. Sir, I think officially there is no change in the policy. Of course, privately I think that many Russians still in their hearts believe in God and try to practice their religion very privately in secret, more or less, but I think the official policy of the Soviet government has not changed.

BY MR. MARTIN:

Q. Do you know Iswolsky's book called "Light before Dusk" which has just been published? A. No, I confess I do not know this book.

Q. Read it and you will find confirmation of what you have just said. A. On this question, may I be allowed to record --

Q. A point in that book is the vast majority of the Russian people are coming back to the Russian orthodox belief but that is in spite of the government; it is just because the influences of the day are operating -- A. On this very point, you probably read the very strong article by Monsignor Fulton Sheen of Catholic University of America in the periodical "America" last fall. You remember President Roosevelt by way of a joke said by reading the very text of the constitution it seems that there is religious freedom because there is the famous article 124. They say the constitution of the Soviets acknowledge or recognize religious freedom and freedom for anti-religious propaganda. I think the president was meaning according to the strict letter it seemed that there is religious freedom, and there was a strong protest in the United States, and particularly Monsignor Sheen

had a very strong, very well documented article in "America" where he proved by facts that officially the old policy, mostly the educational policy in schools, universities and so forth, was spreading atheism, so-called scientific atheism and so forth, and this religious freedom that theoretically seems to be respected in fact and in practice is very much violated.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. It means in practice those who are against all religions are stronger than those who are in favour of some religions. Is that what it means? A. I have enumerated those tenets in this report. This point is important for our particular aspect.

"Revolutionary propaganda through the communist international, stirring up communist activities in foreign countries in order to cause strikes, riots, sabotage, bloodshed and civil war;"

Destruction of all forms of representative or democratic governments, including civil liberties . . .

The ultimate and final objective is by means of world revolution to establish the dictatorship of the so-called proletariat into one world union of Soviet socialist republics with the capital at Moscow."

Certainly there is a great similarity of conditions in the United States and Canada and I think the policy of the American communist party is practically the same as the platform of our Canadian communist party; so, the conclusions of that American report express fairly well the real tendencies of our Canadian communist party. We have to note very carefully these points of the report: "Revolutionary propoganda . . . in order to cause strikes, riots, sabotage, bloodshed and civil war. Destruction of all forms of representative or democratic governments, including civil liberties. . ."

This report was printed in 1936. Now, some defenders

or sympathizers of communism may argue in recent years they have drafted a new constitution less radical, repudiated force and violence.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. Have we got any constitution of that kind? A. I heard a new constitution for the Canadian communist party was drafted in 1937. It was said this morning in this committee--

MR. MARTIN: That is right.

WITNESS: I think there is no great difference in the platform, and moreover this is the last point I shall try to emphasize. Even if in the words of that constitution they do not express explicitly this tendency to violent revolution, by the very logic of their doctrine they are forced to go to some violent revolution at some time at least --

BY MR. MARTIN:

Q. Would you allow me to interrupt you for a moment? (Off the record.) A. It is said now they have a new policy, a pre-war policy that seems to forget completely their revolutionary plans and now they want to support the full war effort and so forth. But I want to say in this last part of my report that by the very logic of their doctrine, you see, they are still pushed to violent revolution, whatever may be the words of their new constitution. We know that after 1935 in all countries, even in America, but mostly in Europe, the communists, on the instructions given by Dimitof, the famous secretary of the international communists, have carried out the programme of common front, "popular front" against fascism; in some countries, like in Spain and France, they have realized a coalition of the left-parties; communists were presenting a programme less radical and warmly democratic; they practised the "out-stretched hand policy" even towards catholics; they were

shouting as a slogan "for bread, for freedom and for democracy."

I spent my summer vacation in Paris in 1936. I read those pamphlets many times. They were warm supporters of democracy. The famous slogan of Maurice Torres, the secretary, was that which I have just given. This same Torres, when the war broke out, went to Germany and for one year, 1939 until the fall of France, every evening from a German station he was broadcasting an address to the workers saying, "French workers don't be fooled; it is a capitalistic war," and so forth. He was practising sabotage. Now, at that time they had received instructions in all the countries of the world to make a coalition of all the left-parties, to prepare the ground and afterwards they would develop their own programmes. But we are not to be deceived by these tactics and this strategy; communists were not giving us their fundamental purpose. Popular front coalition was just a better way of penetration and of "boring in"; for example, you remember the sad story of the popular front in France; after the electoral victory of April 1936 communists refused to enter the Blum cabinet; they were offered some posts as ministers but they refused and immediately after they started the famous "sit-down strikes"; they started disorders of all kinds and so forth, and in June 1936 they were on the verge of attempting the "coup de force ou coup d'Etat." That is well documented in this book by Jacques Bardoux. He proves by documents they were planning a real "coup d'Etat" but at the last moment they received a telegram from Moscow saying, "You have to postpone it, the army is not ready, and the farmers and the peasants are not ready." You remember those very tragic events. And that very night the ministry was informed of the plot. Leon Blum was rather hesitating and the Minister of Work, Mr. Salengro stood up and was very much indignant and said, "We

have to resist, and we have to call the army immediately." He said to the Prime Minister, "If you do not go I will go myself." The poor man was either killed or he died. There is something very mysterious about his death. Two months after I heard the story in France from a French father who said probably he was assassinated by the communists in vengeance because he discovered the plot and at the right moment he was ready to act and to resist. I do not know.

I say we cannot trust the democratic creed of the communists; their profession of democratic faith is just a preliminary part of their real platform, a sort of strategic move that wins many supporters and sympathizers, who otherwise would be frightened by the open declaration of the final issue of communism. Of course, for a time, during a period of preparation, communists may advocate democratic methods, but these democratic methods are just a preliminary work. I should say they are just a springboard to jump into the famous dictatorship of the proletariat. I want to insist on this point: whatever may be the work of approach, legal or illegal, democratic or undemocratic, real communism, according to the classical doctrine of Marx, Engels and Lenin, cannot escape this crucial period and must come to this decisive phase: "the dictatorship of the proletariat." Now, what means the dictatorship of the proletariat? It is something very different from our democracy; it is the absolute power of one party, or more exactly the unlimited and totalitarian power of a few men, leaders of the unique official party of the wage-workers; a power highly concentrated and merciless, crushing systematically all resistance and all opponents, using force, violence and terror to impose the new mode of life, during a long period of time, until the golden, and we may say the utopian age of communism may become possible.

Now, I may support this statement by another quotation from Lenin. You would find these quotations very easily and very well presented in a recent book by Dr. Chandler, entitled "The Clash of Political Ideals," at page 182. There is a very nice anthology in these books on Lenin. He is very frank on Lenin on this point. He says:

"Progressive development .. towards communism marches through the dictatorship of the proletariat; and cannot do otherwise, tfor there is no one else who can break the resistance of the exploiting capitalists, and no other way of doing it. And the dictatorship of the proletariat will produce a series of restrictions of liberty in the case of the oppressors, exploiters and capitalists."

Please let us note these very strong words:

"We must crush them in order to free humanity from wage-slavery; their resistance must be broken by force. It is clear that where there is suppression there must also be violence, and there cannot be liberty or democracy."

I think these words are quite clear, and I can bring many other quotations of this kind at this time.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. I take it from what you say that you also agree with the witness who spoke before you that in your belief the communist party should always have been illegal and always should be illegal? A. Yes, in fact, I think so, sir, but I think that mostly during the war. I think the war is a new motive, if we want one, a new motive concerning the other reasons for maintaining the ban.

Q. I wish you would explain that.

(BB follows)

A. As for me, that is my conviction; it is, really, in the deep sense of the word, subversive; it is a real menace to all our institutions.

Q. Why is it more dangerous at the present time than before the war? A. At the present time there is the problem of the efficiency of the war effort and there is more particularly the crucial problem of the after the war period. If you allow these gentlemen to spread the booklets and poison the minds of the workers, and their magazines and ideas and so forth, they will promote class hatred in the after war period; that would be terrible.

MR. MCKINNON: Probably in a democracy we could afford a laxity of this kind during a peace period, but during war time it is something which we cannot afford to have?

WITNESS: Yes, that is it.

BY MR. MARTIN:

Q. Do you admit the correctness of the objective; do you think that by putting some of these people in jail you are stopping that? A. At least, sir, I think you do not completely stop it but you diminish very much their propaganda by booklets and so forth as compared to what they would do if they had full freedom to spread their booklets.

Q. That is the whole question we have to face, and it is not an easy one. I do not know that it necessarily really means much. You see, we have interned communists, some communists, and we have made the communist party illegal; but really, so far as the real force of the communist party is concerned it has never been interned, and they are of a different form, the real communist is not the man who makes the speech on the corner. I am not afraid very much of those fellows who are interned. There are others who are much more potent, and some of them are in important places? A. Yes.

Q. Some of them are very well educated people? A. Yes,

I know they are.

Q. And I am not convinced yet, unless you can make out a case, that we are going to stop them by interning the more vocal among them.

A. But don't you admit that with full legality they will openly and freely have their newspapers, for example, the famous Daily Clarion, or in Montreal "L'Etat", their daily newspapers passing among the workers; and, moreover they will spread as freely as possible their propaganda booklets and pamphlets.

Q. Right at this time when it is illegal they are publishing their papers and we are receiving them right here in parliament.

A. But they are more or less limited.

Q. They are doing it more now than ever.

A. I think you are right when you say that it is quite impossible to stop everything, but I think this ban is an important check on a good part of their propaganda, particularly booklets, newspapers and things of that kind.

BY MR. BENCE:

Q. Of course they can't advocate overthrow by force; if they do that they would be subject to prosecution in the criminal courts?

A. That is the point.

Q. All right; therefore you can't worry about the type of booklet they are sending out if in these books and booklets they advocate the overthrow then you can do something about them?

A. Very probably at this particular time they will not declare that openly.

Q. No.

A. But I think with legality they will keep on professing their Marxian theories more or less, and they will continue to poison the minds of all workers and prepare their various rights.

Q. I put this question to you: do you not consider that newspapers such as the Canadian Tribune, which was the

successor to the Daily Clarion, has gained in circulation, in prestige and in the extent of its value as far as creating public sympathy for these people is concerned, more by the fact that the communist party is illegal? A. Well, I confess I do not know very much about that, that is a local magazine.

Q. You do not know that? A. No.

MR. BENICE: It is published in the city of Toronto.

BY MR. MCKINNON:

Q. Their whole propoganda, prior to Russia getting into the war, has been that we were putting labor leaders in concentration camps for no other purpose than because they were labor leaders; and that we were tying to them the stigma of communism and on that ground putting them away. After Russia got into the war they reversed that and enlarged on the fact that they were all anti-fascists, and that these interned labor leaders who were anti-fascists could be a wonderful assistance to us, so they say that we are keeping them interned when we are fighting for our lives, and that they would be only too pleased if they were released so that they could jump onto the valiant band waggon and help us fight. Now, one result of that has been to attract quite a number of intellectuals who ordinarily I do not suppose would pay much attention to them, and to develop their sympathy toward their point of view; and they are no doubt making contributions also. There are quite a number of labor organizations who are absolutely opposed to communism in every way shape and form who have been worked up to the idea that this government are definitely anti-labor and are doing everything they possibly can to keep these people interned just because they are labor men; and these are not easy things to combat; and these things are getting before the country -- of course we know it is

propaganda -- but we are getting resolutions from all these labor organizations which we know are not communistic.

A. I think that is another aspect of the question which relates to individual persons. I confess that for my part I am not ready to make any suggestions about that. It seems to me that those particular cases must be examined fully; but I think what is more important is the question of principle, to give legality to this party. That, it seems to me, is a most important question. I do not want to discuss or make any suggestions about the treatment of individual persons. I think we have to examine those cases and if there is a failure, or some doubtful cases, there should be a fair trial or a re-examination -- I don't know.

Q. I will put it to you this way, I will give you an example: suppose there is a man who is a communist and admits it and he is interned over here in the Hull jail. He is of military age and he says look here now I want to get out of here and I want to join the Canadian army, I want to do my bit to help out in this war effort; what would you say of a man who put that proposition to you? A. Well, suppose he gives a promise not to make propaganda, communistic propaganda, I think -- and this is just an opinion -- he might be released on condition that he will not exercise propaganda, but he is to be carefully watched and if again he is openly preaching communism he may be again arrested.

Q. He might turn around and reverse his position entirely when he gets into the army and start preaching conservative propanda, he might attack the government for everything they are doing and blame them for all the changes; that would be creating distrust in another way which would be quite as effective, wouldn't it? A. Yes -- I confess, when it comes to persons, that is another aspect of the question and I am not ready to make any suggestion on that.

Q. They are difficult things to answer; we are finding it very difficult, I am sure. A. For me the main point is this: the maintenance of this ban, because if they again attain full legality they would certainly spread out more and more of this propaganda; they would spread again the propaganda of the communist party and they would be a legal party.

Now, may I just finish what I was quoting, these words from Lenin, it says: "Progressive development.... towards communism marches through the dictatorship of the proletariat; and it cannot do otherwise, for there is no one else who can break the resistance of exploiting capitalists, and no other way of doing it. And the dictatorship of the proletariat will produce a series of restrictions of liberty in the case of the oppressor, exploiters and capitalists. We must crush them in order to free humanity from wage laboring; their resistance must be broken by force. It is clear that where there is suppression there must also be violence, and there cannot be liberty or democracy. And we have the same belief in the recent statement by the famous commissar of justice, Krylenko, reporting on the new laws and the new constitutions said: "The methods of dictatorship remain the same, based on the implacable suppression of adversaries and on terror, and in perfect agreement with the ideas of Lenin". And that is taken from Izvesta, in the issue of February 12, 1936.

MR. BERTRAND: From reading; the book which I mentioned just a few moments ago it would appear that the communist party of Russia is really only a minority.

MR. MCKINNON: Yes, I understand that there are only about a couple of million of them in Russia.

WITNESS: This communist party of course is a very small minority.

MR. MCKINNON: Yes, only about two million.

WITNESS: Yes, there are chapters in the book by Davis,

"Mission to Moscow", here.

MR. MARTIN: If we are going to state that we must state the question correctly, that is not Davis' thesis; what he said was those gentlemen who were purged were plotting with Germany the overthrow of the U.S.S.R.

WITNESS: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: Whether that is true or not that is another conclusion.

MR. ROSS: They all had trials and they all had a chance to make their defence.

MR. BERTRAND: They had a chance to say, yes, we did it.

MR. ROSS: No, they had a better chance than that, according to the papers.

MR. BERTRAND: I have attended a good many trials in Montreal and I have never been at a trial where the accused was willing to say that he was guilty.

MR. MARTIN: There is another book by a lady writer who has spent considerable time in Russia herself, and she said that the reason why these men at the purge trials made confessions, that they did so because of their families who were promised amnesty if these gentlemen would make confessions. That is the other side of it.

MR. ROSS: Davis does not mention that.

MR. MARTIN: No, he does not mention that.

MR. BERTRAND: No, it is almost against human nature to say to the accused you are going to be called for trial immediately and if you will be good enough to admit your guilt we will see that you are shot.

WITNESS: I will just finish these remarks, if I may: this dictatorship of the proletariat is called by communists the real democracy; and so, they are playing on the words and covering their minds with equivocations when they say that communism will not subvert democracy; of course, communism

is tending straight to this strange form of democracy that is called the dictatorship of the proletariat. They are right for those who accept this equation: real democracy is the same as dictatorship of the proletariat. But are we ready to accept this equation? Is it fair to identify democracy with a ruthless dictatorship, crushing by violence and force any form of opposition? As someone wisely remarked, the so-called dictatorship of the proletariat necessarily becomes the dictatorship over the proletariat and over all the citizens.

Before concluding I would like to quote a passage from Mr. Churchill; I find this quotation in the book of Dr. O'Brien, Thunder from the Left, p. 142; Mr. Churchill gives a very exact picture of communist strategy. He writes: "Communism is not only a creed. It is a plan of campaign. At first the time-honoured principles of liberalism and democracy are invoked to shelter the infant organism. Free speech, the right of public meeting, every form of lawful political agitation and constitutional right are paraded and asserted. Alliance is sought with every popular movement towards the Left. The creation of a mild liberal or socialist regime in some period of convulsion is the first milestone. But no sooner has this been created than it is to be overthrown. Woes and scarcity resulting from confusion must be exploited. Collisions if possible attended with bloodshed, are to be arranged between the agents of the new government and the working people, Martyrs are to be manufactured. And then, when the time is ripe and the moment opportune every form of lethal violence from mob revolt to private ass assassination must be used without stint or compunction". Mr. Churchill seems to describe fairly well this strategy of the popular front.

MR. MARTIN: That passage is to be found in the book of Mr. Churchill entitled, "Great Contemporaries".

WITNESS: I am glad to know that. And so, hon. gentlemen, to conclude, please excuse me for having been too long. I would like to have quoted some passages from the well-known encyclica of Pope Pius the Eleventh: Divini Redemptoris. But I just express the substance of this message in a few words. Communism is not only a mere economic system, or a form of political dictatorship, but it is a militaristic philosophy of life, a kind of "Welt-anshauung", a conception of life that is opposed to all our ways of life, to all the liberties we cherish. Communism is a challenge to our religious freedom, to the dignity of our family life, to economic and political freedom. Our present system badly needs many reforms, capitalism, has been rotten by many abuses; we must work for a better social order, but communism is not a remedy to our evils, communism is poison; and it is a false conception of democratic freedom to let people spread poison. Are there any questions?

MR. MARTIN: It is quite obvious from the very excellent presentation you have given -- you are obviously an educated man and a man who knows a lot about history -- do you know of any historical circumstance that would help you in your thesis, that the way to stop this poison (and it is poisonous) is by let us say the padlock method -- and I do not use the word padlock in the literal sense but rather in the sense of whole-sale restraint.

WITNESS: Of course, you mentioned that point this morning to Mr. Penverne. You are perfectly right, the negative method is not sufficient. The strategy against communism cannot be limited to the banning of the communist party and to the incarceration of those men. We have to work for a better social order. There is the old policy programme, and on this point I perfectly agree with you, sir; that there is much to do to correct the abuse of our present system and to realize a better social order; more particularly to uplift the poorer classes. That is a vast programme; but it seems to me that while promoting this

social programs in the different provinces, if Communism is a real danger by its intense propaganda, it seems to me that the negative method assists at least in so far as it helps to check this propaganda.

MR. McKINNON: We are all striving for that better day. What do you think of the British method of ridicule? Don't you think that ought to be given a lot of worthwhile consideration; that is, if you can bring something out in the open and show to the public just what it is and what it stands for, that they have enough common horse-sense to realize what it is all about and not be influenced? That is the Old Country method, the British method; of ridiculing them. What do you think about that?

WITNESS: There is just this point, sir, they have put a ban on their paper, the Daily Worker. Sincerely I think it would not be enough to throw ridicule on the communists of the country, because there are so many of the people simple, I may say; and those that suffer from unemployment and so forth, who if you leave them free will suffer from this propaganda and I think that inevitably many will be poisoned by it.

MR. BERTRAND: It would be very difficult to go out and ridicule the communist system today from our own point of view, especially in England; because people would say you have not been so successful yourselves, and you are not so successful yourself against your own men.

MR. MARTIN: That would be a terrible admission, one that I would not care to make.

MR. BERTRAND: That would be necessary.

MR. McKINNON: You are speaking from a military standpoint?

MR. BERTRAND: Yes.

MR. MARTIN: Russia has tried to stop religion. They passed laws for the closing of the churches, but they did not succeed

BB-10

in closing the churches.

WITNESS: No, fortunately they did not. They did not succeed in shutting religion out of the lives of the citizens, many of them pray privately and secretly en famille, and so forth. But for the public, officially, I think there is very little now in Russia.

MR. HAZEN: I think the Dean of Cantebury in the book which he published stated that the Russians have the right to worship as they see fit, and they have the right to attend churches. He devotes some little time to that.

CC-1 follows.

A. Is it the famous book of Dr. Johnston, the Dean of Canterbury?

Q. Yes. A. I confess I read a few. They were selling in Canada. They were produced in Canada in the Canadian Forum.

Q. That is right. A. Somebody brought it to me. They were selling them in Montreal.

Q. The socialists got it out. A. It seems to me very partial and very exaggerated.

Q. I agree with you. A. It is very exaggerated because he said, "Well, these difficulties are just a misunderstanding, and by making an effort to understand their point of view, we may come to a perfect agreement." That is very very optimistic; too optimistic, I think.

Q. I think he was leaning over backwards. A. Yes.

Q. He did make the statement that they had the right to worship as they saw fit and to attend church. A. Yes. He may have been sincere in his statement, but I think he is outside of the facts.

MR. BERTRAND: There have been public prayers in Moscow very recently asking God to help the army. I understand that some of these officials have been there.

MR. MARTIN: Let us hope that God answers their prayer.

WITNESS: There is the possibility of return to religious tolerance, I think. But in that case they would have to leave, I should say, the straight original Marxism, because Marxism in itself is bitterly anti-religious. The same with their socialism. They have socialism, of course, but it is a mitigated socialism. It is a kind of compromise between public ownership and private ownership. In their system, for example, the land is under public ownership. It is rather a corporative ownership, something not clearly defined. But every farmer is the owner of his

own little house, his ishba, as they say. He has some animals, some domestic animals, some little cattle, and some objects in his private possessions. They acknowledge the right of inheritance and so forth. In their factories they have different scales of wages. This is not communism, not by any means.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. There is not a very great danger that our people here will go to the extremes that the Russians have gone, because we are living free in this country, and the reaction will never be as strong as it was there where they could not breathe without the permission of the Czar.

A. Yes.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. Since 1938 have you noticed any change in the policy of the so-called Canadian Communist party? Have you noticed any difference or change from what it was before 1938? A. I confess that I think there is no important change.

Q. This morning Mr. Penverne filed some pamphlets, some sheets, some little letters written by or on behalf of the Canadian Communist party and the Canadian Communist League, up to June 6, 1941. A. Yes.

Q. Apparently from reading the headlines or the titles of these articles or publications they advocate the same thing as was advocated prior to 1938. If there was a change of attitude or a change of policy or a separation from the third international, I have seen nothing yet of their publications up to June, 1941, to impress me that there was any real change in their policy or their attitude towards capitalism and towards society and democracy. A. Yes.

Q. You know of nothing that would have attracted your attention towards such a change? A. No. But on

this particular point, if you will allow me, on this so-called separation from the third international -- and we sometimes have heard that statement -- I think there is no evidence at all of that. I think that nobody can bring documents to prove that. Moreover, there is positive proof against it. First, I talked about these things recently with Father Ledit, who is very well informed on Russia. He remarked that every time you have a group or an individual who is breaking officially with the third international, immediately all over the world he is cursed and denounced as a traitor, as a renegade. Take for instance, Jacques Doriot. Jacques Doriot was secretary for the French party. He left the party. Immediately all over the world, in Canada and everywhere, he was denounced. They were calling Jacques Doriot a traitor, a renegade. Another example is Benjamin Gitlow. He was secretary for many years of the American Communist party. He left the party. What happened? Immediately they denounced him all over the continent, as a traitor, a renegade and so forth, that he was a slave of the capitalists. He answered them in his famous book, "I confess the truth about communism." Suppose our Canadian party had broken officially its connection with Moscow and the third international. Immediately at least from the United States you would have had a storm about it. They would have been denounced as traitors, as renegades and so forth. As far as I know, we have heard nothing of this. Moreover, a positive symptom, we might say, of their alliance is this new enthusiasm for war. If they had broken with the Moscow international, how could you explain this new enthusiasm for war immediately after the entry of Russia into the war?

2. That is if they had really and truly broken or separated from the Russian communists in 1938, how can they explain their attitude towards war or their sympathy

towards the attitude of Russia until Russia was attacked by Germany? A. Yes. Everything is suggestive that they still are just a branch of the third international communists whose centre is Moscow.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. About two months ago -- I cannot give you the exact date -- there was an article in the American magazine "Life." It took the form of a series of questions that were asked of Sir Stafford Cripps. A. Yes.

Q. One of those questions -- I have not the article before me and of course cannot quote the exact words -- was to this effect: Does Moscow or does the present government in Russia have as its policy to attempt to interfere with the governments of other countries, to change their form of government by force? Sir Stafford Cripps answered that question at some length, and his answer was to the effect that the Russian government policy was to do no such thing. Did you see that article in that magazine, and the answer? A. Yes. This is not a new statement, because it has been repeated many times that there was a clear separation between the third international and the Soviet government. It has been many times demonstrated that there is a very intimate link, because the main supporters and the very high officials of the third international are Russians residing in Moscow.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. And the financial support? A. Yes. In their congress, I think the large majority of the members of this international congress are Russians. I mean, officially, in the facade, as they say, they may say these are different, that this is the Russian government and the other is just the international organization. But in fact, there are many links, and I think it has been proved many times that this distinction or separation is not a real separation.

Q. Indeed there is a theoretical separation between the doctrine of communism and the Soviet government. The Soviet government is trying to put into actual practice the teaching or the real Soviet principle, the real principles of communism. A. Yes.

Q. Maybe not 100 per cent, because all theories of that kind cannot be implemented to the limit of fully 100 per cent. But there is always a margin of theory against practice. A. Yes.

MR. MARTIN: It seems to me that there is a refinement to your question, Mr. Chairman, which you should put to the Father, and which I do not think has been considered. I think the evidence before this committee to date -- as far as I am concerned, at any rate--establishes that the ideology of the Communist party in Canada is the same as the ideology of Marxist communism as attempted to be practiced and as understood in the USSR today. But there is this refinement that I think we have to consider, and this will be the issue which will face this committee, I think. Even though that may be the case, and even though the evidence is clear that up until June of 1941 the communists in Canada did everything they could to hurt the cause of the United Nations, the fact is that now they find themselves in a position where they can be true to that ideology since June 6, 1941, and do all they can to assist in our war effort since that date, because it happens to coincide with the war aims of the present USSR. The question that faces us is this. Are we to acknowledge that as being the fact? I think the evidence is clear that they are anxious, as long as Russia stays in the war, to do all they can to help the United Nations, through helping Russia.

THE CHAIRMAN: That is right. You have hit the nail on the head there. They are satisfied to side with us in the war effort not because they desire the winning of

the war by Britain or the United States, but because they want to see Russia victorious in this war, and want to see the principles of communism triumph in a country where they are implemented or trying to be implemented. From that, are we not justified in still being a little bit hesitant and suspicious about people who obviously work on that basis? Are we not justified in being suspicious that, notwithstanding that they work along with us in this war, they want to take advantage of their effort, to keep their standing and be in a better position to implement their policies and their method of operation as soon as the war is over; in other words, keep the goodwill of the people upon whom they must work.

MR. MARTIN: I think that is the issue.

MR. BERTRAND: The Soviet government never asked officially that we release these men.

THE CHAIRMAN: We must be careful about sabotage of the communists, if they are allies in our country. They may change or adopt different methods. Sabotage can be done by blowing up buildings, but it also can be done by blowing up the attitude or views of people towards certain social and economic views while fighting alongside of them. That is what we must be careful of, and that is the kind of sabotage we must watch. That is my view.

MR. BERTRAND: Take the war loan, if we have another war loan.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BERTRAND: Consider the trouble they might give to this country by trying to sabotage the war loan.

MR. MARTIN: In answer to that, may I say that I doubt if they will try to do that because, for the time being, it is convenient for them to support the war in its totality. I should like to say this -- and this will be off the record.

THE CHAIRMAN: Very well.

(Off the record)

MR. MARTIN: The other issue, Mr. Chairman, I think is for us to be satisfied whether we can curb communism even now during the war and at the end of the war best by following the British practice or continuing our own. That seems to be the main problem that confronts us.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. BERTRAND: We have another gentleman to be heard.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. Have you any idea how many communists there are in Montreal and vicinity? A. I could not say exactly as to the number of their effectives now. I could not say.

MR. MARTIN: I will tell you what they are doing in this campaign they have got on now.

MR. BERTRAND: About 10,000.

MR. MARTIN: They are getting a lot of sympathisers. A lot of the C.C.F. people are supporting them, and of course the C.C.F. are not communists. This campaign they have been getting over in the local organizations has won them a lot of moral supporters.

MR. HAZEN: And in the labour unions.

MR. MARTIN: Yes. Take this fellow we had. Don't put this down.

(Off the record)

THE CHAIRMAN: That is exactly their method of operation just now, working through organized labour, not communism; because there they have a foundation, a mass of people together, in order to preach their doctrine. It is the easiest field because there they have found an organization already set up, and people who attend their meetings. All they have to do is go there and preach their doctrine.

CC-8

MR. BERTRAND: Do you receive all these messages that I receive, Mr. Chairman?

THE CHAIRMAN: They are on file.

MR. BERTRAND: There is one here where they say, "Re report, Montreal Star, June 26

THE CHAIRMAN: Don't put that down.

(Off the record)

Now we will hear the next gentleman, unless you have some more questions to ask.

MR. O'NEILL: Oh yes, I have.

THE CHAIRMAN: Pardon me. Mr. O'Neill has some questions.

DD-1 follows

MR. O'NEILL: The witness seems to be very very well informed. There has been from time to time somewhat of a difference especially between Soviet Republic and the Third International, and I should like to know what is the origin and the meaning of the expression or term "Third International."

WITNESS: Because there were two others. The first one, as you know, was founded by Marx himself and his friend Frederich Engels in 1864 at London, and from this International there were numbers of the different nations which resulted more or less in the famous Commune of Paris in 1871.

BY MR. MARTIN:

Q. Marx was exiled? A. He lived in England from 1848 until his death in 1883; he was exiled.

BY MR. O'NEILL:

Q. A German? A. A German. He was exiled with his friend and collaborator Frederich Engels. They founded the First International. The second one was a re-establishing of the Commune of Paris. Some years after, about 1883, I may say, they rebuilt the Second International and you know all the great social democratic parties were linked to this International until the war. During the other war it was more or less broken but re-established in 1921 and had its centre at Amsterdam, and one of the main presidents, at least for many years, was the famous Van der Velde. You had at the same time this Second International from Amsterdam grouping in its federation all the socialist parties, mostly socialist parties of France with Leon Blum as leader, the socialist party of Belgium with Leon Blum and others, and you had the Third International, the red one they called it, the third, because Lenin wanted to create something more radical, new machinery; and I tried to describe this morning

the violent antagonism between the two. They were laughing at the other one; they called it the Yellow International and they called theirs the Red International, which means something radical and strong; and for years and years there was a split and continuous attacks, you see. Now, however, by new strategy in 1935 they tried to realize the famous common front, the popular front, mostly in France and Spain. You know in Britain for a long time they attempted to link the labour party with the left wing of the communist party, and more especially the famous Sir Walter Citrine was always opposed to this coalition. I must say Britain during those days of hysteria common front, kept cool blood; but they worked on it for a long time. There were meetings to obtain a coalition between the labour party in Britain and the communist party, but they never succeeded in England --

BY MR. MARTIN:

Q. Cripps was opposed to Citrine and he lost his membership in the labour party because of it. ^{A.} They gave it the name of the Third International to distinguish it from the second, that was too easy going, as they say, too obsolete.

BY MR. HAZEN:

Q. Did I understand you to say the third was in 1921?
A. It was re-established and reorganized after the war because -- this is quite funny -- before the war took place in 1910 and 1912 they were very active in all the congresses, the socialists were pledging that in case of war they would fight against the military budget to stop the war; but immediately in 1914 the socialist-German party, the French-socialist party, did everything for the war, and so during the war it was broken; but after the war they tried to rebuild it again, to rebuild this federation. It was a federation of the socialist parties of Europe. As you know,

they had their first meeting in Moscow. In 1919 the Third International began to function, and the next year they had another congress and during that congress drafted very definitely the famous constitution. So at that conference were drawn up the famous 21 articles for the admission of the international parties. This international is a confederation. In these articles Lenin made a very strong speech, and he said very frankly in this speech, "Our task is to overthrow the bourgeoisie by violence, and we have to crush every resistance." His words are strong, very very strong. That is the story in a few words. Since that time you have the international branches of the Red International always fighting against socialistic trade unions until the famous policy of the common front that was realized in Spain and in France in 1936. You remember the date. The first election of the front popular in Spain took place in February. At that time they formed a coalition and presented a common programme and they won the election in April of the same year. In France again there was a coalition between these three big parties, between the communist party and the socialist parties and Leon Blum and the radical party of Deladier and they won an election; but you know what followed, the troubles and serious disorders.

BY MR. BERTRAND:

Q. Have you had occasion to study the relations between the communist party and the C.I.O. in the United States?

A. I may say I have read different American magazines, but it is pretty hard to pronounce a definite statement on the C.I.O., although I think it can be said there was and there still is a communistic penetration. Some of the high officials are real communists.

BY MR. MARTIN:

Q. The president of the C.I.O. is a Catholic?

A. Mr. Phillip Murray is a Catholic.

MR. MCKINNON: He is not the president.

MR. MARTIN: Surely he is.

WITNESS: He was president for a time.

THE CHAIRMAN: He was for a time.

MR. MARTIN: He still is.

WITNESS: I say it is very mixed up. There were very some very important members who really were communists, others are not.

THE CHAIRMAN: This is exactly what happened in the United States, and it is exactly the sequence of what happened in Germany, France and Belgium and Russia. The labour unions which had socialistic tendencies, socialistic programmes, socialized their organizations, were organized on a moderate basis in all countries. Then a radical element developed in them, in the labour parties and formed the radical wing, and it is that radical wing which formed the communist party of the Third International in Russia.

WITNESS: That is so.

THE CHAIRMAN: And then the less radical in Germany, France and in Belgium joined with them at the time of the formation of the common front in 1936?

WITNESS: That is the real story.

THE CHAIRMAN: But the Red communists, as distinguished from the Yellow communists of Europe, is simply the radical wing of socialism. They became too violent in advocating methods that the other people could not follow and would not follow.

WITNESS: That is it.

THE CHAIRMAN: And definitely in England the labour party kept clear of that because as I said this morning they were

established on a sound foundation and they had a keel.

WITNESS: That is the fact.

THE CHAIRMAN: The C.I.O. is the radical wing of the labour party. It is not 100 per cent radical, but one of the main reasons for separation from the Federation of Labour, which was a purely labour party was that it was radical.

MR. O'NEILL: Adopted the slogan of the U.M.W. and the O.B.U.

MR. MARTIN: It would be unfortunate to leave on the record that the C.I.O. was a communist organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: No, it is not a communist organization, but it is very left wing in social matters, more so than the Federation of Labour.

MR. ROSS: It is primarily a labour organization.

THE CHAIRMAN: It is.

MR. ROSS: And the socialist party is more a political organization.

MR. BERTRAND: A labour organization with communist ways of governing.

MR. MARTIN: I would not agree with that.

MR. O'NEILL: Unfortunately the C.I.O. adopted the slogans of the U.M.W. and the O.B.U.

MR. MacINNIS: I am not objecting to this discussion, but I think it is a waste of paper.

MR. DUPUIS: Before the witness retires may I ask him a question?

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. Are you conversant with the communistic activities in Montreal amongst poor families? It has been said that the communist party goes to the poor families and asks them if they have sufficient food or if the children have any shoes? A. I confess no, because you see, I was out of the country for many years, for six years. I just came back

in 1940. I am a poor professor, very busy with my books. I confess I cannot talk a great deal on the practical activities; but I heard about that. Personally I have no contact, I may say, with these activities.

BY MR. MacINNIS:

Q. You are a Canadian? A. Yes.

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. On the point of communism, is there any reason why it should be ^{good} enough for England, or let me put it this way, if it is a good thing in England to give the communists freedom of action and freedom of speech, would it also be wise to give them absolute freedom of speech in Canada? What I am trying to get at is this: is there any reason why we should have one rule in England and a different rule in Canada? A. I think Mr. Penverne this morning made a very nice statement. He said everything depends on particular conditions in the different countries. Now, he mentioned one of those conditions. He said possibly the classes are better prepared and better instructed against that. I would add another reason. We are a new country; we have many new Canadian citizens. I do not want to be offensive to anyone, but it is a fact there was a very intense immigration after the other war. Many Canadian citizens have no root, I may say, in our soil. There is a particular danger again. I do not want to offend any nationality but take, for example, the Ukrainians. They are scattered all over the country and especially in the west. Then, there is a large body in Montreal. These men are newcomers in Canada. They may be more exposed to this propaganda because they have not this attachment to old Canadian citizenship. These points of view, I think, are worth while.

MR. ROSS: There are a great many continental Europeans in England, too, particularly in London.

MR. HAZEN: Oh, no.

MR. MARTIN: Yes, there is a tremendous amount.

MR. BERTRAND: You cannot give the same medicine to every man who has the same sickness.

WITNESS: I think we must not forget this point: if they have not declared the communist party illegal at least they have put a ban on the paper, the "Daily Worker"; so that is something at least. We can say that in England now by jacking the paper up at least they have shaded communist propaganda.

MR. MARTIN: I agree with you in part. For instance, take the C.I.O. in Windsor.

(EE follows)

Mr. Albert Charpentier, President of the Federation of Catholic Workers of Canada, called:

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. Do you represent a labor organization in Quebec?

A. Yes. Our object is Catholic labor organization. We have trade unions all over Canada; for instance, we have one in Ottawa here, and we have syndicates, as we call them, in practically every Catholic community throughout Canada, but more particularly in Quebec.

Q. It is purely a labor organization? A. Oh yes, it is. I may say briefly that our confederation does not limit itself in accepting practising Catholic people; we admit workers of any religious race or creed. It is our principle to adhere to the encyclical principle, and we get our distinction through being a catholic labor movement. My presentation will not be very long because you have heard two masterpieces before me. I will simply make a few brief observations and then submit to you a resolution which we adopted at a meeting of our executive about eight days ago.

BY MR. McKINNON:

Q. What is your membership? A. Roundly speaking, 50,000.

Q. That is in all different kinds of industry? A. Yes. We did have 215 local syndicates and 12 industrial federations, and 7 city trade councils.

Q. What I meant by that is that you are in the pulp and paper industry, and so on? A. Yes, we are in the pulp and paper industry, the building industry, the clothing industry, the boot and shoe industry -- in short I would say in about 40 different districts.

BY MR. ROSS:

Q. And you are exclusively Canadian? A. We are exclusively Canadian. Generally speaking our syndicates are known as

national Catholic syndicates. I would like to make this distinction with respect to our organization clear to you: the difference between our movement and the other mutual labour organizations -- and I mean by that the non-religious labor movements -- we know they never speak of religion or of having certain religious principles and so on, or admitting chaplains to their meetings; whilst we do have these Catholic principles and admit chaplains. That is the difference between our movement and the others; and, moreover, we are strictly Canadian. We have always been opposed to communistic propaganda in our province, especially since the inception of the communist party in this country and more particularly in Quebec.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. Pardon me, may I interrupt? A. Yes.

Q. You say that you have been opposing the communist movement in Quebec; in what way and by what methods have you opposed them? A. Through the starting of our trade principles, of course, of strictly organizing the workers on trade union lines, economic lines; and in establishing closer collaboration with the employers, negotiating, collective bargaining, and so on; and in showing to the workers, especially the French-Canadian workers which are the big majority in our trade unions, the falsehood of the principles of the communists and the seditious meaning of their movement.

Q. And the seditious meaning of their movement? A. Yes. and we were of course popularizing the principles and ideas advocated by our leaders, our Catholic leaders, amongst the people. Amongst our people we have been trying to popularize the Catholic doctrine against communism. It has been admitted that it was mainly through the efforts of our movement that the expansion of the communistic movement in the province of Quebec was stopped; and I think we were much more active in that

regard than any other kind of labor movement, and that was because of the special effort we made. At least, many statements to that effect have been made by people in high places and in different spheres of social and political life. I can give you an example of that in 1939; if I remember well, we combined with other national organizations of the province, specially those in Montreal, to organize a big rally against communistic propaganda especially in the district of Montreal; and we asked the Trade and Labor Council of Montreal which is an international union, a labor movement in Montreal, to participate in that rally, and at the preliminary meeting to organize that rally we had a representative of the Trade and Labor Council of Montreal and he definitely undertook that his organization would be represented at that rally, but when it came to be held they were not there. Why? The explanation is this, in that movement there are many communists who were exerting a very important influence in an effort to maintain their offices -- they had to count on the support of these communists in their councils but they did not like to disclose that -- they also were pretty good friends with the communist leaders in Montreal; we very often found them side by side in different special organizations and meetings sponsored or supported by the communist party in Montreal.

MR. BERTRAND: That was especially the case in the clothing industry.

WITNESS: You are right. Now, they were in a hurry to expell them from their movement the moment the Canadian government declared the communist party illegal, but prior to that time they never denounced them or interfered with them in any way. We may say, however, that in our own movement, the Catholic labor movement we made a canvass of our membership and where we found that certain members were making violent

speeches or anything of that kind we usually found that they were linked up with the communists, and we knew what to do with them.

(FF follows)

I wish now to draw your attention to that big meeting which took place at the L'Assistance Publique hall in Montreal, Quebec, on May 7.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. On what date? A. May 7th.

Q. Of this year? A. This year.

Q. Where was that located? A. L'Assistance Publique hall, at the corner of Barri and Lagauchetierre streets. There was a meeting organized by the international unions of Montreal called, opening an organizing campaign, an organizing campaign coupled with the war production, an organizing campaign in order to appeal to the employers, to secure their collaboration in order to increase war production through closer relationship and so on. I suspected that communists, people in that movement, helped in organizing that big rally in order to make statements to make confusion, to breed confusion in the minds of those who were present. It was a meeting to foster collaboration in order to show their willingness to increase war production; but hypocritically, of course, at the bottom of it it was called to increase their membership. Some speakers there took occasion of that meeting to attack people in our province for their patriotic expressions, for their patriotic statements.

Q. Regarding the war? A. I mean, they took ^{the} occasion of that meeting to attack people whom they thought to be too slow in fostering the war effort.

Q. Endorsing the war effort? A. Endorsing the war effort, and attacked them as being of the fifth column. There was a man there -- of course, I do not want to quote any names -- who was a great friend of these communists a few years ago during the crisis between 1932, 1935 and 1936 -- a very keen friend of these communists.

Q. Was he a labour leader? A. He was a labour leader, yes. He was in the clothing industry, especially in the cap and hat industry. He is one of the main leaders of that council. On account of that comradeship between that fellow and the communists some years ago, I could easily suspect the communists which are still in that movement, of course, but behave themselves very shrewdly nowadays, of helping to organize that meeting, as I have said, in order to make statements -- and I am repeating myself now -- in order to advance the cause. So they attacked people who seemed to them to be slow in helping the war effort, attacking them as members of the fifth column and asking the government, of course --

Q. To interne them? A. To interne them. The big advertisement that appeared in the French dailies in Montreal to attract workers to come to that meeting stated that workers had to join the international trade union, especially the munitions factories, because in those unions they would find a movement there to defend their homes, their families, their religion, their democratic liberties. Well, it was very funny to read such things in such an advertisement coming from that movement, knowing, of course, of what it was composed and what influences were exerting themselves in it.

For myself, just a week ago, attending a meeting of one of our syndicates at Valleyfield, I was very strange at hearing one of our members violently attacking the employers. I was quite surprised to hear him talking that way. I knew he was a pretty violent fellow, but I never thought he would speak so much against the employers. He could not at all find any good in employers, and he thought that anything was accorded to them in this country, having all privileges, having anything they liked, violating all legislation and so on.

BY MR. DUPUIS:

Q. You do not mean to say that that is the belief of your membership? A. No.

Q. That they do not get justice? A. No, certainly not. There is a way of expressing ourselves in our meetings, usually speaking, which is far different from the manner that man did express himself in.

Q. You did not like his manner? A. Not at all.

BY THE CHAIRMAN:

Q. What did you do? Did you do anything? Did you question this member of your union as to the reasons for his violent attacks on his employers and did you try to find out what was the cause of his attitude or did you simply observe that? A. I told him that he was wrong. I told him that he did not use the legislation, the war labour legislation that we had presently.

Q. Yes? A. And that was the reason why he was so vehemently speaking against the employers. So, of course, I corrected him. I told him he should not be so much violent, that he should know what he says before accusing somebody else.

Q. Did you suspect him of having been inspired by any communist influences? A. Well, within myself, of course; within myself. I could not, of course, accuse him of being such.

Q. You did not pursue your inquiry to check up? A.No.

But I will further on do that investigation about him.

Q. Yes? A. In this country the C.I.O. -- I mean to say the communists which at first infested very much the C.I.O. in the United States and here in this country have been leaving. These communists, I may say, have transferred, most of them, from the old international trade union movement to the new Canadian labour movement. It was called the old Canadian Congress of Labour.

GG-1 follows

From the moment that the Canadian branches, some thirteen C.I.O. units of the international union, were asked to resign from the Canadian Congress of Labor the situation improved. So that we may say that the communistic element in the labor movement in this country has now mostly shifted to the Canadian Congress of Labor. Of course, that is my own opinion and I may be wrong; but according to the facts as I appreciate them in this country at the moment most of them (the communists) are in the Canadian Congress of Labor.

MR. BERTRAND: But you have no evidence of that?

WITNESS: No, we have nothing definite, but we have not got into difficulty with them at all. As far as the activities of the communist party here in Canada are concerned at the present time, as far as we can see it is not affecting to any great extent the war effort. Now, I want to submit to you this statement made by Inspector Harvison, of the federal police at a meeting of the Rotary Club in Montreal some little time ago. He told his audience that at the moment when Russia joined our allies in this war they issued a circular which was an order to the communists that they should start propaganda against the class system in this country and that they should get within the ranks of any progressive youth movement and also secure work in all the war plants, especially amongst youth organizations, and expose and develop ^{to} them in the true role of communism. This has been done recently and if our work is done well we cannot see that it is in any way going to affect our war effort.

Now, if you will permit me, I will simply terminate this short presentation by reading to you this resolution which we adopted about a week ago at a conference of our executive.

STATEMENT

by the Confederation of Catholic Workers of Canada before the Federal Parliament Committee with regards to the National Defence Act. The Confederation of Catholic Workers of Canada holds the view that the National Defence Act must not be amended in order that the communist party be rendered legal in Canada.

WHEREAS that the communist party advocated violent class war in order to achieve the dictatorship of the proletariat is fatal to the interests of the entire nation, and especially of the workmen;

WHEREAS the various communist parties in general, and the Canadian communist party in particular have always opposed, and still oppose this collaboration between the various elements of society, even and especially when they carry on the tactics of "united front" and "outstretched hand";

WHEREAS the communist party has for scope to seize political power for itself alone, and to choke for ever through violence all the other parties which do not accept its ideology;

WHEREAS the means used by the communist party, often contrary to justice and truth, repugn to the spirit of understanding indispensable to all organized society and to democracy in particular;

WHEREAS the communists of Canada have carried on, during the first part of the war, illegal activities contrary to the interests and the welfare of the country, and that they endeavoured by every means at their disposal to hinder the war effort;

WHEREAS their recent change of front was not dictated by motives of Canadian interest, but by their interest in another country which, though our ally, does not share the way of life which we have and intend to keep;

WHEREAS people daring to write or speak against the communist party activities in this country are accused of being in the fifth column of of being traitors.

WHEREAS some communists shrewdly make their way into labor unions where they spread their subversive ideas everytime they hear a complaint in respect of working conditions, dismissals or persecution from the employers against union members activities, and where they create the impression to the workers that their labor unions are only a steppingstone towards getting justice which can be secured by workers only when they will take hold themselves of the administration of society through giving the political power to the communist party;

WHEREAS communists are not Russians, Germans, French, English, Spaniards, Americans, since they have no country, their rallying cry being the "international";

WHEREAS the communists taking advantage of the fact that Russia has joined the allies in this war and that since then, they have cunningly decorated their activities with the noble and diplomatic expression of "war effort";

WHEREAS if the communist party were granted legal existence, the outside peril by which we are presently menaced might be doubled by a danger of revolution at home;

The Confederation of Catholic Workers of Canada which embodies around 50,000 workers and which aims to improve the conditions of the working class, in a spirit of collaboration between the various groups of society and of obedience to the laws, declares that it is dangerous for the peace of the country and for the war effort to change the present legislation on behalf of the Canadian communist party.

HH-1 follows.

HH-1

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, Mr. Charpentier, you are through with your presentation?

WITNESS: Yes, I am.

THE CHAIRMAN: The witness quoted from a newspaper. The statement he quoted was written by Mr. Harvison of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police, and it was an extract from a talk to the Rotarians in Montreal. There is no date on this paper.

WITNESS: Yes, here it is, 9th of March, 1942.

THE CHAIRMAN: I notice that Mr. Charpentier tried to quote a paragraph but did not complete it. I think it is well that we have it on the record in order to enable us to pursue it further because it indicates ^{the} / sort of information which should be brought to our attention. May I translate it very freely? This is what it says:

"The sheet of communist propaganda distributed in Canada carried that the war alliance between Canada and the Soviet Union should be directed against the fascist clique of Canada and also that the League of Canadian Youth and all other progressive and anti-fascist youth organizations should immediately begin a vast propaganda in the plants and everywhere among the youth; in the youth organizations also to expose the true role of communism."

I think, Mr. Anderson, it would be well to take this up and produce before this committee the sheet of propaganda that is referred to there.

Thank you, Mr. Charpentier.

---Witness retired.

THE CHAIRMAN: Now, gentlemen, we have this telegram from Mr. Cohen which I mentioned at the opening of the

meeting. I will carry out your direction and inform him that we will receive his brief, and if he has any objection to that let him make it known.

MR. BERTRAND: He appeared before.

THE CHAIRMAN: Yes. He now wants to appear on behalf of the Ukrainian Labour Farmer Temple Association.

MR. MacINNIS: When shall we meet again?

The committee adjourned to meet Tuesday, July 7.

- - - - -

BIBLIOTHEQUE DU PARLEMENT
LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT



3 2354 00485 556 8